IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 13-2013

WHEREAS, the Imperial Irrigation District ("IID"), as a trustee under the California Irrigation District Law, holds water rights to and diverts water from the Colorado River for distribution and use within its service area.

WHEREAS, IID is required by State law to adopt rules and regulations for the equitable distribution of water within the service area of IID.

WHEREAS, IID’s annual consumptive use entitlement was capped at 3.1 million acre-feet (less transfer obligations and any other applicable obligations) as a result of the Quantification Settlement Agreement and related agreements ("QSA"), except as otherwise determined under the Inadvertent Overrun and Payback Policy ("IOPP") as contained in pages 16 through 19 of the Record of Decision for the Colorado River Water Delivery Agreement issued on October 10, 2003.

WHEREAS, it is essential that IID’s water rights and annual entitlement be protected and utilized to produce the maximum benefit for the Imperial Valley community and its agricultural water users.

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2006 the IID Board of Directors ("IID Board") adopted Resolution No. 22-2006 approving the development and implementation of an Equitable Distribution Plan with a straight-line apportionment methodology and an intra-district water banking mechanism to facilitate the movement of water ("2006 Equitable Distribution Plan"). Further, Resolution No. 22-2006 directed the General Manager to prepare the rules and regulations necessary or appropriate to implement the 2006 Equitable Distribution Plan.

WHEREAS, via Resolution No. 22-2006, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code sections 21000, et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines ("CEQA Guidelines"), Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations sections 15000, et seq., the Board adopted the Imperial Irrigation District Equitable Distribution Plan Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse #2006101155) ("2006 Negative Declaration"). As set forth in Resolution No. 22-2006, the Board made certain findings pursuant to CEQA, including that: (1) the 2006
Negative Declaration provided sufficient assessment of the environmental impacts of the 2006 Equitable Distribution Plan; and (2) there was no substantial evidence that the 2006 Equitable Distribution Plan would have a significant effect on the environment.

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2007, the IID Board adopted Resolution No. 31-2007 approving the Imperial Irrigation District Regulations for Equitable Distribution Plan ("2007 Equitable Distribution Plan"). Pursuant to Resolution No. 31-2007, the Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated December 11, 2007, prepared for the 2007 Equitable Distribution Plan, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance Report, the environmental impacts of the 2007 Equitable Distribution Plan were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 Negative Declaration adopted by the Board on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA. The 2007 Equitable Distribution Plan included and absorbed the 2006 Equitable Distribution Plan by including and expanding upon the straight line methodology of apportionment and the establishment of a water banking mechanism.

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2008, the IID Board adopted Resolution No. 22-2008 approving revisions to the 2007 Equitable Distribution Plan ("2008 Equitable Distribution Plan"). Pursuant to Resolution No. 22-2008, the Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated November 14, 2008, prepared for the 2008 Equitable Distribution Plan, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance Report, the environmental impacts of the 2008 Equitable Distribution Plan were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 Negative Declaration adopted by the Board on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA.

WHEREAS, on April 7, 2009, the IID Board adopted Resolution No. 8-2009 approving revisions to the 2008 Equitable Distribution Plan ("2009 Equitable Distribution Plan"). Pursuant to Resolution No. 8-2009, the Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated April 7, 2009, prepared for the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance Report, the environmental impacts of the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 Negative Declaration adopted by the Board on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA.

WHEREAS, while there is limited flexibility provided to IID regarding its 3.1 million acre-feet cap through the IOPP, the IOPP requires IID to pay back all water use in excess of its annual entitlement 3.1 million acre-feet, but does not allow IID any credit for the historically larger underuse that occurs when IID uses less than its annual entitlement.

WHEREAS, it is the policy of IID to deliver its Colorado River water supplies to support Imperial County's agricultural economy and local water uses including municipal, commercial, industrial and environmental use, while at the same time discouraging, to
the maximum extent practicable, water demands that would exceed IID's capped entitlement, which such water demands are subject to the limitations of the IOPP.

WHEREAS, the water supply forecasts for the Colorado River system reflect an ongoing drought and increasing probabilities of water supply shortages.

WHEREAS, to ensure that IID responsibly manages its capped Colorado River entitlement while responding to its water users' needs in a timely manner, it is in the best interest of IID and its agricultural customers to implement an Equitable Distribution Plan to maximize the use of IID's annual water supply while minimizing and/or avoiding costly future overruns.

WHEREAS, in January 2013, a Water Conservation Committee was formed to address potential revisions to the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan to be implemented within 2013.

WHEREAS, on February 6, 2013, the Water Conservation Committee adopted a resolution recommending to the IID Board to move forward with revising the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan to provide for an annual system of apportionment to more effectively manage its Colorado River water supply each year, implement an apportionment as soon as possible, and direct IID staff to immediately communicate this intent to all IID water users per the Communications Plan for Apportionment Program presented to the Board (“Communications Plan”).

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2013, the IID Board unanimously accepted the Resolution adopted by the Water Conservation Committee and directed IID staff and the Water Conservation Committee to move forward with the development of an annual system of water apportionment through revisions to the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan and to begin communicating this intent to all IID water users in accordance with the Communications Plan.

WHEREAS, as provided in the Communications Plan, IID staff conducted a series of public workshops on March 20, 21 and 22 at the Stockmen’s Club in Brawley, the Farm Bureau offices in El Centro and City Hall in Holtville, to begin communications with IID water users regarding the development of an annual system of water apportionment in accordance with a revised 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan.

WHEREAS, the Water Conservation Committee met on February 20, March 6, March 14, March 27, April 4 and April 17 to discuss and identify revisions to the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan.

WHEREAS, the revisions to the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan discussed and identified by the Water Conservation Committee have been incorporated into the 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan and constitutes the Revisions to Imperial Irrigation District’s April 7, 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan (“revised Equitable Distribution Plan” and the “project” for purposes of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines), which is attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.
WHEREAS, the revised Equitable Distribution Plan serves as the underlying policy for implementation of an apportionment or equitable distribution of water, as well as rules and procedures for implementation.

WHEREAS, the revised Equitable Distribution Plan is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq. (“CEQA”), and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000, et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”).

WHEREAS, only minor technical changes and additions to the 2006 Negative Declaration are necessary to address the revised Equitable Distribution Plan and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring for a subsequent negative declaration have occurred. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum to the 2006 Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA document to provide the environmental assessment of the revised Equitable Distribution Plan.

WHEREAS, the Imperial Irrigation District Equitable Distribution Plan Addendum to the Negative Declaration 2006 (SCH #2006101155), dated April 23, 2013 (“Addendum”), which is attached as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference, has been prepared pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Imperial Irrigation District Rules and Regulations to Implement the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

WHEREAS, the IID Board has considered the entire administrative record, including staff reports, Resolutions, the Addendum and the 2006 Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Board of Directors hereby finds and determines that the foregoing recitals, which are incorporated herein by reference, are true and correct.

2. The Board of Directors has reviewed and considered the Addendum and the 2006 Negative Declaration. The Board of Directors hereby finds that, pursuant to CEQA and Sections 15074 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Addendum has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Board of Directors also hereby finds that, based on the whole record before it, there is no substantial evidence that the revised Equitable Distribution Plan will have a significant effect on the environment and the Addendum and the 2006 Negative Declaration reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the IID, as the Lead Agency. The Board of Directors hereby finds that the foregoing is supported by substantial evidence in the record. The Board of Directors hereby approves and adopts the Addendum attached as Exhibit 2.

3. The Board of Directors hereby authorizes and directs that a Notice of Determination be filed with the Clerk of the County of Imperial within five (5) working days of adoption of the Addendum.
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4. The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of Gloria Rivera, Secretary to the Board of Directors, Imperial Irrigation District, 333 East Barioni Boulevard, Imperial, California, 92251.

5. Based on the foregoing, the Board of Directors hereby approves and adopts the revised Equitable Distribution Plan attached as Exhibit 1.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23rd day of April, 2013.

IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Matt Desert
President

Gloria A. Rivera
Secretary
EXHIBIT 1

Equitable Distribution Plan
Equitable Distribution Plan

Adopted December 11, 2007
Revised November 18, 2008
Revised April 07, 2009
Revised April 23, 2013
1.0 **Purpose.**

1.1 **Purpose.** The Imperial Irrigation District ("District") is authorized by State law to adopt rules and regulations for the equitable distribution of water within the District. The District Board has approved a plan for the equitable apportionment of water (the "Equitable Distribution Plan") in any water year the expected demand for water is likely to exceed the supply expected to be available to the District. This Equitable Distribution Plan strictly prohibits individual landowners or water users from transferring water and/or water rights outside the IID service area, but does allow for an intra-district clearinghouse to allow for the movement of agricultural apportionments between IID agricultural water users and farm units within the Imperial Unit. Pursuant to Resolution No. 22-2008, the IID Board of Directors has adopted the following Regulations establishing the rules and procedures for the Equitable Distribution Plan.

2.0 **Terms and Definitions.**

2.1 **Agricultural Water.** Water used for irrigation and related agricultural purposes, fish farming, and algae farming.

2.2 **Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.** A program administered by the District or other entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors to provide a means by which qualified Agricultural Water Users can transfer water during a Water Year pursuant to Section 4.0 herein.

2.3 **Agricultural Water Distribution Board.** A committee of Agricultural Water Users and/or landowners designated to provide oversight and decision-making to the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

2.4 **Agricultural Water User.** A District Water User that uses Agricultural Water.

2.5 **Apportionment.** The equitable apportionment of water among District Water Users pursuant to Section 3.1 herein.

2.6 **Available Water Supply.** Colorado River Water available to the District minus District system losses, system efficiency conservation, 11,500 AF for miscellaneous Present Perfected Rights, and any Water Management Reduction.

2.7 **Conserved Water Rate.** The rate specified in the District's Rate Schedule 13.

2.8 **Cropland.** Irrigable acreage within the District service area divided into fields based on the [proprietary] District Geospatial Data Base compiled from IID records, inspections and U.S. Consolidated Farm Service Agency (CFSA) Common Land Unit (CLU) standards, or other defined acreage database such as the assessor's
parcel records as recommended by an advisory committee and approved by the IID Board of Directors.

2.9 **District.** The Imperial Irrigation District.

2.10 **District Conservation Assignment.** Apportionment contractually or automatically assigned to IID for water conservation purposes from agricultural lands participating in or designated for participation in any District On-Farm Efficiency Conservation or Fallowing Programs or subject to the Temporary Land Conversion Fallowing Policy under the terms and conditions set forth in those program agreements or IID policies.

2.11 **District Fallowing Program.** A program administered by the District to create conserved water by fallowing agricultural lands under the terms and conditions set forth in the Temporary Land Conversion Fallowing Policy or under the terms and conditions set forth in agreements with owners and lessees of agricultural property or Farm Units to fallow these lands for water conservation purposes.

2.12 **District On-Farm Efficiency Conservation Program.** A program administered by the District to create conserved water under the terms and conditions set forth in agreements with owners and lessees of agricultural property to implement on-farm efficiency projects for water conservation purposes.

2.13 **District System Conservation Program/Projects.** An integrated package of system improvements to existing infrastructure and construction of new facilities designed to conserve water through targeted spill reductions, and related projects.

2.14 **District Water User.** Any user of Agricultural or Non-Agricultural Water supplied by the District.

2.15 **Eligible Agricultural Acres.** Acreage that meets all the following tests:

   a. Cropland greater than 5 acres, used for crop production or algae farming

   b. Current with water availability charges and water bills

   c. Connected to District water distribution system

2.16 **Farm Unit.** Under the Water Card process, an Agricultural Water User can aggregate some or all of the fields (leased or owned) by the Water User, and for paying for water under the master water account (Farm Unit). The Farm Unit can be divided into subaccounts for billing to various entities. Fields can be added to or removed from a Farm Unit at any time but a field can only be in one Farm Unit at a time. The primary purpose of a Farm Unit is to allow an Agriculture Water User to order water
on any field within the Farm Unit as long as there is a remaining water balance for the Farm Unit greater than the water order. Since fields can be added to or removed from a Farm Unit at any time, the IID must maintain a water balance by field. If a field balance is less than the order for that field, the IID must be notified concerning which field(s) within the Farm Unit the water is being transferred from within 7 days of the water order or a prorated share from all fields with a remaining balance within the Farm Unit will be transferred to cover the shortfall. The amount of apportioned water available to the Agricultural Water User on the leased fields included in the Farm Unit must be approved by the land owner and lessee of those fields through the Application for Service ("Water Card") process described in Regulation No. 3. Water can be added to a Farm Unit by transferring water through the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse but the transfer must be designated by field within the Farm Unit. An Agricultural Water User can have multiple Farm Units but cannot transfer water between Farm Units absent use of the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse. The priority of water use within a Farm Unit is 1) Accepted apportioned water authorized for use on the field, 2) Water from other fields authorized for transfer within the Farm Unit, and 3) Water from the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

2.17 Environmental Resources Water. Water that the District agrees to provide to habitat or other resource areas pursuant to regulatory permits (excluding water to the Salton Sea for the IID Transfer Project) and water that the District provides pursuant to contract or voluntarily to habitat or other resource areas.

2.18 Non-Agricultural Water. Water used for municipal needs, industrial needs, feed lots, dairies, or Environmental Resources Water.

2.19 Non-Agricultural Water User. A District Water User that uses Non-Agricultural Water within the District.

2.20 Overrun Payback Program. A program to be developed with the Agricultural Water Distribution Board or other entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors, in accordance with the federal Inadvertent Overrun and Payback Policy, in which the cost of and/or responsibility for any District payback obligation will be borne by those water users responsible for overrunning their apportionments in a Water Year (adjusted for any Clearinghouse water transferred into or out of a water user's Farm Unit) should a District overrun occur in that Water Year.

2.21 Straight Line Apportionment. A method used to determine the amount of water available for Agricultural Water Users during a Water Year based on a proration by Eligible Agricultural Acres pursuant to Subsection 3.1 e herein.

2.22 System Loss. Either a direct loss or a reduction in water available for apportionment because of seepage, evaporation or other losses in the District distribution system, adjusted for calculated losses associated with reduced IID diversions.
2.23 **Water Card.** The common term for the "Certificate of Ownership and Authorization of Owner Designee or Tenant" described in Regulation No. 3 of the District's Rules and Regulations Governing the Distribution and Use of Water. The Water Card provides information i.e., cropland, name and address of owner and any lessees, APN, gate and canal providing water service, identity of person authorized to order water/receive notices from District, who is obligated to pay, and similar information.

2.24 **Water Management Reduction.** A reduction in water available for apportionment, or a percentage reduction in a Farm Unit's Straight Line Apportionment, because of a district-wide overrun payback requirement mandatory conservation program, or regulatory limitation of or reduction in IID's Colorado River supply.

2.25 **Water Year.** Each 12-month period that begins on January 1 and ends on December 31.

3.0 **Equitable Distribution.**

3.1 **Apportionment of Supply.** The District shall annually apportion the Available Water Supply among the types of water users in the District using the following criteria:

   a. Municipal Users – Base amount of 2006 usage plus current District-wide average use per capita multiplied by the increase in population since 2006;

   b. Industrial Users – For existing contracts, estimated based on past use, not to exceed contracted amount and contract terms. For new contracts, estimated based on anticipated use, not to exceed contract amount and contract terms, taking into consideration the Integrated Water Resources Management Plan.

   c. Feed Lots, Dairies and Fish Farms – Estimated based upon past use and consideration of future changes;

   d. Environmental Resources Water—Estimated based upon the amount reasonably necessary to achieve the purposes of the District's commitments, taking past use into account; and

   e. Agricultural Lands – Straight Line Apportionment used. Subtract the estimated demand for categories a through d above from Available Water Supply, and then divide the remaining supply by the total number of Eligible Agricultural Acres pursuant to Subsections 2.15 a through c to determine the apportionment per Eligible Agricultural Acre. The amount apportioned to acreage that has either suspended farming activities or is no longer receiving agricultural water service (such as renewable energy generation projects), and has been designated as suitable for the Temporary Land Conversion Fallowing Policy, is subject to a District Conservation Assignment.
3.2 Non-Agricultural Water Users

a. District shall notify Non-Agricultural Users of their Apportionment no later than December 1, prior to the beginning of the Water Year.

b. Non-Agricultural Water Users shall be allowed to use that amount of water needed for reasonable and beneficial use. If a Non-Agricultural Water User exceeds the amount of apportionment quantified for its usage, the fee for the excess amount of water shall be the Water User’s standard water rate plus the Conserved Water Rate.

3.3 Agricultural Water Users.

a. Agricultural Water Users must complete and keep current the Water Card to receive an apportionment and delivery of water. As part of this process, Farm Units must be identified and kept current.

b. A written notice of the apportionment per Eligible Agricultural Acre and the number of Eligible Agricultural Acres per owner shall be sent to the land owner, lessee and the authorized representative no later than December 1 prior to the beginning of the Water Year.

c. The owner or authorized representative of Eligible Agricultural Acres must accept or reject in writing some or all of the Apportionment on a take-or-pay basis within sixty (60) days of the notice of the Apportionment. Payment for the accepted apportioned water shall be made monthly based on actual use or as provided by the Agricultural Water Distribution Board or other entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors. On December 31 of the Water Year; any remaining amount of the unused water part of the take-or-pay obligation will be included in the year end invoice.

d. Should the owner or authorized representative of any Eligible Agricultural Acres fail to accept or reject in writing some or all of the Apportionment on a take-or-pay basis as required, IID will provide water delivery service to an owner or lessee with a valid Water Card in an amount not to exceed the prorated Apportionment volume.

3.4 The IID Board of Directors may terminate an annual Apportionment limitation at any time at its discretion or upon recommendation of the Water Conservation Advisory Board. District shall track actual water demands during the Water Year.

4.0 Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

4.1 Purpose. A mechanism to facilitate the movement of apportioned water between Agricultural Water Users between Farm Units. Management and operation of the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse may be delegated by the District to an entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors on a non-profit basis under rules
approved by the IID Board of Directors, however all final transactions must be reported to the District for implementation.

4.2 **Eligibility.** Any Agricultural Water User with eligible agricultural acres can be a Transferee. Any Agricultural Water User with an accepted Apportionment may be a Transferor. All Transferees and Transferors must be current on their District water accounts and billings including all take-or-pay obligations.

4.3 **Priority of Transfers.** Water made available to the Clearinghouse for transfer will be apportioned under rules to be determined by the Agricultural Water Distribution Board or other entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors. Prior to the development of these supplemental rules, water will be apportioned proportionally, by acreage, to all Farm Units that have submitted a request for additional apportioned water.

4.4 **Dispute Resolution.** All disputes regarding water transferred into or out of the Clearinghouse will be resolved by the Agricultural Water Distribution Board or other entity authorized by the IID Board of Directors.

4.5 **Agricultural Water Distribution Board Composition.** This board shall be comprised of agricultural landowners, water users and/or representatives appointed by, or using a methodology approved by, the IID Board of Directors.

4.6 **Clearinghouse Notice of Transfer.** The Agricultural Water Clearinghouse reporting mechanism to document all transfers of apportioned water including the relevant transactional information to execute the transaction between the Transferor and Transferee.

4.7 **Take-or-Pay Obligation for Water Transferred through the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.** The Transferee shall pay the District the total take-or-pay obligation amount due before the processing of any Notice of Transfer for the transferred water. The total amount due is based on the Acre-Feet of water transferred (not to exceed Clearinghouse Notice of Transfer) multiplied by the current District agricultural water rate. After the District processes the Clearinghouse Notice of Transfer, the Transferor shall have no further take-or-pay obligation for payment of that water. Any supplemental transactional information or fees associated with the transfer of the water between the Transferor and Transferee but not relevant to the implementation of the transaction are a private matter and shall not be reported to the District.

**Interface With District Agricultural On-Farm Conservation and Land Fallowing Programs.**

4.8 An Agricultural Water User that participates in the District's On-Farm Conservation or Fallowing Programs is subject to a District Conservation Assignment of his accepted Apportionment equal to the amount of water conserved by on-farm measures or fallowing for which the Agricultural Water User is contracted.
a. If the Agricultural Water User's accepted Apportionment is less than his On-Farm Conservation or Fallowing Program contracted amount, he must procure this difference from the following sources for which the Agricultural Water User qualifies pursuant to these Regulations: the Agricultural Water User's accepted Apportionment on other Eligible Agricultural Acres, or the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

b. If the Agricultural Water User's accepted Apportionment is more than his Fallowing Program contracted amount, he may use the difference on other Eligible Agricultural Acres not participating in a District Agricultural Land Fallowing Program, on the fallowed field after the term of Fallowing Program, or offer it to the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

5.0 **Miscellaneous**

5.1 The General Manager is authorized and directed to do any and all things necessary to implement and effectuate these Regulations in a manner consistent with this policy, including the temporary modification of any dates necessary to facilitate implementation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In October 2003, the Imperial Irrigation District ("IID" or "District") signed the Quantification Settlement Agreement and related agreements (collective referred to herein as the "QSA"). Pursuant to the QSA, IID agreed to limit its Priority 3 diversions of Colorado River water to 3.1 million acre-feet per year. As a result of this cap on diversions, the demand for water by users within the District may exceed the supply available to the District. In 2011 and 2012, IID exceeded its 3.1 million acre-feet annual entitlement under the QSA as permitted by the Inadvertent Overrun and Payback Policy (IOPP) as contained in pages 16 through 19 of the Record of Decision for the Colorado River Water Delivery Agreement issued on October 10, 2003. Nevertheless, IID is responsible for paying back those overruns under the IOPP in 2013 and 2014. Moreover, water supply forecasts for the Colorado River system reflect an on-going drought and increasing probabilities of water supply shortages.

IID has determined that a plan must be adopted to equitably distribute the available water supplies amongst the users. The equitable distribution of water is required pursuant to California Water Code Section 22252 which states:

22252. When any charges for the use of water are fixed by a district the water for the use of which the charges have been fixed shall be distributed equitably as determined by the board among those offering to make the required payment.

This Addendum is prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Public Resources Code sections 21000, et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines), Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations sections 15000, et seq., which may collectively be referred to as “CEQA.”

II. BACKGROUND

a. 2006 – Adoption of Equitable Distribution Plan and Final Negative Declaration

In 2006, IID launched an effort to evaluate the different methods for the equitable distribution of water within its service area in times where water user demand exceeds supply. The IID hired two consultants – Dr. Michael Hanemann, a professor at the University
of California, Berkeley, and Bennett Brookes with CONCUR, Inc. They were hired to undertake an analysis that assessed and ranked different methodologies for the equitable distribution of water. Their study process included a public stakeholder committee comprised of community representatives and involved public meetings and facilitated a meaningful discussion of the issues and analysis prior to completing their equitable distribution recommendation. The meetings and analysis culminated in a Draft Final Report entitled “Equitable Distribution of Water” dated August 22, 2006, also referred to as the “Hanemann Report.”

On November 28, 2006, the IID Board of Directors (“Board”) adopted Resolution No. 22-2006 approving the development and implementation of an Equitable Distribution Plan (“EDP”) to apportion agricultural water users using a straight-line methodology, with an intra-district water banking mechanism to facilitate the movement of water from land with low-water use demands to those with high-water use demands. As part of this Resolution, the Board directed the General Manager to prepare the rules and regulations necessary or appropriate to implement the EDP within the District. Pursuant to this Resolution, the Board also approved the Imperial Irrigation District Equitable Distribution Plan Negative Declaration (SCH#2006101155) (“2006 ND”), which was attached to the Resolution. As set forth in this Resolution No. 22-2006, the Board made certain findings pursuant to CEQA, including that: (1) the 2006 ND provided a sufficient assessment of the environmental impacts of the EDP pursuant to CEQA, and (2) there was no substantial evidence that the EDP will have a significant effect on the environment.

b. 2007 – Adoption of Equitable Distribution Regulations

Consistent with Board direction in 2006, rules and regulations necessary to implement the EDP were prepared in 2007. On December 18, 2007, the Board adopted Resolution No. 31-2007 approving “Regulations for Equitable Distribution Plan (“EDP Regulations”) to serve as the foundational policy for implementation of the apportionment and the rules and procedures for implementation of the EDP. Pursuant to this Resolution, the Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated December 11, 2007, prepared for the EDP Regulations, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance Report for the EDP Regulations, the EDP Regulations were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 ND adopted by the Board for the EDP on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. When the EDP Regulations were adopted, the EDP Regulations included and absorbed the original EDP regarding the straight line method of apportionment and the establishment of a water bank.

c. 2008 – Adoption of Revised Equitable Distribution Regulations and 2009 Apportionment Amounts

On November 18, 2008, the Board adopted Resolution No. 22-2008 approving revisions to the EDP Regulations (“2008 EDP Regulations”). Pursuant to Resolution No. 22-2008, the
Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated November 14, 2008, prepared for the 2008 EDP Regulations, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance report for the 2008 EDP Regulations, the 2008 EDP Regulations were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 ND adopted by the Board for the EDP on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

d. **2009 – Adoption of Further Revised Equitable Distribution Regulations**

On March 3, 2009 and March 17, 2009 the Board directed that further changes be made to the 2008 EDP Regulations: (1) Revise section 3.2c to state: “Feed Lots, Dairies, and Fish Farms,” (2) Revise the definition of Farm Unit at section 2.11, (3) Remove the reference to Unused Water Charge at sections 2.21 and section 4.6, and (4) change the water exchange processing fee at section 4.5 to a qualitative description of a fee which will be determined by staff (at the same time staff sets the other data prior to December 1 preceding a Supply and Demand Imbalance year), such fee to be derived from the estimated cost of administration of the District Water Exchange (“2009 EDP Regulations”).

The 2009 EDP Regulations were approved April 7, 2009 by Resolution No. 8-2009. Pursuant to Resolution No. 8-2009, the Board approved and adopted the conclusions of an Environmental Compliance Report, dated April 7, 2009, prepared for the 2009 EDP Regulations, which was attached to the Resolution. The Board resolved that based upon the Environmental Compliance report for the 2009 EDP Regulations, the 2009 EDP Regulations were sufficiently assessed pursuant to the 2006 ND adopted by the Board for the EDP on November 28, 2006 and no further environmental assessment was required pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Moreover, to unequivocally state that the IID’s intention to provide cattle feedlot operators with a sufficient and reliable water supply throughout a Supply and Demand Imbalance period and for the duration of the 2009 equitable distribution pilot program, the IID Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 7-2007 also on April 7, 2009 documenting this commitment to the Imperial Valley cattle industry.


In 2011, IID diverted 93,190 acre-feet more than it’s approved order, and ended the year with an 82,662 acre-feet overrun account balance. In accordance with the IOPP, IID is required to pay back an estimated 62,000 acre-feet of this overrun in 2013, through the creation of conserved water, with the balance of 20,662 acre-feet due in 2014. The IID has submitted a payback plan for the 2011 overrun in accordance with the IOPP outlining the manner in which IID will pay back the 62,000 acre-feet due in 2013.

For 2012, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation’s February 14, 2013 water use projection report indicated that IID overran its approved order by an estimated 161,973 acre-feet; however, due to the lower elevation of Lake Mead on January 1, 2013, the entire 2012 overrun will be required to be paid back in 2014 under the IOPP. IID staff presented this information to the IID Board of Directors in late 2012, at a January 8, 2013 IID Board Meeting, at a series
apportionment stakeholder outreach public workshops in March, 2013 and at various IID and water conservation advisory board public meetings in 2013.

f. 2013 – Water User Advisory Committee

The IID Board of Directors, at its January 22, 2013 meeting, authorized the formation of a special water user advisory committee (sometimes referred to as the “Water Conservation Committee”) to recommend a solution that would minimize the possibility of IID water overruns and that would integrate with the water conservation programs already in place or being developed. This Water Conservation Committee was specifically tasked with addressing the near-term overrun paybacks, longer-term water supply cap management concerns, and the overlap of existing and proposed conservation programs, with a system of annual apportionment that would maximize the IID’s 3.1 million acre-feet annual Colorado River water entitlement while minimizing future overruns.

Using principles from the Farm Bureau Plan and soliciting comments from the public during multiple stakeholder meetings, staff and the water user advisory committee propose minor policy revisions to the 2009 EDP Regulations, which the minor policy revisions are contained in the Revisions to Imperial Irrigation District’s April 7, 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan (“2013 EDP”), the proposed project under this Addendum. When considering the policy revisions to the 2009 EDP Regulations, IID determined that these policy revisions do not result in any new significant environmental effects.

III. PURPOSE OF PROJECT

The IID is authorized by State law to adopt rules and regulations for the equitable distribution of water within IID. The IID Board approved a plan for the equitable distribution of water in 2006, the EDP, which has been amended from time to time. This EDP strictly prohibits individual landowners or water users from transferring water and/or water rights outside of the IID service area, but does allow for an intra-district clearinghouse to allow for the movement of agricultural apportionments between IID agricultural water users and farm units within IID.

IV. PROJECT

IID staff and a water user advisory committee recommend that the IID Board of Directors modify the 2009 EDP Regulations to provide for an annual system of apportionment to more effectively manage its Colorado River supply each year. This recommendation was accepted by the IID Board of Directors and the Board directed staff and the water user advisory committee to move forward with the development of an annual system of water apportionment through revisions of the 2009 EDP Regulations, which culminated in the 2013 EDP.

The 2013 EDP (or Revisions to Imperial Irrigation District’s April 7, 2009 Equitable Distribution Plan) is the proposed project and captures the minor technical changes and additions to the 2009 EDP Regulations proposed by staff and the water user advisory committee.
V. PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

When a project is changed or changes occur in the environmental conditions as analyzed in the previous environmental document, a determination must be made by the lead agency as to whether an Addendum, Subsequent, or Supplement document is prepared. In accordance with the state California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines Section 15164(b), "an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred."

The 2006 ND was reviewed and an Initial Study and Environmental Checklist was prepared to evaluate the revisions to the 2009 EDP Regulations resulting in the 2013 EDP recommended by staff and a water user advisory committee to determine whether potential impacts, changes, or conclusions associated with the proposed project would meet any of the criteria for a subsequent negative declaration as set out in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines. A copy of the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist developed for the proposed project is attached to this Addendum.

I. CEQA REQUIREMENTS.

Criteria for Subsequent Negative Declaration. Section 15162(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provides that “If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.” Under Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, a subsequent EIR shall be prepared if one or more of the following conditions occur:

"(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise
of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete . . . , shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR . . . ;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives."

IID has determined that none of the conditions set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) have occurred. IID has determined that only minor technical changes and additions are made to the project under the 2006 ND to revise the project in accordance with the 2013 EDP and only minor technical changes and additions to the 2006 ND are necessary to provide the environmental analysis of the 2013 EDP. Therefore, IID has determined that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, this Addendum is the appropriate document to identify minor technical changes and additions to the 2006 ND for the environmental analysis of the 2013 EDP.

2. EVALUATION OF PROJECT CHANGES.

2.1 Minor Technical Changes and/or Additions. Minor technical changes and additions have been incorporated into the proposed project. The changes include:

2.1.1 Rather than rely on a board determination forecasting a Supply/Demand Imbalance for an upcoming year, with a provision to terminate the apportionment if the imbalance doesn’t materialize, the 2013 EDP will provide for an apportionment on an annual basis, which may be terminated at any time.
2.1.2 Definitions of District on-farm and efficiency conservation programs were added to address IID programs that have been implemented since the 2009 EDP Regulations. Definitions for overrun payback programs were added, which are programs that have not yet been implemented, but may be at a future time. Definition for water management reductions to allow for the integration of existing federal policy requirements were also added.

2.1.3 The District Water Exchange was renamed the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse and given additional flexibility to operate outside of the IID.

2.1.4 An advisory board identified as the agricultural water distribution board was created to allow for water user and/or landowner oversight and decision-making, in lieu of the IID board, for the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

2.1.5 Removes fish farming from eligible agricultural acres. Removes certain eligibility criteria for historically unfarmed lands to qualify for an apportionment.

2.1.6 The framework established to set the priority of transfers to apportion the water made available to the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse.

2.1.7 The framework established for dispute resolution.

2.1.8 Authorizes and directs the General Manager to implement and effectuate the 2013 EDP consistent with these revisions.

2.2 Minor Edits

Included in the changes and as part of the proposed project, were minor word changes proposed by IID staff and the water user advisory committee.

3. EVALUATION OF CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES AND NEW INFORMATION.

Addendum to 2006 ND. IID has conducted this analysis of the proposed project policy revisions and has reached the conclusion these changes are not substantial with regard to environmental matters. IID further finds that these policy revisions do not indicate that the project will have any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and, therefore, do not constitute new information which would require a subsequent Negative Declaration to the 2006 ND
pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Further, IID finds that only minor technical changes and additions are made to the project under the ND to revise the project in accordance with the 2013 EDP and only minor technical changes and additions to the 2006 ND are necessary to provide the environmental analysis of the proposed project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164.

Date Addendum filed with Negative Declaration

Vikki Dee Bradshaw
Assistant Supervisor, Environmental Management
INITIAL STUDY

In Support of the Addendum to the 2006 IID Negative Declaration
State Clearinghouse # 2006101155

Imperial Irrigation District
Equitable Distribution Plan

April 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Addendum addresses the environmental effects associated with the 2013 EDP, which proposes minor changes and additions to the 2009 EDP Regulations recommended by IID staff and the water user advisory committee.

The CEQA Checklist (Appendix G) is utilized in this analysis as the criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts. The threshold of significance for a given environmental effect is the level at which the IID finds a potential effect of the proposed project to be significant. Thresholds of significance can be defined as a “qualitative or qualitative standard, or set of criteria, pursuant to which significance of a given environmental effect may be determined” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.7 [a]).

The scope of analysis contained within this Initial Study addresses the environmental resource areas that were previously analyzed in the 2006 ND.

This Initial Study provides a comparative analysis for each technical area and evaluates the potential changes in the impacts that were previously described in the 2006 ND.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture Resources  ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Noise  ☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation  ☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems  ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the Project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☒ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.
Environmental Checklist
IID Equitable Distribution Plan Negative Declaration Addendum

I. Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Aesthetics – Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Implementation of the EDP will have no effect on existing aesthetic resources in the IID water service area. Although there is the possibility that cropping patterns and/or locations of idled lands may change during an SDI under the EDP, any changes would be minor and fully within the existing fluctuation of cropping patterns in the District.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for
water management purposes. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts to aesthetics. No new mitigation measures are required.

II. Agricultural and Forest Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Agricultural and Forest Resources – Would the Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The predominant land use in the IID water service area is agriculture. Implementation of the EDP is intended to support the persistence of agricultural practices in the area by providing a method of water distribution under shortage conditions that is predictable, equitable and more flexible for agricultural resources than the statutory allocation method based on assessed value. The EDP would not result in any alterations to the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, compared to a scenario where an SDI occurs without an EDP in place to allocated available supplies.

The EDP is expected to be beneficial to agriculture by providing farmers with predictability regarding the method of allocation of available water supplies in years when demand exceeds supplies.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The defining of an overrun payback and water management programs, and references to other IID conservation programs and policies, incorporate existing IID water transfer and cap management requirements. The proposed modifications do not result in a change to the existing environmental analysis that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

III. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Air Quality – Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The proposed EDP would not result in any impacts associated with air quality.

Implementation of the EDP could result in minor changes in the amount of water applied to some lands and in the location and amount of idled lands as water is exchanged within the IID water service area. However, the amount of those lands irrigated less or idled is expected to be similar to or less than under the existing condition under an SDI situation without an EDP. In addition, existing Imperial Air Pollution Control District air quality regulations (Rule 806 Conservation Management Practices) require application of best management practices on idled lands with would prevent air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The defining of an overrun payback and water management programs, and references to other IID conservation programs and policies, incorporate existing IID water transfer and cap management requirements. Based on proposed changes to this policy, and for the reasons described above, the proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. The proposed project would not violate any air quality standards during implementation. No new mitigation measures are required.

IV. Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IV. Biological Resources – Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

X
b. Have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Implementation of the EDP would not have an effect on any biological resources within the IID water service area. The EDP could result in minor short-term changes in the location of water use and therefore the volume of flows in the drains. However, any changes in locations of flows are expected to be both short-term and negligible, and well within historic variations, and therefore not to result in any adverse effects on biological resources that rely on the drains for habitat.

State and federal refuges within the IID water service area and other environmental areas (i.e. managed marsh) dependent on water supplies will be allocated water on a per acre basis in the event of an SDI, using the SLM method. These areas typically grow vegetation that has low consumptive use and include lands that are fallowed on a rotational basis; therefore, it is expected that under an SDI they will have sufficient supplies to maintain current uses and
operations and/or to fulfill obligations under environmental permits issued to IID. No impacts to these areas will occur under the EDP.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

Based on subsequent revisions to the 2006 EDP Regulations in 2008 and 2009, an Environmental Resources Water category was created in the Regulations for Equitable Distribution Plan policy document. Environmental resources water is defined as water that the District agrees to provide to habitat or other resource areas pursuant to regulatory permits (excluding water to the Salton Sea for the IID Transfer Project) and water that the District provides pursuant to contract or voluntarily to habitat or other resource areas.

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. Based on proposed changes to this policy other reasons described above, the proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in impacts related to biological resources outside of the historic variations the IID experiences.

**V. Cultural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Cultural Resources – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

### Discussion

No construction is anticipated to result from implementation of the EDP; therefore, no effects to cultural resources will occur.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### Addendum Analysis

The proposed changes to the plan are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts to cultural resources. No new mitigation measures are required.

### VI. Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |
| No impact |

| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral |
| No impact |

- X
spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Discussion

The proposed EDP would not result in any impacts associated with geology and soils. In years when an SDI is declared, the EDP could result in a minor change in cropping patterns or the numbers of acres idled/fallowed compared to years when there is an SDI and no EDP is in place; however, any differences are expected to be negligible and well within the range of typical fluctuations within the District. With the EDP, some farmers may choose to fallow lands in years when an SDI has been declared or to minimize multiple croppings which, if not properly mitigated, could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, without an adopted EDP including a water exchange program, the existing condition could result in greater numbers of acres idled or fallowed. Under the EDP, the amount of fallowed lands is expected to be within the current range of fallowed lands in the IID water service area.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The defining of overrun payback and water management programs, and references to other IID conservation programs and policies, incorporate existing IID water transfer and cap management requirements. The District Water Exchange was renamed the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse, and additional flexibility provided to this intra-district transfer mechanism. The proposed EDP Regulation changes are not expected to alter the amount of fallowed lands within the current range of anticipated fallowed lands in the IID water service area. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006
IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

### VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working in the Project area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Implementation of the EDP would have no impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. There would be no activities associated with the EDP that would interfere with existing emergency plans or increase fire risk.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional hazards or introduction to hazardous materials. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

| VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the project: |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? |
| Potentially Significant |
| Less than Significant Impact |
| No Impact |
| X |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

e. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

f. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

g. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

i. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
Discussion

The proposed EDP would not result in any impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

Implementation of the EDP and the associated water exchange program will not affect the total amount of water use in the District. Nonetheless, water exchanges between farmers could result in short-term changes in the location of water use throughout the IID water service area, potentially causing changes in the volume of flows in drains throughout the District. However, due to restrictions imposed in the water exchange program on the amount of water that can be transferred or acquired, the magnitude of any potential change is anticipated to be minimal and due to constant variation in cropping patterns and locations of idled lands, most likely to be undetectable when compared to the existing condition.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

Implementation of the proposed policy changes and associated Agricultural Water Clearinghouse will not affect the total amount of water use in the District. Nonetheless, water transferred through the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse could result in short-term changes in the location of water use throughout the IID water service area potentially causing changes in the volume of flows in drains throughout the District. The defining of overrun payback and water management programs, and references to other IID conservation programs and policies, incorporate existing IID water transfer and cap management requirements. As in the previous 2006 IID EDP ND analysis, the magnitude of any potential change due to revisions in the EDP Regulations is anticipated to be minimal and due to constant variation in cropping patterns and locations of idled lands, most likely to be undetectable when compared to the existing condition. No new mitigation measures are required.

IX. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. Land Use and Planning – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Discussion

Implementation of the EDP would not result in any land use impacts. It would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any established land use plan or policy. Because there are no adverse biological effects of the EDP or changes to the natural environment resulting from the EDP, it would not conflict with the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project Habitat Conservation Plan/ Natural Community Conservation Plan.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional land use impacts. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

X. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. Mineral Resources – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discussion**

Implementation of the EDP would have no effect on mineral resources.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional mineral resources impacts. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

**XI. Noise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. Noise – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Discussion

The EDP would not result in any generation of noise.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional noise impacts. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

XII. Population and Housing

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Discussion

Implementation of the EDP will have no effect on population. In the event of an SDI, existing municipal water users will receive an allotment of water that is equivalent to their current per capita usage. Future development will receive an allotment based on the valley-wide average per capita usage that assumes implementation of urban water conservation restrictions in water use in future developments in urban areas would likely occur in the absence of the EDP under an SDI; therefore, no impacts to population and housing are anticipated under the EDP.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The proposed policy changes did not modify the municipal use provisions of the SDI and as such will not entail additional impacts on urban population and housing. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

XIII. Public Services

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. Public Services – Would the project:

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

1. Fire protection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Police protection? 

3. Schools? 

4. Parks? 

5. Other public facilities? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The potential for an SDI situation was the same with or without the EDP. Impacts to fire protection are not anticipated as existing municipal users will receive a per capita allotment of water under the EDP that is sufficient for public health and safety purposes. A valley-wide standard will be applied to new development; however, it is anticipated that this standard will be sufficient to maintain acceptable service rations. The project will not result in an increased need for public services; therefore, no impacts to public services are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The proposed policy changes will not entail additional impacts to public services. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

**XIV. Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIV. Recreation – Would the project:**

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

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

**Discussion**

Implementation of EDP will not result in the increase of use of recreational facilities or include the construction of recreational facilities; therefore there would be no impacts to recreational resources.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

The proposed policy changes do not entail additional impacts to recreational facilities. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

**XV. Transportation/Traffic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XV. Transportation/Traffic — Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Implementation of EDP will have no effect on Transportation and Circulation. No additional trips will be generated, and no roads will be affected.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional impacts to transportation and circulation. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

**XVI. Utilities and Service Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Under the EDP, in the event of an SDI, existing municipal users would be unaffected as they would receive the same amount of water that they have used historically on a per capita basis. All future development, regardless of city supply, would be subject to the same valley-wide use allotment as determined annually by the Board of Directors, based on the use of water conservation best management practices. The EDP will not result in the need for any additional wastewater, water, or solid waste facilities. Because of the allotment provided to existing municipal users is based on historic use it will not result in impacts to consider the valley-wide
per capita use prior to construction and thus will incorporate best management practices to avoid impacts during an SDI.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Addendum Analysis**

The proposed policy changes will not entail additional impacts to utilities and services. As in the previous analysis in the 2006 IID EDP ND, existing municipal users would be unaffected as they would receive the same amount of water that they have used historically on a per capita basis. All future development, regardless of city supply, would be subject to the same valley-wide use allotment as determined annually by the Board of Directors, based on the use of water conservation best management practices. Impacts from the project will not result in the need for any additional wastewater, water, or solid waste facilities. The proposed project impacts are consistent with the findings in the 2006 IID EDP ND and would not result in new or more severe impacts. No new mitigation measures are required.

**XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?

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

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within IID, the number of acres fallowed/idled at any time fluctuates as shown on Figure 3 below. In 2003, IID implemented a rotational fallowing program to create conserved water to deliver to the Salton Sea, as mitigation water for the Transfer Project, and for other purposes related to the Transfer Project. Over the next 11 years (in 2006), under the approved QSA Delivery Schedule, fallowing will increase incrementally to a maximum of about 25,000 acres to provide conserved water for Transfer Project purposes. After 2017 (or sooner), it is anticipated that the use of fallowing as a conservation method will terminate and be replaced with efficiency conservation to implement the Transfer Project. The increment of fallowing for the Transfer Project is also shown on Figure 3. To protect ongoing agriculture in the IID service area, the existing fallowing program allows a field participating in the program to be fallowed for a maximum of only 2 of every 4 years. Under the existing condition if an SDI were to occur, it is anticipated that additional lands could be idled or fallowed but that the amount would be well within the existing fluctuation of idled or fallowed but that the amount would be well within the existing fluctuation of idled and fallowed lands. With the EDP, if an SDI is declared, the water exchange program would allow a redistribution of water that could reduce the amount of fields that would be fallowed.

**Discussion**

a) Fish and Wildlife Species:

Because implementation of the EDP would not result in any changes in the existing environmental, no construction is proposed and no changes in drain flows beyond the existing fluctuation in drain flows would occur, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels. In addition, for the same reasons, the project would not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. Similarly, the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
b) Cumulative Impacts:

Because there are no environmental impacts associated with implementation of the EDP, there are no cumulative impacts to consider.

c) Humans:

The proposed project would not have a substantial or adverse effect on human beings. Based on the above, IID has determined that the adoption of the Equitable Distribution Plan will not have any significant adverse environmental effects.

Addendum Analysis

The proposed EDP Regulation revisions have eliminated the SDI trigger and instead implemented a system of annual apportionment that is in effect on January 1 of each year. The EDP maintains a termination provision that allows the annual apportionment to be called off at any point prior to or during the year if water supply or demand conditions make it necessary for water management purposes. The defining of overrun payback and water management
programs, and references to other IID conservation programs and policies, incorporate existing IID water transfer and cap management requirements. The District Water Exchange was renamed the Agricultural Water Clearinghouse, and additional flexibility provided to this intra-district transfer mechanism. With the proposed revisions to the EDP Regulations, the analysis provided in the 2006 IID EDP ND is still applicable. An updated Figure 3 is also shown below for information purposes; the following programs illustrated here include the creation of conserved water for transfer, Salton Sea Mitigation deliveries, and overrun payback purposes. Under the revised EDP Regulations a, it is anticipated that additional lands could be idled or fallowed but that the amount would be well within the existing fluctuation of idled or fallowed lands and not attributable to the revised Regulations. The renamed Agricultural Water Clearinghouse would continue to allow for a redistribution of water that could reduce the amount of fields that would be fallowed absent this intra-district transfer mechanism.

**Updated Figure 3**

a) **Fish and Wildlife Species:**

Because implementation of the proposed policy changes to the EDP would not result in any changes in the existing environmental conditions, no construction is proposed and no changes in drain flows, beyond the existing anticipated fluctuations in drain flows, would occur, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop
below self-sustaining levels. In addition, for the same reasons, the proposed project revisions would not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. Similarly, the proposed project revisions would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) Cumulative Impacts:

Because there are no environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed revised policy changes to the EDP Regulations, there are no cumulative impacts to consider.

c) Humans:

The proposed project revisions would not have a substantial or adverse effect on human beings. Based on the above, IID has determined that the adoption of the proposed policy changes to the EDP Regulations will not have any significant adverse environmental effects.
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Imperial Irrigation District
Equitable Distribution Plan
Final Negative Declaration
State Clearinghouse # 2006101155

November 2006
1. Introduction

This Negative Declaration is being prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It incorporates an Initial Study evaluating the potential for environmental impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the proposed Equitable Distribution Plan in the Imperial Irrigation District (IID or District). Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study, this Negative Declaration concludes that the Equitable Distribution Plan will not have a significant effect on the environment. The Equitable Distribution Plan is not the assignment or conveyance of a water right but rather a process intended to provide a predictable method to apportion the available supply of water in years when IID determines that the demand exceeds supply.

In October 2003, IID signed the Quantification Settlement Agreement and related agreements (collectively referred to herein as the "QSA"). Pursuant to the QSA, IID agreed to limit its annual Priority 3 diversions of Colorado River water to 3.1 million acre-feet (MAF) per year. IID's obligations under the QSA have been assessed in the Final EIR/EIS for the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project (Transfer Project), certified by the IID Board of Directors in June 2002, as supplemented by an Addendum thereto approved by the IID Board in October 2003. As a result of this cap on diversions, the demand for water by users within the District may exceed the supply available to the District, referred to herein as a "supply/demand imbalance" (SDI). IID has determined that a plan must be adopted to equitably distribute the available water supplies amongst the users in the event that IID determines that an SDI is likely to occur in any individual year. The equitable distribution of water is required pursuant to California Water Code Section 22252 which states:

[Redacted text]

The Equitable Distribution Plan evaluated herein provides an approach for apportioning or allocating water in any individual year where the District anticipates that the demand for water by users within the District is likely to exceed the supply available to the District. This scenario, referred to as a "supply/demand imbalance" (SDI), will occur with or without an Equitable Distribution Plan.

This analysis does not consider the effects of the SDI itself, since the occurrence of an imbalance is outside the control of IID. Rather, this analysis considers the effects of implementing the Equitable Distribution Plan, in the event of an SDI. Recent
analyses of water demand in the District indicate that an SDI could occur in up to 52% of the years during the term of the Transfer Project. The Equitable Distribution Plan implements State law and also eases the burden on water users by providing agricultural users with more certainty regarding the method of water allocation in the event of an SDI, so they can plan appropriately and minimize economic effects of a reduction of their water supply.

An SDI situation could occur because either supply is low or demand is high. Demand could be high because of weather conditions (e.g., unusually high temperatures lead to higher rates of water application) or because of cropping and other management decisions by growers (e.g., unusually favorable market conditions lead to a larger acreage of higher water-using crops). If an SDI is anticipated to occur, for any reason, available supplies would be allocated in accordance with the procedures described in the proposed Equitable Distribution Plan as summarized below in the Project Description.

This Initial Study provides an analysis of the potential for environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the Equitable Distribution Plan pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Articles 5 and 6.

2. Project Description

2.1 Project Location

Through its extensive system of more than 3,000 miles of canals and drains, IID currently provides up to 3.1 MAF of Colorado River water annually to nearly one-half million irrigated acres and several municipal areas within the IID water service area shown on Figure 1. Of the water IID delivers, approximately 97 percent is used for agricultural purposes. The remaining three percent of its water deliveries supplies seven municipalities, one private water company and two community water systems as well as a variety of industrial uses and rural homes or businesses (www.iid.com).

2.2 Need for Equitable Distribution

During the period 1994-2002, the District diverted an average of about 3.2 MAF annually from the Colorado River, including the amount of water transferred to the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) under the 1988 IID/MWD Water Transfer Agreement. Under the QSA, approved in October 2003, the District’s total annual diversions of Colorado River water under Priority 3 are now capped at 3.1 MAF including the amount of water transferred pursuant to the 1988 IID/MWD Water Transfer Agreement and the amount of water transferred to San Diego County Water Authority, Coachella Valley Water District, and/or MWD under the QSA.
Agricultural water use in Imperial Valley is inherently variable because of unpredictable variation in environmental factors such as rainfall, the salinity of Colorado River water at Imperial Dam, the incidence of pests, and economic factors such as commodity prices, production costs and changes in cropping patterns. In the past, there have been year-to-year swings in total agricultural water use on the order of 25,000-50,000 AF, and sometimes as much as 100,000 AF or more.

Municipal and industrial (M&I) water uses account for a very small proportion of total water use within the District (less than 3%), however there has been an increase in the rate of residential development in the last couple of years. Between 2004 and 2005, the Imperial Valley population grew by 3%, making it the sixth fastest growing county in the state during that period. The conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses could ultimately lead to a reduction in total water use depending on the types of developments and the implementation of urban water conservation best management practices. However, the increase in urbanized areas within the IID water service area could contribute to annual water demand within the District if the lands being developed have been idle and not actively farmed in the years prior to development.

If a very severe drought were to occur in the Colorado River Basin, existing statutes and anticipated shortage criteria would require a reduction in diversion of Colorado River water by permit holders with junior water rights and implementation of contractual shortage-sharing provisions of the QSA triggered by a reduced supply of Colorado River water. While IID’s senior water rights minimize the likelihood of its entitlement being immediately affected, it is not unreasonable to assume that a shortage-sharing scenario could be proposed for California water users (including IID) under extreme or extended shortage conditions where diverters with junior water rights have already been reduced.

In addition, steady climate warming, earlier occurrences and shorter periods of snowmelt, and shrinking snowpack have contributed to reduced water runoff from the mountains in the Colorado River Basin. Coupled with a fully-allocated Colorado River system, increased water user demands, and historically low reservoir storage elevations, it is possible that a drought sufficient to trigger some reduction in the District’s supply of Colorado River water could occur in the future.

A recent simulation analysis conducted for the District takes the actual levels of water use observed in the District over the period 1987-1998 and translates them to the 75-year period 1925-99 based on the weather conditions in those years compared to those in 1987-1998, assuming current cropping patterns and market conditions. Over the 75-year simulation period, in 52% of the years, demand is projected to exceed the 3.1 MAF cap. The overruns range from 44,000 to 212,800 AF, with an average of 114,000 AF. This could increase if market conditions favor crops with more intensive water needs. (Hanemann 2006)

Given all these factors, simulations predict that IID could face an SDI situation 4 or 5 times in the next 10 years. Moreover, it is also likely that SDI situations could occur back-to-back, resulting in a need to implement an Equitable Distribution Plan for two or more years in a row.
2.3 Equitable Distribution Plan

The four key objectives of the Equitable Distribution Plan proposed by IID are as follows:

- Ensure equity
- Provide certainty for water users
- Provide flexibility for water users
- Preserve the vitality of the local economy.

Under the proposed Equitable Distribution Plan, during or not later than, October of each year, IID staff will forecast water demand and available supply for the following year and make a recommendation regarding the risk of water user demands exceeding available supply for the following calendar year. If the staff analysis concludes that forecasted water user demands will exceed the annual supply, then a Supply Demand Imbalance (SDI) will be recommended. Declaration of an SDI situation requires implementation of allocation of water pursuant to the Equitable Distribution Plan for the following year. If demand is not predicted to exceed supply, then Equitable Distribution is not needed for the following year. The SDI determination can be revisited at any time during the year to determine if Equitable Distribution should continue or be suspended for the remaining months of the year.

2.3.1 Apportionment by Water User Type

In the IID water service area, agricultural lands cultivating vegetables and field crops currently account for about 90% of the water use. Permanent crops account for an additional 6%. The remaining 4% is divided between municipal, industrial and miscellaneous uses. The Equitable Distribution Plan acknowledges that some groups may warrant lesser cutbacks than others. For some users, such as industrial users, permanent crops and dairies, a cutback in water deliveries has the potential to result in greater economic harm compared to other users. In addition, cutbacks to some user types such as municipal users, which account for only 3% of the total current water demand, may be costly to implement, but provide only a very minor contribution to reducing the overall water demand. In the event of an SDI, the proposed Equitable Distribution Plan would allocate the available water supply to water user accounts based on the following water use categories:

- System Losses – Annual Estimated Loss in AF
- Supply of Last Resort – Set Amount or percentage of total supply in AF
- Municipal Users – AF per Capita
- Industrial Users – Contracted Amount in AF
- Feed Lots – AF per animal
- Permanent Crops – Acre Feet based on Crop Needs
- Agricultural Lands per Acre – Straight Line Apportionment: Remaining Supply divided by authorized total acres
The amount or unit amounts for each of these water use categories will be set by the Board of Directors each year an SDI is declared.

Prior to allocating water to water users, under the Equitable Distribution Plan, water would be set aside from the total available supply to account for water attributed to system losses and the Supply of Last Resort as described below.

**System Losses:** Each year a quantity of water (on the order of 179,000 - 445,000 AF/year) is "lost" throughout the IID water delivery system and unavailable for use by water consumers in the District. System losses occur due to seepage, evaporation, and operational losses.

**Supply of Last Resort:** Under the Equitable Distribution Plan, if an SDI is declared, IID would set aside a specified volume of its annual entitlement as a Supply of Last Resort. The set aside amount would be determined each year based on the supply and demand conditions. If any water user is in desperate need of water, an application to an IID water user committee can be made and if determined to be a critical need, an allocation from the Supply of Last Resort will be approved by an IID water user committee. If approved, the amount of the approved request would be credited to the proper water account in the Water Order Entry System.

The various water user types and proposed method of allocation under the Equitable Distribution Plan are described below.

**Municipal Users:** Imperial Valley contains a large and growing urban population, most of which is served by retail water agencies who obtain their raw water supply from the District. The water agencies treat the water and distribute it to the population within their service areas for residential, commercial, industrial and public uses. For urban water agencies, the Equitable Distribution Plan assumes that the unit for apportionment is the number of people served by the agencies. The allotted per capita water use factor, in gallons per capita per day (gpcd), would be applied to the current service population based on the historic per capita amount. Currently, water use varies significantly among different urban agencies reflecting (1) differences in the balance of residential, commercial, industrial and public uses in each town and (2) differences in the residential density, lot size, building vintage and landscaping. For this reason, the same per capita water use factor will not currently be applied to each urban water agency. However, in order to be equitable, and to provide a level playing field for the location of future new urban developments in the Valley, it is important that new urban developments be held to equivalent water use standards that require implementation of urban water conservation best management practices by the appropriate entities. Therefore, when an SDI is declared, under the Equitable Distribution Plan, cities will receive a base amount that is calculated based on existing per capita use plus a per capita amount for new development that is based on a valley-wide average.

**Industrial Users:** Industrial users within the IID water service area include geothermal facilities, food processing facilities, manufacturing plants, etc. These users hold existing contracts within IID to receive a specified amount of water that is based on the requirements
specific to their industry and are based on reasonable use. In the event of an SDI, to avoid significant economic harm to these industries, the Equitable Distribution Plan includes continuing to provide these users with the contracted amount in acre feet.

Feed Lots: Within the IID water service area, there are approximately 35 feed lots with approximately 600,000 head of cattle and sheep combined. In the event that an SDI is declared, feed lots would be apportioned an amount of water based on the specific requirements of the animals on an acre feet per animal basis to avoid any economic harm.

Agricultural Lands. Total agricultural water use accounts for about 96% of all water use in the Imperial Valley. The District divides agricultural uses into three broad categories: field crops, vegetables, and permanent crops. Permanent crops account for about 6% of the water use in the District. Field crops and vegetables together account for about 90% of total water use. In 2005 there were 366,963 acres devoted to field crops, 94,751 acres devoted to vegetables.

- Permanent Crops: Because of the potential for economic harm if a permanent crop does not receive adequate water, under an SDI situation this water use type would be allocated water on a crop water need basis. This approach allocates water to a field based on the reasonable water requirements for the specific crops and field conditions.

- Other Agricultural Lands: All other agricultural lands (90% of total water use) that have been paying the water availability fee would be allocated water based on Straight Line Method (SLM) of apportionment. Under SLM, the remaining water supply after all other users (above) have been allocated their allotment would be divided among these agricultural lands in an equal per-acre amount. In addition, these agricultural users would be eligible to participate in an internal water exchange program as described below. State and federal refuges within the IID water service area that currently receive water from IID are included in this water use category and would receive water in an SDI based on the SLM. In addition, any areas within the IID water service area that receive water to support resources required under environmental permits issued to IID are also included in this category.

2.3.2 Internal Exchange Program for Agricultural Water Users

Most water districts in California allow users to exchange water within the district subject to the district’s approval. This strategy is referred to as an internal water exchange. Districts that allow internal water exchanges do so for two reasons: it provides flexibility for their water users, and it simplifies the administration of water allocation for the district. Further, internal water exchanges are more common among water districts, such as IID, which have little or no storage for banking water. Under the Equitable Distribution Plan, internal exchanges will be permitted for agricultural purposes within the District with the same reasonable and beneficial use restrictions currently in effect.
The proposed Equitable Distribution Plan for IID includes an internal water exchange program with the following general requirements:

- Parties wanting to exchange water must submit an application to IID for approval.
- Based on exchange criteria (maximum, minimum and beneficial use) IID approves or denies application.
- If application is approved, the volume of the approved exchange is credited and/or debited to the proper water accounts in IID’s accounting system.
- There will be a limit on the maximum amount of water per acre that can be transferred off a field.
- There will be a limit on the maximum amount of water per acre that can be acquired.
- There may be restrictions on the timing and frequency of transfers.
- Urban and industrial users will not be participants in the water exchange program but are eligible to acquire water from the Supply of Last Resort.

2.3.4 Flexibility of the Equitable Distribution Plan

The Equitable Distribution Plan is designed to be flexible in order to meet the changing circumstances in supply and demand. In years when an SDI is declared, the Equitable Distribution Plan will be defined by applying the methodology described above based on the extent to which demand exceeds supply in each particular year. Each year that an SDI is declared, allotments will be reviewed and revised if necessary and the following set points will be determined:

1) Amount of total supply to be set aside for the Supply of Last Resort
2) Maximum amount that can be transferred from an account under the exchange program and restrictions on the timing and frequency of transfers
3) Minimum amount that must be retained by an account under the exchange program
4) Maximum amount that can be acquired by an account for beneficial use
5) System Loss Amount

The methodology described in the sections above is what is currently recommended based on existing knowledge of the District. However, as implementation proceeds, the Equitable Distribution Plan could be revisited and adjusted as needed.
2.3.5 Development of Equitable Distribution Plan

The proposed approach to the equitable distribution of water within the IID water service area was developed over the course of nearly one year of public meetings and facilitated discussions with local stakeholders. This stakeholder group referred to as the ED Work Group, was comprised of local agricultural, business and government leaders. The process also included a rigorous analysis of District records by the ED consultant in consultation with the ED Work Group and targeted stakeholder meetings with representatives from local public water systems, labor representatives, and agricultural advocacy organizations. Eight public workshops were held – two at the project outset, three to summarize draft findings, and three to present draft recommendations. More than 90 people attended the workshops, which were held in Brawley, El Centro and Calexico. Finally, the ED consultant has also presented his findings from Phases I and II of the ED project to the IID Board of Directors at regularly scheduled Board meetings, which are open to the public.

3. Existing Setting

3.1 Existing Delivery System

Up to now, IID has operated a demand-based water delivery system; water users have been able to place orders for the delivery of water and have these orders honored without limit and within canal capacity limitations as long as they are in good standing with respect to their payments to the District and as long as use is limited to that being necessary for reasonable and beneficial purposes. The District is rather unique in California in not previously allocating water in the sense of imposing a specific quantitative limit on the total amount of water available to individual water users over the course of a season. Most other water districts in California and in Colorado River Basin states do allocate water in this sense – that is, they do not have a purely demand-based delivery system. The main reason for the District’s distinctive water supply is the unique nature of its water rights as holder of one of the oldest and largest rights to water from the Colorado River. This is a very important economic asset which benefits landowners and water users throughout the District.

Under the demand-based water delivery system, as described above, during the period 1994-2002, the District consumed an average of about 3.2 MAF from the Colorado River, including the amount of water transferred to MWD under the 1988 MWD Water Transfer Agreement. Under the QSA, approved in October 2003, the District’s total consumption of Colorado River water under Priority 3 is now capped at 3.1 MAF. Therefore, in years when the projected water demand exceeds the available supply capped at 3.1 MAF, under the existing condition, there is currently no Board-approved approach to equitably distribute the available water supply. Section 22250 of the California Water Code requires districts to use the assessed value of their land as a percentage of the total assessed valuation of all lands served by the district as an apportionment method if no other method of apportionment is used.
Since adoption of the QSA in 2003 and imposition of the 3.1 cap on Priority 3 diversions of Colorado River water, water demand has not exceeded supply; therefore, the method of equitable distribution of available supplies without an adopted Equitable Distribution Plan has not been tested. The Board wishes to adopt an Equitable Distribution Plan in order to replace the statutory allocation method based on assessed value and to avoid uncertainty among users regarding the method of allocation.

3.2 Agricultural Water Use

As an irrigation district authorized under state law, IID delivers water for irrigation and domestic purposes within a service area consisting of about 500,000 acres in Imperial County. Historic trends of agricultural use in the region from 1950 through 2005 are shown on Figure 2. This figure shows both Total Net Acres of crops and Total Acres of crops, which includes multiple-cropped acreage. Because many of the fields within IID are double- and triple-cropped due to the year-round growing season, the Total Acres of Crops figure is higher.

![Figure 2: TOTAL NET ACRES AND TOTAL ACRES OF CROPS](image)

Within IID, the number of acres fallowed/idled at any time fluctuates as shown on Figure 3 below. In 2003, IID implemented a rotational fallowing program to create conserved water to deliver to the Salton Sea, as mitigation water for the Transfer Project, and for other purposes related to the Transfer Project. Over the next 11 years, under the approved QSA Delivery Schedule, fallowing will increase incrementally to a maximum of about 25,000 acres to provide conserved water for Transfer Project purposes. After 2017 (or sooner), it is anticipated that the use of fallowing as a conservation method will terminate and be
replaced with efficiency conservation to implement the Transfer Project. The increment of fallowing for the Transfer Project is also shown on Figure 3. To protect ongoing agriculture in the IID service area, the existing fallowing program allows a field participating in the program to be fallowed for a maximum of only 2 of every 4 years. Under the existing condition if an SDL were to occur, it is anticipated that additional lands could be idled or fallowed but that the amount would be well within the existing fluctuation of idled and fallowed lands. With the Equitable Distribution Plan, if an SDL is declared, the water exchange program would allow a redistribution of water that could reduce the amount of fields that would be fallowed.

3.3 Other Water Use

3.3.1 Municipal and Industrial Water Use

Currently, municipal water use accounts for about 3 percent of the total water use in the District. Municipal water use has been about 60,000 AF per year. Seven municipalities, one private water company and two community water systems treat the water and distribute it to the population within their service areas for residential, commercial, industrial and public uses. Water use varies significantly among different urban agencies reflecting differences in the balance of residential, commercial, industrial and public uses in each town and differences in the residential density, lot size, building vintage and landscaping. For example, in 2005, total urban use averaged about 201 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) in El Centro, 202 gpcd in Imperial, and 463 gpcd in Brawley. Part, but not all, of the difference may be due to the larger component of industrial water use in Brawley. Per capita residential water use is higher in Brawley than in the other two cities; Brawley has more trees and more outdoor landscaping than the other two cities. Another factor may be that Brawley does not have residential metering, although this is now being introduced.

Under the existing condition, in the event of an SDL it is expected that municipal water users would be reduced in some pro rata manner consistent with the assessed value method provided for under State law.
4. Initial Study of Environmental Impacts

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project. See the checklist on the following pages for more details.

☐ Land Use and Planning  ☐ Transportation/Circulation  ☐ Public Services
☐ Population and Housing  ☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☐ Geological Problems/Soils  ☐ Energy and Mineral Resources  ☐ Aesthetics
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Hazards  ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality  ☐ Noise  ☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture Resources  ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Negative Declaration for IID Equitable Distribution Plan
1. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines &amp; Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-8 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The proposed Equitable Distribution Plan (EDP) would not result in any impacts associated with geology and soils.

In years when an SDI is declared, the EDP could result in a minor change in cropping patterns or the numbers of acres idled/fallowed compared to years when there is an SDI and no EDP is in place; however, any differences are expected to be negligible and well within the range of typical fluctuations within the District. With the EDP, some farmers may choose to fallow lands in years when an SDI has been declared or to minimize multiple cropings which, if not properly mitigated, could result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. However, without an adopted EDP including a water exchange program, the existing condition could result in greater numbers of acres idled or fallowed. Under the EDP, the amount of fallowed lands is expected to be within the current range of fallowed lands in the IID water service area.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.
2. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The proposed EDP would not result in any impacts associated with air quality.

Implementation of the EDP could result in minor changes in the amount of water applied to some lands and in the location and amount of idled lands as water is exchanged within the IID water service area. However, the amount of those lands irrigated less or idled is expected to be similar to or less than under the existing condition under an SDI situation without an EDP. In addition, existing Imperial Air Pollution Control District air quality regulations (Rule 806 Conservation Management Practices) require application of best management practices on idled lands which would prevent air quality impacts.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

3. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to zero level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which Permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) result in flooding on- or off-site</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater discharge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Place housing or other structures which would impede or re-direct flood flows within a 100-yr. flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) as a result of the failure of a dam or levee?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Would the change in the water volume and/or the pattern of seasonal flows in the affected watercourse result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) a significant cumulative reduction in the water supply downstream of the diversion?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) a significant reduction in water supply, either on an annual or seasonal basis, to senior water right holders downstream of the diversion?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) a significant reduction in the available aquatic habitat or riparian habitat for native species of plants and animals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) a significant change in seasonal water temperatures due to changes in the patterns of water flow in the stream?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) a substantial increase or threat from invasive, non-native plants and wildlife</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The proposed EDP would not result in any impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.

Implementation of the EDP and the associated water exchange program will not affect the total amount of water use in the District. Nonetheless, water exchanges between farmers could result in short-term changes in the location of water use throughout the IID water service area, potentially causing changes in the volume of flows in drains throughout the District. However, due to restrictions imposed in the water exchange program on the amount of water that can be transferred or acquired, the magnitude of any potential change is anticipated to be minimal and, due to constant variation in cropping patterns and locations of idled lands, most likely to be undetectable when compared to the existing condition.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the DFG or USFWS?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Implementation of the EDP would not have an effect on any biological resources within the IID water service area. The EDP could result in minor short-term changes in the location of water use and therefore the volume of flows in the drains. However, any changes in locations of flows are expected to be both short-term and negligible, and well within historic variations, and therefore not to result in any adverse effects on biological resources that rely on the drains for habitat.

State and federal refuges within the IID water service area and other environmental areas (i.e. managed marsh) dependent on water supplies will be allocated water on a per acre basis in the event of an SDI, using the SLM method. These areas typically grow vegetation that has low consumptive use and include lands that are fallowed on a rotational basis; therefore, it is expected that under an SDI they will have sufficient supplies to maintain current uses and operations and/or to fulfill obligations under environmental permits issued to IID. No impacts to these areas will occur under the EDP.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental impacts, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping &amp; Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The predominant land use in the IID water service area is agriculture. Implementation of the EDP is intended to support the persistence of agricultural practices in the area by providing a method of water distribution under shortage conditions that is predictable, equitable and more flexible for agricultural resources than the statutory allocation method based on assessed value. The EDP would not result in any alterations to the existing environment.
that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, compared to a scenario where an SDI occurs without an EDP in place to allocate available supplies.

The EDP is expected to be beneficial to agriculture by providing farmers with predictability regarding the method of allocation of available water supplies in years when demand exceeds supplies.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

6. **NOISE. Would the project result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The EDP would not result in any generation of noise.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

7. **LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues (and Supporting Information Sources) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | | X

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | X

**Discussion**
Implementation of the EDP would not result in any land use impacts. It would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any established land use plan or policy. Because there are no adverse biological effects of the EDP or changes to the natural environment resulting from the EDP, it would not conflict with the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project HCP/NCCP.

**Mitigation Measures**
None required.

8. **MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? | | | | X

Discussion
Implementation of the EDP would have no effect on mineral resources.

**Mitigation Measures**
None required.

9. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Implementation of the EDP would have no impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. There would be no activities associated with the EDP that would interfere with existing emergency plans or increase fire risk.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

10. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

Implementation of the EDP will have no effect on population. In the event of an SDI, existing municipal water users will receive an allotment of water that is equivalent to their current per capita usage. Future development will receive an allotment based on the valley-wide average per capita usage that assumes implementation of urban water conservation best management practices as required by the Urban Water Management Act. These restrictions in water use in future developments in urban areas would likely occur in the absence of the EDP under an SDI; therefore, no impacts to population and housing are anticipated under the EDP.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Implementation of the EDP will have no effect on Transportation and Circulation. No additional trips will be generated, and no roads will be affected.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

12. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The potential for an SDI situation is the same with or without the EDP. Impacts to fire protection are not anticipated as existing municipal users will receive a per capita allotment of water under the EDP that is sufficient for public health and safety purposes. A valley-wide standard will be applied to new development; however, it is anticipated that this standard will be sufficient to maintain acceptable service rations. The project will not result in an increased need for public services; therefore, no impacts to public services are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

13. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

Under the EDP, in the event of an SDI, existing municipal users would be unaffected as they would receive the same amount of water that they have used historically on a per capita basis. All future development, regardless of city supply, would be subject to the same valley-wide use allotment as determined annually by the Board of Directors, based on the use of water conservation best management practices. The EDP will not result in the need for any additional wastewater, water or solid waste facilities. Because the allotment provided to existing municipal users is based on historic use it will not result in impacts to public utilities or services to existing development. Future developments will be required to consider the valley-wide per capita use prior to construction and thus will incorporate best management practices to avoid impacts during an SDI.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 14. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues (and Supporting Information Sources) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | X

**Discussion**

Implementation of the EDP will have no effect on existing aesthetic resources in the IID water service area. Although there is the possibility that cropping patterns and/or locations of idled lands may change during an SDI under the EDP, any changes would be minor and fully within the existing fluctuation of cropping patterns in the District.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

15. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | | | | X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5? | | | | X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | X

**Discussion**

No construction is anticipated to result from implementation of the EDP; therefore, no effects to cultural resources will occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

16. RECREATION. Would the project:

**Negative Declaration for IID Equitable Distribution Plan**
### Discussion

Implementation of the EDP will not result in the increase of use of recreational facilities or include the construction of recreational facilities; therefore there are no impacts to recreational resources.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within IID, the number of acres fallowed/idled at any time fluctuates as shown on Figure 3 below. In 2003, IID implemented a rotational fallowing program to create conserved water to deliver to the Salton Sea, as mitigation water for the Transfer Project, and for other purposes related to the Transfer Project. Over the next 11 years, under the approved QSA Delivery Schedule, fallowing will increase incrementally to a maximum of about 25,000 acres to provide conserved water for Transfer Project purposes. After 2017 (or sooner), it is anticipated that the use of fallowing as a conservation method will terminate and be replaced with efficiency conservation to implement the Transfer Project. The increment of fallowing for the Transfer Project is also shown on Figure 3. To protect ongoing agriculture in the IID service area, the existing fallowing program allows a field participating in the program to be fallowed for a maximum of only 2 of every 4 years. Under the existing condition if an SDI were to occur, it is anticipated that additional lands could be idled or fallowed but that the amount would be well within the existing fluctuation of idled and fallowed lands. With the Equitable Distribution Plan, if an SDI is declared, the water exchange program would allow a redistribution of water that could reduce the amount of fields that would be fallowed.

Discussion

a) Fish and Wildlife Species:

Because implementation of the EDP would not result in any changes in the existing environment, no construction is proposed and no changes in drain flows beyond the existing fluctuation in drain flows would occur, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels. In addition, for the same reasons, the project would not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. Similarly, the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) Cumulative Impacts: Because there are no environmental impacts associated with implementation of the EDP, there are no cumulative impacts to consider.

c) Humans: The proposed project would not have a substantial or adverse effect on human beings.

Based on the above, IID has determined that the adoption of the Equitable Distribution Plan will not have any significant adverse environmental effects.
5. Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation,

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☒

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent (see Appendix A). A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. ☐

Prepared By: Ms. Laura Hamish/Project Manager/CH2M HILL

Reviewed By: Lead Agency Representative

John Eckhardt, PhD.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21063, 21084, 21084.1, and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21063(c), 21063.1, 21064.3, 21064.4, 21064.5 through 21064.9, 21064.5 through 21064.9, 21064.1, 21093, 21094, 21115; Smidt v. County of Mendocino, 220 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1989); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).
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