

Appeal of Certification of Consistency

C20185-A7

Step 1 - Appellant(s) Information

Appellant Representing: San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta

Primary Contact: Osha Meserve

Address: 510 8th st

City, State, Zip: Sacramento, CA 95814

Telephone/Fax: 9164557300 / 9162447300

E-mail Address: osha@semlawyers.com

Step 2 - Covered Action being Appealed

Covered Action ID: C20185

Covered Action Title: California WaterFix

Agency Subject to Appeal: California Department of Water Resources

Contact Person Subject to Appeal: Katherine Marquez

Address: 3500 Industrial Blvd., Room 117

City, State, Zip: West Sacramento, CA 95691

Telephone/Fax: (916) 651-9569

E-mail Address: cwf_dp_consistency@water.ca.gov

Covered Action Description: The Department of Water Resources' (DWR) fundamental purpose in proposing the California WaterFix is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The fundamental purpose is informed by past efforts taken within the Delta and the watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, including those undertaken through the CALFED Bay-Delta Program and Delta Risk Management Strategy. Attached is a summarized project description of California WaterFix from the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS) describing the conveyance facilities, operations and Environmental Commitments. For a detailed version see Final EIR/EIS, Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives. As typical for construction projects of this size, engineering refinements have developed through the planning process. The California WaterFix Project Refinements document of this July 2018 certification of consistency describes these refinements, as documented in the California WaterFix Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and in the California WaterFix Draft Supplemental EIR/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The California WaterFix Project Refinements document goes on to describe how the refinements in each CEQA document do not conflict with the conclusions nor do they significantly change the detailed findings for each of the Delta Plan Policies in the Delta Plan Certification of Consistency for the California WaterFix as supported, in part, by the 2016 Final EIR/EIS and 2017

certified Final EIR. The WaterFix certification of consistency is based on DWR's interpretation of the Delta Plan policies, which was developed with support from DSC staff through the early consultation process. If it is determined by the DSC Delta Council that a Delta Plan policy DWR finds to be not applicable to California WaterFix, in fact does apply to portions of California WaterFix, and/or full consistency with the policy as interpreted by the Council is not feasible, California WaterFix should still be found to be consistent with the Delta Plan pursuant to subdivision (b)(1) of section 5002 of title 23 of the California Code of Regulations. That provision states that, where full consistency with all relevant regulatory policies may not be feasible, an agency proposing a covered action may nevertheless certify that the action is consistent with the overall Delta Plan by certifying that the action is consistent with the coequal goals themselves. As demonstrated in the Final EIR/EIS and described in California WaterFix and the Coequal Goals document, California WaterFix is consistent with the coequal goals themselves.

Step 3 - Consistency with the Delta Plan

DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 2

a. [G P1\(b\)\(2\)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. \(b\)\(2\)](#) - Mitigation Measures

G P1(b)(2)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. (b)(2) provides that covered actions not exempt from CEQA, must include all applicable feasible mitigation measures adopted and incorporated into the Delta Plan as amended April 26, 2018, (unless the measure(s) are within the exclusive jurisdiction of an agency other than the agency that files the certification of consistency), or substitute [mitigation measures](#) that the agency that files the certification of consistency finds are equally or more effective. For more information, see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, and Delta Plan Appendix O, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which are referenced in this regulatory policy.

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [SJC_223 Lambie.pdf](#), [Antioch_300 Paulsen.pdf](#), [Antioch-500 Paulsen.pdf](#), [CCC-SC_10.pdf](#), [CCC-SC_11.pdf](#), [ccc-sc_63 Increased Exports During Dry Periods.pdf](#), [ccc-sc_67 MWD Presentation July 10 2018.pdf](#), [ccc-sc-59 HC3 Comparison.pdf](#), [DCL- 2 1986 Coordinated Operations Agreement CVP SWP.pdf](#), [DCL- 3 DSC Item_11 Update Re CWF Feb. 22-24 2017.pdf](#), [DCL-1 WIFIA Solic.pdf](#), [DCL-4 cwfnotice_pet_hrg.pdf](#), [DCL-5 CCC Letter re Plan B.pdf](#), [dwr_1292 Reyes Memo.pdf](#), [land_121 USACE Permit App.pdf](#), [ndwa_500 Kienlen.pdf](#), [ndwa_502 MBK Report.pdf](#), [NRDC-204 Burman Ltr.pdf](#), [scwa_200 Mehl.pdf](#), [scwa_300 Schmitz.pdf](#), [sdwa_320 MWD Board Meeting Packet July 10 2018.pdf](#), [sdwa_321 Michael.pdf](#), [SJTA 203 Woodley Letter.pdf](#), [sosc_81Wirth Presentation.pdf](#), [stkn_47 Paulsen.pdf](#), [ccc-sc_52 CVP Share of Exports under H3+.pdf](#), [dwr-1143 Revised Operations Criteria.pdf](#), [172-11ExhIndex.xlsx](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

b. [G P1\(b\)\(3\)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. \(b\)\(3\)](#) - Best Available Science

G P1(b)(3)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. (b)(3) provides that, relevant to the purpose and nature of the project, all covered actions must document use of best available science. For more information, see [Appendix 1A](#), which is referenced in

this regulatory policy.

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta (“Delta Counties and LAND”) generally appeal DWR’s entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council’s applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project’s inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND’s Appeal documents. [ecos_11 Lamare.pdf](#), [fsl_21 Ivey.pdf](#), [land_148 Dooling&Popper.pdf](#), [SJC_200 Brett.pdf](#), [sosc_21 Pandolfino.pdf](#), [sosc80 Wirth.pdf](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

c. [G P1\(b\)\(4\)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. \(b\)\(4\)](#) - Adaptive Management

G P1(b)(4)/Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. (b)(4) provides that an ecosystem restoration or water management covered action must include adequate provisions, appropriate to its scope, to assure continued implementation of adaptive management. For more information, see [Appendix 1B](#), which is referenced in this regulatory policy. Note that this requirement may be satisfied through both of the following:

(A) An adaptive management plan that describes the approach to be taken consistent with the adaptive management framework in Appendix 1B; and

(B) Documentation of access to adequate resources and delineated authority by the entity responsible for the implementation of the proposed adaptive management process.

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta (“Delta Counties and LAND”) generally appeal DWR’s entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council’s applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project’s inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND’s Appeal documents. [Antioch-600 Paulsen.pdf](#), [Antioch-601.pdf](#), [CCC-SC--51 Denton.pdf](#), [LAND-240 Shilling.pdf](#), [LAND-241 Shilling 2018.pdf](#), [LAND-242 AMOverview2007.pdf](#), [LAND-243 MurphyWeiland2014.pdf](#), [LAND-244 WilliamsSzaroShapiro2009.pdf](#), [LAND-245 Biber2013.pdf](#), [LAND-246 Gardner2015.pdf](#), [LAND-247 Walters2007.pdf](#), [LAND-250 Flores2013.pdf](#), [LAND-251 CADBDPCP2011.pdf](#), [LAND-252 AppCAM2013.pdf](#), [LAND-253 Williams2011.pdf](#), [LAND-254 Doremus2011.pdf](#), [LAND-255 NieSchultz2012.pdf](#), [LAND-256 SZELondon et al2009.pdf](#), [LAND-257 Gunderson1999.pdf](#), [LAND-258 Gunderson2006.pdf](#), [LAND-259 McLainandLee1996.pdf](#), [LAND-260 Moyleetal2018.pdf](#), [LAND-266 Errata Stokely.pdf](#), [LAND-267 Stokely2018.pdf](#), [LAND-268 Stokely2018.pdf](#), [LAND-269 TrinityRODAppC2010.pdf](#), [LAND-270 TrinityMngmtCnclSbcmtee2004.pdf](#), [LAND-271 Houston2018.pdf](#), [LAND-272 CDRAssociates2008.pdf](#), [LAND-273 Duffy2016.pdf](#), [LAND-274 Buffingtonetal2014.pdf](#), [LAND-275 TrinityRvrRstrtnScients2010.pdf](#), [LAND-277 DISB2016.pdf](#), [LAND-278 Headwaters2017.pdf](#), [LAND-279 HeadwatersFINAL.pdf](#), [LAND-280 BORLtr2017.pdf](#), [LAND-281 CSAMPPolicyGroup.pdf](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[WR P1 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5003](#) - Reduce Reliance on the Delta through Improved Regional Water Self-Reliance

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta (“Delta Counties and LAND”) generally appeal DWR’s entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council’s applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project’s inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND’s Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[WR P2 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5004](#) - Transparency in Water Contracting

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta (“Delta Counties and LAND”) generally appeal DWR’s entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council’s applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project’s inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND’s Appeal documents. [DCL-1 WIFIA Solic.pdf](#), [DCL-221 Consolidated Contract.pdf](#), [DCL-222 BOR Notice of Neg COA.pdf](#), [DCL-223 PCL Comment Letter.pdf](#), [DCL-224 CWIN Letter to Sen Jackson.pdf](#), [DCL-225 CCWD Letter to BOR.pdf](#), [DCL-226 MWD Mtg. March 27 2018 2a Presentation.pdf](#), [sdwa_316 Meeting Transcript.pdf](#), [sdwa_315 MWD Presentation.pdf](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 4

[Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. \(c\)](#) - Conservation Measure

Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5002, subd. (c) provides that a conservation measure proposed to be implemented pursuant to a natural community conservation plan or a habitat conservation plan that was: (1) Developed by a local government in the Delta; and (2) Approved and permitted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife prior to May 16, 2013 is deemed to be consistent with the regulatory policies listed under Delta Plan Chapter 4 of this Form (i.e. sections 5005 through 5009) if the certification of consistency filed with regard to the conservation measure includes a statement confirming the nature of the conservation measure from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Is a statement confirming the nature of the conservation measure from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife available?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

[DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[ER P1 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5005](#) - Delta Flow Objectives

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta (“Delta Counties and LAND”) generally appeal DWR’s entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not

consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [CCC-SC_20 DISB letter to DWR.pdf](#), [DWR-1012 Testimony Greenwood.pdf](#), [DWR-1029 PPT Greenwood.pdf](#), [DWR-1069 Modeling Output Figures.pdf](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[ER P2 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5006](#) - **Restore Habitats at Appropriate Elevations**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[ER P3 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5007](#) - **Protect Opportunities to Restore Habitat**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[ER P4 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5008](#) - **Expand Floodplains and Riparian Habitats in Levee Projects**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[ER P5 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5009](#) - **Avoid Introductions of and Habitat for Invasive Nonnative Species**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh](#)

DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 5

[DP P1 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5010](#) - **Locate New Urban Development Wisely**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[DP P2 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5011](#) - **Respect Local Land Use When Siting Water or Flood Facilities or Restoring Habitats**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL-101 SWRCB Hearing Transcript March 15 2018.pdf](#), [LAND 130 Van Loben Sels.pdf](#), [land_123 Roadway segments of concern.pdf](#), [LAND135 Shilling.pdf](#), [LAND188 Robinson.pdf](#), [LAND205 Stirling.pdf](#), [saco_1 Sac Gen Plan Ag ele.pdf](#), [saco_18 Moghissi.pdf](#), [SDWA_134 Michael.pdf](#), [SDWA_141 DPC Econ Sust Plan.pdf](#), [SJC_291 Neudeck.pdf](#), [SJC_323 Balaji.pdf](#), [SJC327 Nakagawa.pdf](#), [SJC328 Project Refinement Fact Sheet.pdf](#), [SJC-329 Excerpts from ASDEIRS.pdf](#), [SOSC 72 Yee.pdf](#), [yolo_1 kokkas.pdf](#), [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 7

[RR P1 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5012](#) - **Prioritization of State Investments in Delta Levees and Risk Reduction**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[RR P2 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5013](#) - **Require Flood Protection for Residential Development in Rural Areas**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals.

Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[RR P3 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5014](#) - **Protect Floodways**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

[RR P4 / Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 5015](#) - **Floodplain Protection**

Is the covered action inconsistent with this portion of the regulatory policy?

Yes, Inconsistent

Answer Justification:

San Joaquin County, Contra Costa County, Solano County, Yolo County, and Local Agencies of the North Delta ("Delta Counties and LAND") generally appeal DWR's entire consistency determination for the Delta Tunnels Project. The Project is not consistent with any of the Council's applicable regulations or the Coequal Goals. Additional information regarding the Project's inconsistency with applicable requirements is included in Delta Counties/LAND's Appeal documents. [DCL Exh Index.xlsx](#), [DCL Appeal.pdf](#)

08/27/2018