

# A. Facility Refinements Assessment

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>
<b>Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
<b>4.2.1:</b> The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	= No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.2:</b> The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	= No change in effects on Delta water quality, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.3:</b> The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	= No change in effects on beneficial uses, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.4:</b> Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	= No change in effects on Delta water levels, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.5:</b> The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	= No change in effects to cumulative Delta hydrology and water quality effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</b>		
<b>4.3.1:</b> In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	= No change in effects on Delta fisheries or aquatic resources, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.2:</b> Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	= No change in effects resulting in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.3:</b> Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	= No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.4:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	= No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.3.5:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	=	No change in effects that would result in the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any modifications to the hydraulic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.6:</b> Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	=	No change in effects on Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.3.7:</b> Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	=	No change in effects on direct entrainment or impingement of fish, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: B Alternative 2: B Alternative 3: SU Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.3.8:</b> Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	=	No change in effects on fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any additional fish screen maintenance activities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.9:</b> The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	=	No change in effects to cumulative Delta fisheries and aquatic resources effects. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation for Alternatives 1, 2, and 4 and Significant and Unavoidable for Alternative 3. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.3, Mitigation Measure 4.3.1, pp. 4.3-55 through 4.3-56, Mitigation Measure 4.3.2, pp. 4.3-58 through 4.3-59, and Mitigation Measure 4.3.3, pp. 4.3-59; Section 4.13, Mitigation Measure 4.13.2, pp. 4.13-18; Section 4.5, Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-20; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.2b, pp. 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: SU Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity</b>		
<b>4.4.1:</b> The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	=	No change in effects related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides, since no additional people or structures would be exposed to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.4.2:</b> During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on soil erosion and less potential loss of topsoil, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.4.3:</b> Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	=	No change in effects related to expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not expose project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>
<b>Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.4.4:</b> The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to soil erosion, topsoil loss and exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater</b>			
<b>4.5.1:</b> During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on water quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.5.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	=	No change in effects on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.5.3:</b> Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on drainage patterns. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.5.4:</b> Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects related to runoff water. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.5.5:</b> Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	=	No change in effects related to flood hazard, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.5.6:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	=	No change in effects related to risk of inundation from dam or levee failure since a reduced Eastside Trail would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.5.7:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to local hydrology, drainage and water quality associated with the potential for reduced effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources</b>		
<b>4.6.1:</b> Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on grassland habitat and associated sensitive plant communities, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.2:</b> Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on jurisdictional wetlands or waters, & streambeds & banks, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.3:</b> Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	= No change in effects since no special status plant species shown on Fig 4.6-12 (Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, pg. 4.6-60). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.4:</b> Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on CTS habitat (grassland is CTS upland aestivation habitat) and RLF wetlands and stockpools located within trail area (see Figure 2-2, Eastside Trail Reduction, in Chapter 2 of this document). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.5:</b> Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on western pond turtle populations as a shorter Eastside Trail would cross fewer drainages in the watershed grassland areas. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.6:</b> Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotus diving beetle.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, since the shorter Eastside Trail would not provide access to this habitat in the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.7:</b> Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on San Joaquin kit fox habitat & regional movement since grassland provides habitat for burrows and prey base. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM/SU Alternative 2: LSM/SU Alternative 3: LSM/SU Alternative 4: LSM/SU
<b>4.6.8:</b> Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on burrowing owl habitat since grassland provides upland nesting and foraging habitat. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.9:</b> Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	= No change on nesting habitat, since none is located in watershed grasslands. Potential for slightly decreased effects on foraging habitat for golden eagle and Swainson's hawk since foraging habitat is located in watershed grasslands. No change in effects on bald eagles or their habitat. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM/B Alternative 2: LSM/B Alternative 3: LSM/B Alternative 4: LSM/B

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.6.10:</b> Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on Alameda whipsnake habitat in grassland areas of the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM LSM LSM
<b>4.6.11:</b> Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	=	No change in effects on VELB or their habitat since no VELB habitat is located in grassland trail area. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM LSM LSM
<b>4.6.12:</b> Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on breeding bird nest sites (grassland provides nesting and foraging habitat for some bird species). No change in effects related to migratory birds since reduction of the Eastside Trail would not require new powerlines. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM LSM LSM
<b>4.6.13:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	No change in effects to designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields) since no critical habitat for listed species occurs in the watershed). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM NI NI
<b>4.6.14:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on habitat for nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard) that may occur in the watershed grasslands. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM LSM LSM
<b>4.6.15:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse), since grassland provides grassy open areas for badger and pocket mouse burrows. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LSM LSM LSM LSM
<b>4.6.16:</b> Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	No change in effects to Pacific Flyway species as reduction of the Eastside Trail would have no effect on the draining of the reservoir during construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS
<b>4.6.17:</b> The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	No change in effects on local and regional conservation plans since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes related to local & regional conservation plans & ordinances protecting biological resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	NI NI NI NI
<b>4.6.18:</b> Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to biological resources associated with the potential for reduced effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	=	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.7: Land Use</b>			
<b>4.7.1:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	=	No change in effects related to existing communities, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not physically divide any existing communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.7.2:</b> Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	=	No change in effects related to applicable land use plans, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in conflicts with applicable land use plans. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.7.3:</b> Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	=	No change in effects related to aviation policies, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in conflicts with any aviation policies. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.7.4:</b> Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	=	No change in effects related to flight hazards, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in potential temporary flight hazards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.7.5:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to land use. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.8: Agriculture</b>			
<b>4.8.1:</b> Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	=	No change in effects to the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.2:</b> The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	=	No change in effects related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: SU Alternative 2: SU Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.3:</b> The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	=	No change in effects to zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.8.4:</b> The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to agriculture. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: SU Alternative 2: SU Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation</b>				
<b>4.9.1:</b> Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	=	No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LSM
			Alternative 2:	LSM
			Alternative 3:	LSM
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.2:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	=	No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles, a substantial increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LSM
			Alternative 2:	LSM
			Alternative 3:	LSM
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.3:</b> Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change of operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LS
			Alternative 2:	LS
			Alternative 3:	LS
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.4:</b> Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to transportation and circulation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LSM
			Alternative 2:	LSM
			Alternative 3:	LSM
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality</b>				
<b>4.10.1:</b> Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions due to slightly less trail construction activity. Impacts remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LSM
			Alternative 2:	LSM
			Alternative 3:	LSM
			Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.10.2:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LS
			Alternative 2:	LS
			Alternative 3:	LS
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.3:</b> Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LS
			Alternative 2:	LS
			Alternative 3:	LS
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.4:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LS
			Alternative 2:	LS
			Alternative 3:	LS
			Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.5:</b> Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the production greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:	LS
			Alternative 2:	LS
			Alternative 3:	LS
			Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.10.6:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	= No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>Section 4.11: Noise</b>		
<b>4.11.1:</b> Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.11.2:</b> Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.11.3:</b> Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	= No change in effects related to exposing persons to or generating excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.11.4:</b> The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	= No change in cumulative effects related to noise. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems</b>		
<b>4.12.1:</b> Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	= No change in effects related to the temporary disruption of utilities and public service systems, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any increase in temporary utility and public service disruptions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.2:</b> Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	= No change in effects related to the construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any new utility infrastructure or public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.12.3:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	= No change in effects related solid waste generation, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.4:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	= No change in cumulative effects related to public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health</b>		
<b>4.13.1:</b> Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	=	No change in effects related to exposing construction workers and the public to hazardous substances, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result not expose construction workers or the public to additional hazardous substances. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.13.2:</b> Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects related to the accidental release of hazardous materials, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.13.3:</b> Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects related to wildland fires, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.13.4:</b> Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	=	No change in effects related to locating electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in the placement of any power supply facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.13.5:</b> The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to hazardous materials and public health associated with the release of hazardous materials or other hazards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources</b>		
<b>4.14.1:</b> The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	=	No change in effects related to aesthetic effects on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.14.2:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	=	No change in effects related to degrading existing visual character or quality since a reduced Eastside Trail would not introduce any new components. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.14.3:</b> The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	=	No change in effects related to adding new light or glare since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any new source of substantial light or glare. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.14.4:</b> The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to visual or aesthetic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation</b>		
<b>4.15.1:</b> Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	=	No changes in effects related to loss of recreation areas. Although there would be a reduction in the length of the revised Eastside Trail as compared to the trail as originally proposed in Alternatives 1-4, there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.15.2:</b> The project alternatives would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	=	No changes in effects related to increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities. Although there would be a reduction in the length of the revised Eastside Trail as compared to the trail as originally proposed in Alternatives 1-4, there would be no adverse effects on existing recreational opportunities that would result in increased use of other recreational facilities and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.15.3:</b> No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	=	No changes in effects related to cumulative effects on recreational facilities, opportunities or experiences. Although there would be a reduction in the length of the revised Eastside Trail as compared to the trail as originally proposed in Alternatives 1-4, there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>		
<b>4.16.1:</b> Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on historical resources. A reduced Eastside Trail would avoid passing nearby two historic properties and would therefore result in decreased effects. However, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.16.2:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on areas considered generally high for potential for paleontological resources since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. However, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.16.3:</b> Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	=	No changes in effects related to potential disturbance of human remains since there is a low potential for undiscovered buried cultural resources (including human burials) and since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.16.4:</b> Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects associated with the disturbance of historical, archaeological or paleontological resources or disturbance of human remains. However, impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects</b>				
<b>4.17.1</b> Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local income and employment. A reduced Eastside Trail would slightly decrease the amount of project construction which could reduce beneficial effects. This change would be minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	B B B B
<b>4.17.2:</b> Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	No change in effects to the local agricultural economy since a reduced Eastside Trail would not affect agricultural land since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS
<b>4.17.3:</b> Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on the local economy since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. This change would be very minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS
<b>4.17.4</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local income and employment, when combined with construction of other future projects since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. This change would be minor and not affect impact levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	B B B B
<b>4.17.5:</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	=	No changes in effects to the local agricultural economy. A reduced Eastside Trail would not affect agricultural land uses since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	SU SU LS LS
<b>4.17.6</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	=	No changes in cumulative related to socioeconomic effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS
<b>Section 4.18: Environmental Justice</b>				
<b>4.18.1:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects of environmental impacts that would disproportionately affect minority and/or low income communities, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any new impacts to nearby minority and/or low-income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS
<b>4.18.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local employment opportunities. A reduced Eastside Trail would slightly decrease the amount of project construction work which could reduce beneficial effects. This change would be minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	NI NI NI NI
<b>4.18.3:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects of environmental impacts to minority and/or low income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: Alternative 2: Alternative 3: Alternative 4:	LS LS LS LS

**TABLE A-1  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.18: Environmental Justice (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.18.4:</b> Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to environmental justice associated with the potential for increased beneficial effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets</b>		
<b>4.19.1:</b> The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	No change in effects to Indian Trust Assets since no additional land area would be affected. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects</b>		
<b>4.20.1:</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	No change in effects to growth-inducing effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>4.2.1:</b> The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	=	No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.2:</b> The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	=	No change in effects on Delta water quality since a realigned Westside Trail would not result any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.3:</b> The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	=	No change in effects on beneficial uses since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.4:</b> Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	=	No change in effects on Delta water levels since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.2.5:</b> The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	=	No change in cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta Water Quality, or change in Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</b>			
<b>4.3.1:</b> In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	=	No change in effects on water quality conditions as a result of construction activities since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.2:</b> Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	=	No change in effects on behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.3:</b> Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	=	No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.4:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	=	No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.3.5:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	=	No change in effects on the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.3.6:</b> Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	=	No change in effects on Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.3.7:</b> Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	=	No change in effects to direct entrainment or impingement of fish since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.3.8:</b> Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	=	No change in effects on fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any additional fish screen maintenance activities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.3.9:</b> The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	=	No change in effects related to cumulative effects to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity</b>				
<b>4.4.1:</b> The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	=	No change in effects related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides, since no additional people or structures would be exposed to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.4.2:</b> During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects to soil erosion and loss of topsoil due to additional trail length. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21; Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a-b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.4.3:</b> Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	=	No change in effects related to unstable soils since a realigned Westside Trail would not expose project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.4.4:</b> The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21; Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a-b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives	
<b>Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater</b>				
<b>4.5.1:</b> During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on water quality associated with the larger area of disturbance. Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.5.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	=	No change in effects related to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge since a realigned Westside Trail would not require groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.3:</b> Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	=	No change in effects related to drainage patterns since a realigned Westside Trail would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.4:</b> Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	>	Potential for slightly increased runoff water associated with the larger area of disturbance. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.5.5:</b> Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	=	No change in effects related to flood hazard, since a realigned Westside Trail would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.6:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	=	No change in effects related to risk of inundation from dam or levee failure, since a realigned Westside Trail would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.7:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects; however, not to the level of cumulatively considerable and impacts would remain less than significant. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources</b>				
<b>4.6.1:</b> Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on NCCP habitat types and associated sensitive plant communities associated with realignment of the Westside Trail. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1a and b, pp. 4.6-91 through 4.6-92). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.2:</b> Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on wetland habitat and waters of the U.S associated with realignment of the Westside Trail. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a and b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.6.3:</b> Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects to special status plant species. This impact was not previously identified under the original alignment of the Westside Trail under Alternative 4. Implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.3a and b, pp. 4.6-106 through 4.6-107). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.6.4:</b> Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	>	Potential for increased effects on CTS habitat (two additional ponds could be impacted, and grassland is CTS upland aestivation habitat) and RLF wetlands and stockponds located within trail area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.4a and b, pp. 4.6-112 through pp. 4.6-115. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.5:</b> Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	=	No change in effects on western pond turtle populations since no habitat is located along the realigned Westside Trail. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.6:</b> Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotus diving beetle.	=	No change in effects to vernal pool species and habitat since this habitat does not occur in the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.6.7:</b> Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	>	Potential for slightly increased temporary effects on San Joaquin kit fox habitat and regional movement since the longer trail would impact more habitat. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.7a, b and c, pp. 4.6-139 through 4.6-140). No change in conclusions or mitigation related to permanent and temporary impacts.	Alternative 4: LSM/SU
<b>4.6.8:</b> Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on burrowing owl habitat as a portion of the trail would occur through owl habitat. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.8a and b, pp. 4.6-145 through 4.6-146). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.6.9:</b> Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	>	Potential for slightly increased direct effects on golden eagle nesting habitat located along the Westside Trail. Potential for slightly increased effects on foraging habitat for golden eagle and Swainson's hawk, since foraging habitat is located in watershed grasslands. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.9a and b, pp.4.6-151 through 4.6-153). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM/B
<b>4.6.10:</b> Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on Alameda whipsnake habitat in scrub habitat areas of the watershed. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.10a and b, pp. 4.6-157 through 4.6-158). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.6.11:</b> Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on VELB habitat associated with the longer trail. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.11, pp. 4.6-160 through pp. 4.6-161). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.12:</b> Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on breeding bird nest sites (grassland provides nesting and foraging habitat for some bird species). With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.12a, b and c, pp. 4.6-162 through 4.6-164). No change related to migratory birds since changes to the Westside Trail would not require new powerlines. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.13:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	No change in effects since no critical habitat is designated in watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.14:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on habitat for nonlisted special-status species that may occur in the watershed grasslands. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.14, pp. 4.6-168). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.15:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on nonlisted special-status mammal species (grassland provides grassy open areas for badger and pocket mouse burrows). With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.15a and b, pp. 4.6-170 through 4.6-172). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.16:</b> Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	No change in effects since changes to the Westside Trail would have no effect on the draining of the reservoir. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.17:</b> The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	No change in effects related to local and regional conservation plans. The Draft EIS/EIR found that the proposed project would have no impact on this resource. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.18:</b> Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to biological resources; however, cumulatively considerable impacts remain less than significant. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives	
<b>Section 4.7: Land Use</b>			
<b>4.7.1:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	=	No change in effects related to existing communities since a realigned Westside Trail would not divide an existing community. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.7.2:</b> Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	=	No change in effects related to applicable land use plans since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in conflicts with applicable land use plans. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.7.3:</b> Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	=	No change in effects related to aviation policies since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in conflict with any aviation policies. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.7.4:</b> Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	=	No change in effects related to flight hazards since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any temporary flight hazards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.7.5:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to land use. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.8: Agriculture</b>			
<b>4.8.1:</b> Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	=	No change in effects to the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.2:</b> The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	=	No change in effects related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.3:</b> The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	=	No change in effects to zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.8.4:</b> The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to agricultural effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<b>4.9.1:</b> Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	=	No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.9.2:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	=	No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<b>4.9.3:</b> Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.9.4:</b> Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to traffic and transportation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality</b>			
<b>4.10.1:</b> Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.10, Mitigation Measures 4.10.1, pg. 4.10-28 through 4.10-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.10.2:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.10.3:</b> Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.10.4:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.10.5:</b> Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the production of greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.10.6:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>Section 4.11: Noise</b>			
<b>4.11.1:</b> Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	=	No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in noise during construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.11.2:</b> Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	=	No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in noise that would exceed noise standards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.11: Noise (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.11.3:</b> Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	=	No change in effects related to exposing persons to or generating excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, since a realigned Westside Trail would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise level. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.11.4:</b> The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to noise. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems</b>			
<b>4.12.1:</b> Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	=	No change in effects related to the temporary disruption of utilities and public service systems since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in any increase in temporary disruptions to utilities and public service disruptions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.2:</b> Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	=	No change in effects related to requiring or resulting in the construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities since the realigned Westside Trail would not require any new utility infrastructure or public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.12.3:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	=	No change in effects related solid waste generation since the realigned Westside Trail would not increase solid waste generation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.4:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health</b>			
<b>4.13.1:</b> Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	=	No change in effects related to the exposure of hazardous substances present in the disturbed areas since the realigned Westside Trail would not expose construction workers or the public to additional hazardous substances. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.13.2:</b> Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to the accidental release of hazardous materials. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21; Section 4.13, Mitigation Measure 4.13.2, pg. 4.13-19). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.13.3:</b> Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to wildland fires. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.13, Mitigation Measure 4.13.3, pp. 4.13-20 through 4.13-21). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.13.4:</b> Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	=	No change in effects related to the placement of electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in the placement of any power supply facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.13.5:</b> The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to hazardous materials and public health; however, cumulatively considerable impacts remain less than significant. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources</b>				
<b>4.14.1:</b> The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	=	No change in effects related to aesthetic effects on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.14.2:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	=	No change in effects related to degrading existing visual character or quality since the realigned Westside Trail would not introduce any new components. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.14.3:</b> The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	=	No change in effects related to adding new light or glare since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in any new source of substantial light or glare. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.14.4:</b> The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to visual or aesthetic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation</b>				
<b>4.15.1:</b> Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	=	No changes in effects related to loss of recreation areas since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in the loss of recreational opportunities there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.15.2:</b> The project alternatives would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	=	No changes in effects related to increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.15.3:</b> No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to recreational facilities, opportunities or experiences. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>				
<b>4.16.1:</b> Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on historical resources. A realigned Westside Trail would pass through or nearby five known historic properties, which is slightly less than the six known historic properties that would be passed through or nearby with an Alternative 4 (160 TAF) trail. Impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.2:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	=	No change in effects on areas considered generally high for potential for paleontological resources, and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation. Since there is a low potential for undiscovered buried cultural resources (including human burials) with the realigned Westside Trail, this potential impact would not change. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.3:</b> Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	=	No change in effects related to potential disturbance of human remains since there is a low potential for undiscovered buried cultural resources (including human burials) with the realigned Westside Trail, this potential impact would remain less than significant with mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.4:</b> Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.1a-h, pp. 4.16-48 through 4.16-50; Mitigation Measures 4.16.2a and b, pp. 4.16-50 through 4.16-51; and Mitigation Measure 4.16.3, pg. 4.16-55). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects</b>				
<b>4.17.1</b> Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	>	Potential for slightly increased beneficial effects on local income and employment. A realigned Westside Trail would slightly increase the amount of construction, which could increase beneficial effects upon local income and employment. However, this change would be minor and would not change the socioeconomic level of effect. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	B
<b>4.17.2:</b> Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	No Change in effects to the local agricultural economy since a realigned Westside Trail would not affect agricultural land since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.17.3:</b> Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	=	No Change in effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.17.4</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	>	Potential for slightly increased beneficial effects on local income and employment. A realigned Westside Trail would slightly increase the amount of construction, which could increase beneficial effects upon local income and employment, when combined with construction of other future projects. However, this change would be minor and would not change the socioeconomic level of effect. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	B
<b>4.17.5:</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	=	No Change in effects on Contra Costa County's economy temporary loss of agricultural land uses associated with project construction. A realigned Westside Trail would not affect agricultural land uses since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-2  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.17.6</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	>	Potential for slightly increased beneficial effects on local income and employment. A realigned Westside Trail would slightly increase the amount of construction, which could increase beneficial effects upon local income and employment as a result of temporary recreational impacts. However, this change would be minor and would not change the socioeconomic level of effect. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.18: Environmental Justice</b>			
<b>4.18.1:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects related to environmental impacts that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities since a realigned Westside Trail would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.18.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Potential for slightly increased beneficial effects related to employment opportunities for identified minority &/or low income communities since a realigned Westside Trail would local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.18.3:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects related to cumulative environmental impacts that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.18.4:</b> Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to environmental justice associated with the potential for increased beneficial effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets</b>			
<b>4.19.1:</b> The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	No change in effects to Indian Trust Assets since the realignment of the Westside Trail would not be located on any Indian Trust Assets. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects</b>			
<b>4.20.1:</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	No change in effects to growth-inducing effects since the realignment of the Westside Trail would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-3**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
<b>4.2.1:</b> The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	=	No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		LS
<b>4.2.2:</b> The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	=	No change in effects on Delta water quality since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		LS
<b>4.2.3:</b> The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	=	No change in effects on beneficial uses since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		LS
<b>4.2.4:</b> Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	=	No change in effects on Delta water levels since the secondary core borrow area would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		LS
<b>4.2.5:</b> The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to Delta hydrology and water quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		LS
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</b>		
<b>4.3.1:</b> In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	=	No change in effects on Delta fisheries or aquatic resources since the secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		NI
<b>4.3.2:</b> Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	=	No change in effects to behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		NI
<b>4.3.3:</b> Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	=	No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		NI
<b>4.3.4:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	=	No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		NI
<b>4.3.5:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	=	No change in effects that would result in the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any modifications to the hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Alternative 4:		NI

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.3.6:</b> Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	=	No change in effects on Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.3.7:</b> Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	=	No change in effects on direct entrainment or impingement of fish since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.3.8:</b> Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	=	No change in effects on fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any additional fish screen maintenance activities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.3.9:</b> The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity</b>				
<b>4.4.1:</b> The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	=	No change in effects related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides, since no additional people or structures would be exposed to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.4.2:</b> During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects to soil erosion and loss of topsoil due to additional borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.4.3:</b> Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	=	No change in effects related to unstable soils, since a secondary core borrow area would not expose project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.4.4:</b> The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to geology, soils, and seismicity; however, not to the level of cumulatively considerable. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater</b>				
<b>4.5.1:</b> During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on water quality. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.5.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	=	No change in effects related to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, since a secondary core borrow area would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.3:</b> Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	=	No change in effects related to drainage patterns, since a secondary core borrow area would not alter substantially alter current drainage patterns. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.4:</b> Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to runoff water. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.5.5:</b> Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	=	No change in effects related to flood hazard since a secondary core borrow area would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.6:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	=	No change in effects related to risk of inundation from dam or levee failure since a secondary core borrow area would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.5.7:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to local hydrology, drainage, and water quality; however, not to the level of cumulatively considerable. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources</b>				
<b>4.6.1:</b> Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on NCCP habitat types and associated sensitive plant communities. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1a and b, pp. 4.6-91 through 4.6-92). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.2:</b> Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on wetland habitat is located in the secondary core borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a and b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM

**TABLE A-3**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives	
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.6.3:</b> Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	=	No change in effects since no special status plant species were identified during appropriately-timed focused surveys. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.4:</b> Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on CTS and CRLF habitat as grassland provide upland aestivation habitat. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.4a and b, pp. 4.6-112 through pp. 4.6-115. No change in effects on RLF habitat. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.5:</b> Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on western pond turtle populations that may occur in the uplands along Kellogg Creek. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.5, pp. 4.6-119) No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.6:</b> Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotyus diving beetle.	=	No effect on vernal pool species and habitat, since it is not located in the core borrow area. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.7:</b> Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	>	Potential for slightly increased temporary effects on San Joaquin kit fox habitat and regional movement since the borrow area is located along the kit fox movement corridor located northeast of Los Vaqueros Reservoir. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.7a, b and c, pp. 4.6-139 through 4.6-140) No change in effects on the western movement corridor. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM/SU
<b>4.6.8:</b> Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on burrowing owl habitat as a portion of the secondary core borrow area is potential burrowing owl nesting habitat. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.8a and b, pp. 4.6-145 through 4.6-146). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.9:</b> Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects to foraging habitat for golden eagle and Swainson's hawk, since habitat is located in borrow area grasslands. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.9a and b, pp.4.6-151 through 4.6-153). No change in effects on bald eagles or their habitat. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM/B

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.6.10:</b> Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on Alameda whipsnake non-scrub habitat in the borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.10a and b, pp. 4.6-157 through 4.6-158). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.11:</b> Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	=	No change in effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat is not present in the borrow area. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.12:</b> Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on breeding bird nest sites (grassland provides nesting and foraging habitat for some bird species). With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.12a, b and c, pp. 4.6-162 through 4.6-164). No change related to migratory birds since use of the borrow area would not require new powerlines. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.13:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	No change in effects to critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields), since no critical habitat is designated in watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.14:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on habitat for nonlisted special-status species that may occur in the borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.14, pp. 4.6-168). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.15:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on nonlisted special-status mammal species (borrow area provides grassy open areas for badger and pocket mouse burrows). With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.15a and b, pp. 4.6-170 through 4.6-172). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.6.16:</b> Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	No change in effects to Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds. Use of the borrow area would have no effect on the draining of the reservoir. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.17:</b> The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	No change in effects related to conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources. The Draft EIS/EIR found that the proposed project would have no impact on this resource. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	NI
<b>4.6.18:</b> Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative biological effects. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, impacts to these resources would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1a and b, pp. 4.6-91 through 4.6-92; Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a and b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103; Mitigation Measures 4.6.4a and b, pp. 4.6-112 through	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-3**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.6.18</b> (cont.)	pp. 4.6-115; Mitigation Measure 4.6.5, pp. 4.6-119; Mitigation Measures 4.6.7a, b and c, pp. 4.6-139 through 4.6-140; Mitigation Measure 4.6.8a and b, pp. 4.6-145 through 4.6-146; Mitigation Measures 4.6.9a and b, pp.4.6-151 through 4.6-153; Mitigation Measures 4.6.10a and b, pp. 4.6-157 through 4.6-158; Mitigation Measures 4.6.12a, b and c, pp. 4.6-162 through 4.6-164; Mitigation Measure 4.6.14, pp. 4.6-168; and Mitigation Measures 4.6.15a and b, pp. 4.6-170 through 4.6-172). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	
<b>Section 4.7: Land Use</b>		
<b>4.7.1:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	= No change in effects related to existing communities, since a secondary core borrow area would not physically divide an existing community. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.7.2:</b> Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	= No change in effects related to applicable land use plans, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in conflicts with applicable land use plans. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.7.3:</b> Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	= No change in effects related to aviation policies, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in conflicts with any aviation policies. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.7.4:</b> Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	= No change in effects related to flight hazards, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in potential temporary flight hazards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.7.5:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	= No change in cumulative effects related to land use. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.8: Agriculture</b>		
<b>4.8.1:</b> Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	= No change in effects to the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.2:</b> The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	= No change in effects related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.8.3:</b> The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	= No change in effects to zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.8.4:</b> The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	= No change in cumulative effects related to agricultural. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation</b>				
<b>4.9.1:</b> Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	=	No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.2:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	=	No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.3:</b> Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in a change of operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.9.4:</b> Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to transportation and circulation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality</b>				
<b>4.10.1:</b> Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions due to additional borrow material excavation. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.10, Mitigation Measures 4.10.1, pg. 4.10-28 through 4.10-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.2:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.3:</b> Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a secondary core borrow area would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.4:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a secondary core borrow area would not result increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.5:</b> Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a secondary core borrow area would not increase the production of greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.10.6:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>
<b>Section 4.11: Noise</b>		
<b>4.11.1:</b> Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in noise levels that exceed local noise standards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.11.2:</b> Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in changes to operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.11.3:</b> Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	= No change in effects related to exposing persons to or generating excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, since a secondary core borrow area would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.11.4:</b> The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	= No change in cumulative effects related to noise. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems</b>		
<b>4.12.1:</b> Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	= No change in effects related to the temporary disruption of utilities and public service systems, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any increase in temporary utility and public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.2:</b> Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	= No change in effects related to requiring or resulting in the construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities, since a secondary core borrow area would not require any new utility infrastructure or public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.12.3:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	= No change in effects related solid waste generation, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.12.4:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	= No change in cumulative effects related to utilities and public service system. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health</b>		
<b>4.13.1:</b> Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	= No change in effects related to the exposure of hazardous substances present in the disturbed areas, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in exposing construction workers or the public to additional hazardous substances. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact		Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.13.2:</b> Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	=	No change in effects related to the accidental release of hazardous materials, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase to the accidental release of hazardous materials. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.13.3:</b> Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	=	No change in effects related to wildland fires, since a secondary core borrow area would not expose people or structures to wildfires. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.13.4:</b> Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	=	No change in effects related to locating electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in the placement of any power supply facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.13.5:</b> The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to hazardous materials and public health. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources</b>			
<b>4.14.1:</b> The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	=	No change in effects related to aesthetic effects on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.14.2:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on the existing visual character and quality, since a secondary core borrow area would result in the removal of soil. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measure 4.14.2a, pg. 4.14-33). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
<b>4.14.3:</b> The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	=	No change in effects related to adding new light or glare, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in new sources of substantial light or glare. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.14.4:</b> The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	=	No change in effects related to cumulative effects related to visual or aesthetic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation</b>			
<b>4.15.1:</b> Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	=	No changes in effects related to loss of recreation opportunities, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in the loss of any additional recreation opportunities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>		<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>	
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation (cont.)</b>				
<b>4.15.2:</b> The project alternatives would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	=	No changes in effects related to increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increased use of existing recreational opportunities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>4.15.3:</b> No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	=	No changes in effects related to cumulative effects on recreational facilities, opportunities or experiences. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS
<b>Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>				
<b>4.16.1:</b> Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	=	Potential for slightly increased effects on historical resources. There are no known cultural resources in the secondary core borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.1a-h, pp. 4.16-48 through 4.16-50). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.2:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on paleontological resources. There are no known paleontological resources in the secondary core borrow area, however this area has moderate (with a very small area of high) paleontological sensitivity. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.2a and b, pp. 4.16-50 through 4.16-51). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.3:</b> Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to the disturbance of human remains and cumulative impacts. There are no known cultural resources in the secondary core borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measure 4.16.3, pg. 4.16-55). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>4.16.4:</b> Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.1a-h, pp. 4.16-48 through 4.16-50; Mitigation Measures 4.16.2a and b, pp. 4.16-50 through 4.16-51; and Mitigation Measure 4.16.3, pg. 4.16-55). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LSM
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects</b>				
<b>4.17.1</b> Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	=	No changes in effects to local employment, since a secondary core borrow area would not create a source of new income and local employment. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	B
<b>4.17.2:</b> Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	No changes in effects to agricultural land use associated with project construction and development of a secondary core borrow area, since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4:	LS

**TABLE A-3  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Project Update Comparison</b>	<b>Impact to Alternatives</b>
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.17.3:</b> Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	= No changes in effects related to short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in the loss of recreation income. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.17.4</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	= No changes in effects on income and local employment, since a secondary core borrow area would not have an effect on income and local employment. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: B
<b>4.17.5:</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	= No changes in the cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy of a secondary core borrow area since there is no agricultural land within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.17.6</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	= No changes in the cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>Section 4.18: Environmental Justice</b>		
<b>4.18.1:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	= No changes in effects of environmental impacts that would disproportionately affect minority and/or low income communities, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any new impacts to nearby minority and/or low-income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.18.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	= No changes in effects on employment opportunities for minority &/or low income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>4.18.3:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	= No changes in effects of environmental impacts to minority and/or low income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
<b>4.18.4:</b> Construction and operation of the project, when combined with+ construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	= No changes in to employment opportunities for minority &/or low income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets</b>		
<b>4.19.1:</b> The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	= No change in effects to Indian Trust Assets, since a secondary core borrow area would not be located on any Indian Trust Assets. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
<b>Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects</b>		
<b>4.20.1:</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	= No change in effects to growth-inducing effects, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI

## B. Timing Variant Assessment

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
<b>4.2.1:</b> The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. Delivery of Delta water to the reservoir would be staged however deliveries of water to other users would not be affected. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.2.2:</b> The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. Use of Delta water resources would be staged however Delta water quality would not be affected. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.2.3:</b> The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. Use of Delta water resources would be staged however changes to Delta water quality would not result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.2.4:</b> Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. Diversion of Delta water resources would be staged however deliveries of water to other users would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.2.5:</b> The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. Use of Delta water resources would be staged however changes would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</b>		
<b>4.3.1:</b> In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. In-channel construction activities would only occur during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.3.2:</b> Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1. In-channel construction activities generating underwater sound-pressure levels would only occur during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact		Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)</b>			
<b>4.3.3:</b> Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Dewatering of the coffer dam would only occur during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.3.4:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Construction of a new Delta Intake structure would only occur during one implementation period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.3.5:</b> The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Operation (after construction) of a new Delta Intake structure would only occur during one implementation period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.3.6:</b> Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Use of Delta water resources would be staged however project operations would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.  This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.3.7:</b> Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Operation of a new screened intake or changes to diversions at existing intakes would only occur during one implementation period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  Benefits would not be realized until after implementation of Stage II. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: B
<b>4.3.8:</b> Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Maintenance of fish screens at a new Delta Intake structure would only occur during one implementation period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.3.9:</b> The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  The project would be staged however this change would not cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity</b>		
<p><b>4.4.1:</b> The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Project facilities including the reservoir dam would be constructed under Stage I to the 160 TAF level identified in Alternative 4, and again under Stage II to the 275 TAF as identified under Alternative 1. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LS
<p><b>4.4.2:</b> During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	<p>&gt; This construction impact would be similar in nature but greater in extent than under Alternative 1 because of the two separate construction periods.</p> <p>The Timing Variant would include construction-related activities and impacts associated with the 160 TAF borrow areas in addition to the 275 TAF borrow areas, which could result in increased potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts as compared to Alternative 1. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages (i.e., areas near the dam, Kellogg Creek) would potentially result in temporary impacts during both stages. Project elements that would be relocated or reconstructed during both construction stages (i.e., marina facilities) would potentially result in temporary soil-related impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS/EIR to address this impact would be applied to both stages of construction and all disturbed sites. These measures would reduce the effects of staging reservoir expansion to less than significant. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<p><b>4.4.3:</b> Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The marina would be re-located under Stage I to the location identified in Alternative 4, and again under Stage II to the location as identified under Alternative 1.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LS
<p><b>4.4.4:</b> The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The project's contribution to cumulative effects associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil could increase due to the addition of a second construction stage. However, with mitigation of project effects, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LS

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality</b>		
<p><b>4.5.1:</b> During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.</p>	<p>&gt; This construction impact would be similar in nature but greater in extent than under Alternative 1 because of the two separate construction periods.</p> <p>Potential water quality impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM for both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.5.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The construction impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. This impact would be LS for both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LS.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.5.3:</b> Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The reservoir would be constructed under Stage I to the 160 TAF level identified in Alternative 4, and again under Stage II to the 275 TAF as identified under Alternative 1. New and relocated trails in the watershed would be constructed to accommodate the 275 TAF reservoir level during Stage I in order to minimize repeating trail construction.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.5.4:</b> Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The project would be staged however would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.5.5:</b> Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The project would be staged however this would not increase placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard areas in a way that could impede or redirect flood flows.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.5.6:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The project would be staged however this would not increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.5.7:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The project's contribution to cumulative effects associated with drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area could increase due to the addition of a second construction stage. However, with mitigation, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with local hydrology.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources</b>		
<p><b>4.6.1:</b> Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).</p>	<p>&gt; The permanent impact to habitat would be the same as under Alternative 1. The temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration because construction would occur in two separate stages in some areas.</p> <p>Key assumptions (see Table 3.2-2) include locating all mitigation outside the 275 TAF impact areas. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages although with mitigation these impacts would remain LSM in each stage.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.6.2:</b> Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.</p>	<p>&gt; Permanent impact to wetlands would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in some areas in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages (i.e., areas near the dam, Kellogg Creek) would experience temporary construction impacts during both stages. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM during both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.6.3:</b> Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Areas where these plant species might occur would only be affected during one construction period (Stage II), as under Alternative 1.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.6.4:</b> Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.</p>	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM during both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.6.5:</b> Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages.</p> <p>Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.6:</b> Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotus diving beetle.	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Areas where these species might occur would only be affected during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.7:</b> Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	<p>&gt; Permanent impact to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages.</p> <p>Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM.</p> <p>Permanently reducing potential regional movement opportunities in one location would remain SU in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM/SU
<b>4.6.8:</b> Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	<p>&gt; Permanent impact to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.9:</b> Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM.</p> <p>Beneficial effects for bald eagle would be similar to Alternative 1 however slightly reduced since extended over a longer implementation period.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM/B (bald eagle)

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.6.10:</b> Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	<p>&gt; Permanent impact to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.11:</b> Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	<p>&gt; Permanent impact to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages.</p> <p>Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.12:</b> Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.13:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Areas where these species might occur would only be affected during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.14:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.6.15:</b> Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	<p>&gt; Permanent impacts to habitat for these species would be the same as under Alternative 1. Temporary impacts due to construction would be similar in nature but greater in duration in some areas because construction would occur in two separate stages. Areas that would be disturbed during both construction stages would experience temporary impacts during both stages.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.6.16:</b> Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  There would be no impact during Stage I construction. Impact would occur during Stage II construction, only.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    LS
<b>4.6.17:</b> The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  The project would be staged however the alternatives would not cause conflicts with local and regional conservation plans protecting biological resources.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    NI
<b>4.6.18:</b> Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	= Similar to Alternative 1.  The project's contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats could increase due to the addition of a second construction stage. However, the combined effect would remain LS.  The project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    LS
<b>Section 4.7: Land Use</b>		
<b>4.7.1:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    NI
<b>4.7.2:</b> Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    LS
<b>4.7.3:</b> Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Construction activities would only occur in the designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport during one construction period (Stage II) as under Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    LSM
<b>4.7.4:</b> Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	= This construction impact would be similar in nature but greater in extent than under Alternative 1 because of the two separate construction periods.  This impact would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.  Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM for both construction stages and the combined effect would remain LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    LSM
<b>4.7.5:</b> The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1:    NI

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.8: Agriculture</b>		
<b>4.8.1:</b> Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  There would be no temporary impacts to Important Farmlands during Stage I construction; Impacts would only occur during Stage II construction.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.8.2:</b> The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  There would be no permanent impacts to Important Farmlands during Stage I construction; Impacts would only occur during Stage II construction.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: SU
<b>4.8.3:</b> The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  There would be no temporary or permanent conflicts with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract during Stage I construction; Impacts would only occur during Stage II construction.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.8.4:</b> The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  There would be no temporary or permanent impacts to Important Farmlands during Stage I construction; Impacts would only occur during Stage II construction. Resulting cumulative effects would remain unchanged for Alternative 1.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation</b>		
<b>4.9.1:</b> Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	> Construction traffic impacts would be similar in nature to those analyzed for Alternative 1 but greater in duration because project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. Construction-related traffic during Stage I / Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction. Impacts during Stage I construction would remain LS.  Construction-related traffic would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities would have already been built during Stage I). Overall, similar to Alternative 1, construction traffic impacts would be LSM.  Key assumptions (see Table 3.2-2) include waste material resulting from partial teardown of 160 TAF dam constructed during Stage I would be disposed of within the 275 TAF reservoir inundation zone and not off-hauled.  Mitigation measures would reduce impacts during Stage II construction to LSM. The combined effect would be LSM. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.9.2:</b> Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>No facility construction activities would occur outside of the Los Vaqueros Watershed during the first stage of construction; traffic access impacts would only occur during Stage II construction.</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.9.3:</b> Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Project facilities including recreational facilities would be constructed and operated under Stage I to the 160 TAF level identified in Alternative 4, and again under Stage II to the 275 TAF as identified under Alternative 1. Individually or collectively, post-construction traffic would not exceed County standards.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.9.4:</b> Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).</p>	<p>= Impacts during each of the two construction stages would be less than under Alternative 1. Staged implementation would result in two time periods where construction traffic-related impacts would occur. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p> <p>Impacts during Stage I construction would be LS because most construction would occur within Los Vaqueros reservoir watershed lands (as determined for Alternative 4). The project's contribution to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation could increase due to the addition of a second construction stage. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts during Stage II construction to LSM. The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).</p> <p>No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality</b>		
<p><b>4.10.1:</b> Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.</p>	<p>&gt; Short-term emissions related to construction activities during Stage I construction would be reduced in volume due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 / Stage II construction.</p> <p>Short-term emissions related to construction activities would be expected to be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Due to the addition of second construction stage, the project would result in lower levels during each construction stage however potentially result in an overall greater emissions due to two rounds of equipment mobilization. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to LSM under both construction stages and the combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.10: Air Quality (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.10.2:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	= Similar to Alternative 1.  Operation of the project after construction of Stage I and subsequently after Stage II would result in LS impacts in both cases. The effect of Stage II operation would be the same as those analyzed for Alternative 1. The effects of the two construction stages would not be additive no change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.10.3:</b> Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	= Similar to Alternative 1.  Construction and/or operation of Stage I and subsequently Stage II would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would result in LS impacts in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.10.4:</b> Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	= Similar to Alternative 1.  Odor related impacts would be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.10.5:</b> Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	> Similar to Alternative 1.  There could be a slight increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to the staging of construction. This impact would be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.10.6:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	> Staged implementation would result in two time periods where construction-related air quality impacts would occur. These time periods would be separated by a temporal gap of a minimum of 7 years. Impacts during each construction stage would be reduced as compared to Alternative 1.  The project's overall contribution to increases of criteria pollutant emissions could increase slightly compared to Alternative 1 due to the addition of a second construction stage. This impact would be LSM on the project level. The project would not result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.  The cumulative impacts would be LSM in both cases. The combined effects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to air quality of a magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>Section 4.11: Noise</b>		
<b>4.11.1:</b> Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	= Similar to Alternative 1.  Construction-related noise during Stage I construction would be reduced in volume due to the reduced intensity of construction activities (including no blasting) and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 and Stage II construction.  Construction-related noise during Stage II construction would be similar to Alternative 1. This impact would be LSM in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.11: Noise (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.11.2:</b> Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.11.3:</b> Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Construction-related ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise during Stage I construction would be reduced due to the reduced intensity of construction activities (including no blasting) and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 and Stage II construction.</p> <p>Construction-related ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise during Stage II construction would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.11.4:</b> The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.</p>	<p>= Construction-related noise impacts during Stage I construction would be reduced as compared to Alternative 1 and Stage II construction.</p> <p>Construction-related noise impacts during Stage II construction would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Staged implementation would result in two time periods where construction noise-related impacts would occur. Stage I and Stage II construction periods would be separated by a temporal gap of a minimum of 7 years.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts during both construction stages to LSM. The project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative construction-related short-term noise impacts.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<b>Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems</b>		
<p><b>4.12.1:</b> Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>No facility construction activities would occur outside of the Los Vaqueros Watershed during Stage I construction. Utility and public service impacts would only potentially occur during the second stage of construction.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.12.2:</b> Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Neither Stage I or Stage II would require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LS
<p><b>4.12.3:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Neither Stage I or Stage II would require or result in increases to solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<p><b>4.12.4:</b> Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Stage I and Stage II construction periods would be separated by a minimum of 7 years. Staged implementation would result in two time periods where cumulative construction-related impacts on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity would potentially occur.</p> <p>The project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity. This impact would be LSM in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health</b>		
<p><b>4.13.1:</b> Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards during Stage I / Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction. Impacts during Stage I construction would remain LS.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). Overall, similar to Alternative 1, potential construction-related hazards impacts would remain LS.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	Alternative 1: LS

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.13.2:</b> Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.</p>	<p>= Project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards during Stage I/ Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction. Impacts during Stage I construction would be LSM.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). Overall, similar to Alternative 1, potential construction-related hazards impacts would be LSM. This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1      LSM</p>
<p><b>4.13.3:</b> Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.</p>	<p>= Project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards during Stage I/ Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction. Impacts during Stage I construction would be LSM.</p> <p>Potential construction-related hazards would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). Overall, similar to Alternative 1, potential construction-related hazards impacts would be LSM. This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1:      LSM</p>
<p><b>4.13.4:</b> Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.</p>	<p>= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Only Stage II includes new power supply options, and those would not be located within 150 feet of a school.</p> <p>This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1:      NI</p>
<p><b>4.13.5:</b> The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.</p>	<p>= Project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.</p> <p>Potential cumulative construction-related hazards during Stage I/ Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction. Impacts during Stage I construction would be LS.</p> <p>Potential cumulative construction-related hazards would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to hazards and public health. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1:      LS</p>

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources</b>		
<b>4.14.1:</b> The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Neither Stage I or Stage II would result in a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.14.2:</b> The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	> Stage I construction would result in increased visual effects to visual resources associated with the 160 TAF borrow areas. The Stage I impacts would be greater than those that would result under Stage II / Alternative 1, which would not require use of borrow areas downstream of the existing dam mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant as described in the Draft EIS/EIR for Alternative 4.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.14.3:</b> The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Stage I construction would result in the same LS impacts related to new light and glare as Alternative 4. These impacts would be less than those that would result under Stage II / Alternative 1, which would require mitigation for creating a new source of glare that could adversely affect views in the area. Stage II impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, as described for Alternative 1 in the Draft EIS/EIR.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.14.4:</b> The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	= Project construction and related impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period.  Potential cumulative effects upon visual/aesthetic resources in the project area during Stage I/ Alt 4 construction would be increased (as compared with Stage II / Alternative 1) due to the addition of two core borrow areas as compared to Alternative 1 construction.  Potential cumulative construction-related hazards would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to hazards and public health.  Cumulative impacts would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation</b>		
<b>4.15.1:</b> Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	> Interruption of recreational opportunities during Stage I construction would be reduced due to the shorter construction period as compared to Alternative 1/ Stage II construction.  Interruption of recreational opportunities during Stage II construction would be similar to Alternative 1.  This impact would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year time period and be LSM in both cases. However, the combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.15: Recreation (cont.)</b>		
<p><b>4.15.2:</b> The project alternatives would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.</p>	<p>= Use of other recreational facilities during Stage I construction would be reduced due the shorter construction period as compared to Alternative 1/ Stage II construction. Use of other recreational facilities during Stage II construction would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>This impact would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year time period and be LS in both cases. The combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<p><b>4.15.3:</b> No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.</p>	<p>= Project effects upon recreation would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. Potential cumulative recreation-related impacts during Stage I/ Alt 4 construction would be reduced in volume (as compared with State II / Alternative 1) due to the reduced intensity of construction activities and would occur for a shorter duration as compared to Alternative 1 construction.</p> <p>Potential cumulative recreation-related impacts would be slightly reduced in volume under Stage II due to the reduced intensity of construction activities as compared to Alternative 1 (i.e.- because some facilities already built during Stage I). With mitigation proposed for project-related recreation impacts, and LS impacts upon are facilities, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to recreation.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<b>Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>		
<p><b>4.16.1:</b> Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.</p>	<p>&gt; Similar to Alternative 1, both construction stages would have the potential to affect multiple historic resources and burial/reburial sites. Drawdown under Stage 1 would be similar to that which can occur under existing conditions at the reservoir; therefore, construction of Stage 1 would not result in any new erosion-related impacts. Both core borrow areas were designed to avoid known historic properties and lie in an area with primarily low potential for buried cultural resources and human remains. Overall, the total impact would be as described for Alternative 1. Mitigation measures implemented during both construction stages would reduce impacts to LSM.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.16.2:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.</p>	<p>&gt; Similar to Alternative 1, both construction stages would have the potential to affect paleontological resources. With use of core borrow areas for Stage I plus Stage II borrow pits upstream of the dam, there is some potential for increased effects on paleontological resources.</p> <p>Mitigation measures implemented during both construction stages would reduce impacts to LSM.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<p><b>4.16.3:</b> Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1, both construction stages would have the potential to disturb human remains. The secondary core borrow area was designed to avoid known historic properties and lies in an area with primarily low potential for buried cultural resources and human remains. Overall, the total impact would be as described for Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.16.3</b> (cont.)	<p>Mitigation measures implemented during both construction stages would reduce impacts to LSM. The project's contribution to cumulative adverse effects associated with the disturbance of human remains would not be considerable.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	
<b>4.16.4:</b> Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	<p>= Similar to Alternative 1, staged implementation would result in two time periods where cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources would potentially occur. Since the secondary core borrow area was designed to avoid known historic properties and lies in an area with primarily low potential for buried cultural resources and human remains, the cumulative impact would be as described for Alternative 1.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would reduce impacts during both construction stages to LSM. The combined effect would remain LSM. The project's contribution to cumulative adverse effects on historical and/or unique archaeological resources and paleontological resources would not be considerable.</p> <p>This impact would be LSM in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LSM</p>
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects</b>		
<b>4.17.1</b> Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	<p>&gt; This beneficial effect would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. The combined effect of multiple construction periods could result in some unquantified, but slight additive economic benefits.</p> <p>This impact would be B in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: B</p>
<b>4.17.2:</b> Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	<p>= There are no effects to agriculture associated with Stage I / Alternative 4. The temporary and permanent loss of land associated with Stage II / Alternative I would not be of sufficient magnitude to result in a significant economic impact on the economy as a whole.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<b>4.17.3:</b> Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	<p>&gt; The short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year time period. However, the combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to result in a significant economic impact on the economy as a whole.</p> <p>This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: LS</p>
<b>4.17.4</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	<p>&gt; Beneficial effects upon income and local employment due to two construction phases would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. The combined effect could result in some unquantified, but slight additive economic benefits.</p> <p>This impact would be B in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative 1: B</p>

**TABLE B  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects (cont.)</b>		
<b>4.17.5:</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of permanent loss of agricultural land uses.	= There are no effects to agriculture associated with Stage I / Alternative 4. The temporary and permanent loss of land associated with Stage II / Alternative I would not be of sufficient magnitude to result in a significant economic impact on the economy as a whole. There would be no change in cumulative effects relative to Alternative 1 on County economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	Alternative 1: LSM
<b>4.17.6</b> Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	= Potential cumulative effects on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. However, the combined effect would not be of sufficient magnitude to result in a cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts. This impact would be LS in both cases.  No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>Section 4.18: Environmental Justice</b>		
<b>4.18.1:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Construction impacts would occur twice within an approximately 7 – 10 year period. Neither Stage I or Stage II construction and operation would disproportionately affect minority and/or low income communities.  This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.18.2:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Neither Stage I or Stage II construction and operation would disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low income communities.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: NI
<b>4.18.3:</b> Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Neither Stage I or Stage II construction and operation would disproportionately affect minority and/or low income communities.  This impact would be LS in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS
<b>4.18.4:</b> Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	= No change in effects relative to Alternative 1.  Neither Stage I or Stage II construction and operation, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would disproportionately affect employment opportunities for minority &/or low income communities.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: NI

**TABLE B**  
**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR TIMING VARIANT CEQA / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS RELATIVE TO ALTERNATIVE 1**

Environmental Impact	Timing Variant Comparison	Impact of Alternative 1
<b>Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets</b>		
<b>4.19.1:</b> The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	No change in effects relative to Alternative 1 to Indian Trust Assets since neither Stage I nor Stage II affects Indian Trust Assets.  This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI
<b>Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects</b>		
<b>4.20.1:</b> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	No change in impacts relative to Alternative 1.  Neither Stage I or Stage II construction and operation result in growth-inducing effects. This impact would be NI in both cases. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
		Alternative 1: NI