

**Mojave Water Agency  
Water Supply Reliability  
and  
Groundwater Replenishment Program**

---

**Final Project Environmental Impact Report  
SCH#: 2005041103**

**Mojave Water Agency  
22450 Headquarters Drive  
Apple Valley, CA 92307-4304**

**January 2006**

## **Preface**

This Final EIR for the Mojave Water Agency Water Supply reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program includes responses to comments and MWA's responses to comments received during the public comment period from October 28, 2005 through December 13, 2005 (See Appendix A). For reader convenience and coherence, responses to comments have been incorporated into the Final EIR, except where the clarifying response consisted of a reference to the analysis in the draft EIR. Minor editorial changes, such as corrections of typographical errors, are not noted.

The Final EIR therefore contains minor editorial changes, additional information intended to clarify or amplify analysis in the draft EIR, and responses to public and agency recommendations for additional mitigation. Per a commitment in the draft EIR (Section 5.4.7.2), the FEIR also includes consideration of relocation of the upstream Antelope Wash recharge basin to a downstream site to avoid and minimize impacts associated with the upstream site. Finally, it includes a designation of the environmentally superior alternative and designation of the proposed project alternative.

These changes are designated in the text with Arial typeface and their location in the Final EIR is listed following the Table of Contents.

## Table of Contents

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>A.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	ES-1
1.	Background	ES-1
2.	Relationship of 2004 PEIR to Water Supply Reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program	ES-2
<b>B.</b>	<b>Scope of Analysis</b>	ES-3
1.	General	ES-3
2.	Scope of Project EIR	ES-3
<b>C.</b>	<b>Project Purpose and Need</b>	ES-5
<b>D.</b>	<b>Formulation of Alternatives</b>	ES-6
<b>E.</b>	<b>Project Description: Facilities</b>	ES-7
<b>F.</b>	<b>Project Description: Operations</b>	ES-10
<b>G.</b>	<b>Project Impacts</b>	ES-11
<b>H.</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	ES-12
<b>I.</b>	<b>Selection of an Alternative for Implementation</b>	ES-14

### CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

<b>1.1</b>	<b>Legal Basis for this Project EIR</b>	1-1
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Purpose of the Project EIR</b>	1-2
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Mojave Water Agency 2004 Regional Water Management Plan PEIR</b>	1-5
1.3.1	Scope	1-5
1.3.2	Program Level Analysis	1-6
1.3.3	Relationship of 2004 PEIR to Water Supply Reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program	1-7
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Scope of Analysis</b>	1-7
1.4.1	General	1-7
1.4.2	Public Scoping Comments and Known Areas of Controversy	1-8
1.4.3	Scope of Project EIR	1-10
1.4.4	Report Organization	1-13

### CHAPTER 2: PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

<b>2.1</b>	<b>Approach to Needs Analysis</b>	2-1
<b>2.2</b>	<b>MWA</b>	2-2
2.2.1	MWA Purposes	2-2
2.2.2	Existing Conditions and Constraints:	
	Water Supply, Water Use in the MWA service area	2-2

2.2.3	Constraints on MWA's Water Supply	2-7
2.2.4	Historic Groundwater Overdraft	2-10
2.2.5	Geology and the Interconnections of Groundwater Basin Subareas	2-10
2.2.6	1996 Mojave Basin Area Adjudication	2-10
2.2.7	Distribution of Supply	2-11
2.2.8	Appropriately-Sited Facilities for Extraction of Groundwater	2-11
2.2.9	Local Issues of Concern	2-12
2.2.10	Ecological Restoration	2-12
2.2.11	Summary	2-13
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Metropolitan</b>	2-13
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Project Planning Criteria</b>	2-16

## **CHAPTER 3: INITIAL SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES AND FORMULATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES FOR DETAILED EVALUATION**

<b>3.1</b>	<b>Initial Screening of Alternative Facilities</b>	3-1
3.1.1	Potential Alternative Facilities	3-1
3.1.2	Recharge facilities	3-2
3.1.3	Facilities for conveying water to the recharge facilities	3-3
3.1.4	Groundwater extraction and conveyance facilities	3-3
3.1.5	Operational features	3-3
3.1.6	Riparian restoration features	3-8
3.1.7	Summary	3-8
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Initial Screening of Facility Alternatives</b>	3-9
3.2.1	A General Summary of the Screening Process	3-9
3.2.2	Screening Variables: Hydrogeology and Water Quality	3-12
3.2.3	Screening Variables: Regulatory Constraints	3-13
3.2.4	Screening Variables: Costs	3-13
3.2.5	Screening Variables: Land Use	3-14
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Results of Initial Facility Screening</b>	3-14
3.3.1	Fatal Flaws: Use of Mojave Forks Dam	3-14
3.3.2	Post-Screening Analysis of a Facility Alternative not evaluated in the General Screening Process	3-14
3.3.3	Morongo Basin/Johnson Valley	3-16
3.3.4	Mojave Basin	3-18
3.3.5	Water Treatment Plant Alternative	3-22
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Formulation of Alternatives for Detailed Consideration</b>	3-22
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Evaluation</b>	3-23

## CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

<b>4.1</b>	<b>Basic Operational Scenarios</b>	4-1
4.1.1	Traditional Water Banking	4-3
4.1.2	Modified Banking Program (Banking plus Exchange)	4-8
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Facilities</b>	4-12
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Minimum Facilities Alternative</b>	4-12
4.3.1	Existing Facilities	4-12
4.3.2	New Facilities	4-13
4.3.3	Operations	4-18
4.3.4	Construction	4-22
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Small Projects Alternative</b>	4-23
4.4.1	Recharge Basins	4-24
4.4.2	Operation	4-27
4.4.3	Construction	4-29
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Large Projects Alternative</b>	4-30
4.5.1	Recharge Basins and Associated Facilities	4-30
4.5.2	Operations	4-34
4.5.3	Construction	4-34
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Construction Schedule</b>	4-36
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Measures for Avoidance and Minimization of Environmental Impacts incorporated into the Project Description</b>	4-38
4.7.1	Facility Site Selection	4-38
4.7.2	Operation Schedule	4-38
4.7.3	Best Management Practices when Constructing in the Public Right-of-Way	4-38
4.7.4	Aesthetic Treatment	4-38
4.7.5	Air Quality	4-39
4.7.6	Noise	4-39
4.7.7	Construction Crew Training, On-Site Biological Monitoring, and Isolation of the Construction Area	4-39
4.7.8	Water Quality	4-40
4.7.9	Cultural Resources Management	4-40
4.7.10	Assurances that Impact Minimization Measures will be implemented	4-41
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Project Energy Use and Measures to Reduce Energy Use</b>	4-41
4.8.1	Construction Energy Use	4-41
4.8.2	Operations Energy Use	4-45
<b>4.9</b>	<b>Summary and Comparison of Proposed Project Alternatives</b>	4-45
<b>4.10</b>	<b>Required Approvals</b>	4-46

## CHAPTER 5: ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION

<b>5.1</b>	<b>Environmental Setting: General</b>	5-1
5.1.1	Setting	5-1
5.1.2	Scope of Impact Assessment	5-3
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Aesthetics</b>	5-4
5.2.1	Environmental Setting	5-4
5.2.2	Facilities Impacts	5-4
5.2.3	Operational Impacts	5-10
5.2.4	Significance of Impacts, Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-11
5.2.5	Unavoidable Significant Impacts after Mitigation	5-15
5.2.6	Effects of the No Project Alternative	5-15
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Air Quality</b>	5-16
5.3.1	Environmental Setting	5-16
5.3.2	Facilities Impacts	5-17
5.3.3	Alternative Daily Emissions Estimates	5-23
5.3.4	Summary Analysis	5-24
5.3.5	Operational Impacts	5-26
5.3.6	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-28
5.3.7	No Project Alternative	5-31
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Biological Resources</b>	5-32
5.4.1	Environmental Setting	5-32
5.4.2	Facilities Impacts: Mechanisms for Effect	5-37
5.4.3	Impact Analysis Methods	5-43
5.4.4	Facility Impacts: Specific Mechanisms for Effect	5-43
5.4.5	Facility Impacts	5-44
5.4.6	Operational Impacts	5-56
5.4.7	Significance, Mitigation, and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-60
5.4.8	No Project Alternative	5-67
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Cultural Resources</b>	5-67
5.5.1	Environmental Setting	5-67
5.5.2	Facilities Impacts	5-73
5.5.3	Operational Impacts	5-76
5.5.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-76
5.5.5	Summary Comparison of Alternative Impacts	5-78
5.5.6	No Project Alternative	5-78
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Geology and Soils</b>	5-78
5.6.1	Environmental Setting	5-78
5.6.2	Facilities Impacts	5-80
5.6.3	General Operational Effects	5-87
5.6.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-88

5.6.5	Summary Comparison of Alternative Impacts	5-90
5.6.5	No Project Alternative	5-90
<b>5.7</b>	<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	5-91
5.7.1	Environmental Setting	5-91
5.7.2	Facilities and Operations Impacts	5-91
5.7.3	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-93
5.7.4	Summary Comparison of Alternative Impacts	5-94
5.7.5	No Project Alternative	5-95
<b>5.8.</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	5-95
5.8.1	Environmental Setting	5-95
5.8.2	Facilities Impacts	5-95
5.8.3	Operational Impacts	5-99
5.8.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-100
5.8.5	No Project Alternative	5-101
<b>5.9.</b>	<b>Noise</b>	5-101
5.9.1	Environmental Setting	5-101
5.9.2	Facilities Impacts	5-103
5.9.3	Operational Impacts	5-107
5.9.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-108
5.9.5	No Project Alternative	5-110
<b>5.10</b>	<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>	5-110
5.10.1	Environmental Setting	5-110
5.10.2	Facilities Impacts	5-111
5.10.3	Operational Impacts	5-113
5.10.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-113
5.10.5	No Project Alternative	5-114
<b>5.11</b>	<b>Recreation</b>	5-115
5.11.1	Environmental Setting	5-115
5.11.2	Facilities and Operations Impacts	5-115
5.11.3	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-116
5.11.4	Summary Comparison of Alternative Impacts	5-117
5.11.5	No Project Alternative	5-117
<b>5.12</b>	<b>Traffic</b>	5-117
5.12.1	Environmental Setting	5-117
5.12.2	Facilities Impacts	5-118
5.12.3	Operations Effects	5-121
5.12.4	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-121
5.12.5	No Project Alternative	5-123
<b>5.13</b>	<b>Water Resources (Water Quality)</b>	5-123
5.13.1	Environmental Setting	5-123
5.13.2	Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Effects	5-126
5.13.3	Effects of the Proposed Project, General	5-147
5.13.4	Alternative Impacts	5-161

5.13.5	Effects on Metropolitan Water Supplies and Water Quality	5-165
5.13.6	Effects of Changes in Project Magnitude on Water Quality	5-166
5.13.7	Significance of Impacts	5-168
5.13.8	Mitigation and Significance of Impacts after Mitigation	5-169
5.13.9	No Project Alternative	5-170
<b>5.14</b>	<b>Water Resources (Hydrology)</b>	5-171
5.14.1	Environmental Setting	5-171
5.14.2	Mechanisms for Effect	5-171
5.14.3	Potential Project Effects	5-171
5.14.4	Significance of Effects and Mitigation	5-178
5.14.5	Mitigation and Significance of Effects after Mitigation	5-179
5.14.6	No Project Alternative	5-179
<b>5.15</b>	<b>Population, Housing, and Growth</b>	5-180
5.15.1	Environmental Setting	5-180
5.15.2	Facilities and Operational Impacts	5-183
5.15.3	Significance and Mitigation	5-184
5.15.4	No Project Alternative	5-185
<b>5.16</b>	<b>Use of Energy and Energy Conservation</b>	5-186
5.16.1	Environmental Setting	5-186
5.16.2	Mechanisms for Effect	5-186
5.16.3	Proposed Project Effects	5-187
5.16.4	Significance, Mitigation, and Significance after Mitigation	5-187

## **CHAPTER 6: Cumulative Impacts**

<b>6.1</b>	<b>Environmental Setting</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Mechanisms for Effect and Effects</b>	<b>6-2</b>
6.2.1	Aesthetics	6-2
6.2.2	Air Quality	6-3
6.2.3	Biological Resources	6-3
6.2.4	Cultural Resources	6-3
6.2.5	Geology and Soils	6-4
6.2.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	6-5
6.2.7	Land Use	6-5
6.2.8	Noise	6-5
6.2.9	Public Services and Utilities	6-5
6.2.10	Recreation	6-6
6.2.11	Traffic	6-6
6.2.12	Water Resources (Water Quality)	6-6
6.2.13	Water Resources (Hydrology)	6-7
6.2.14	Growth	6-8
6.2.15	Energy Use and Energy Conservation	6-8
6.2.16	Significance of Impacts, Mitigation, and	



## **CHAPTER 7: Comparison of Alternatives**

<b>7.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	7-1
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	7-2
7.2.1	Facility -by-Facility Impact Analysis	7-2
7.2.2	No Project Alternative	7-3
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Comparison of Effects</b>	7-3
7.3.1	Comparison of Project Alternatives	7-3
7.3.2	Comparison of Upstream and Downstream sites for Antelope Wash Recharge	7-6
7.3.3	A Summary Decision Analysis	7-8
7.3.4	Comparison of Project and No-Project Alternatives	7-12
7.3.5	Designation of the Environmentally Superior Alternative	7-15
7.3.6	Designation of the Proposed Project	7-16

## **CHAPTER 8. REFERENCES**

## **CHAPTER 9: RECORD OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

<b>9.1</b>	<b>Public Contacts prior to the Notice of Preparation an EIR</b>	9-1
9.1.1	2004 PEIR	9-1
9.1.2	Local Agency Participation Effort	9-2
9.1.3	Briefing and Field Visit for Regulatory Agencies	9-3
9.1.4	Contacts during the 2003-2005 Pilot Project	9-4
<b>9.2</b>	<b>Public Scoping and Comments in Response to the Notice of Preparation</b>	9-4
9.2.1	Distribution of the Notice of Preparation	9-4
9.2.2	Presentation to the MWA Technical Advisory Committee	9-5
9.2.3	Written Comments Received	9-6
<b>9.3</b>	<b>Review of the draft EIR</b>	<b>9-7</b>

## **CHAPTER 10: LIST OF ACRONYMS AND SPECIAL TERMS**

## **CHAPTER 11. LIST OF PREPARERS**

## **APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

## Figures

### Executive Summary

Figure ES-1. Location of potential new facilities

Follows ES-3

### Chapter 1

Figure 1-1 MWA service area and Water Delivery Facilities. 1-1a

Figure 1-2 Groundwater basins in the Mojave Water Agency service area, Mojave River Basin 1-3a

### Chapter 4

Figure 4-1 Location of potential new facilities 4-12a

Figure 4-2 Schematic of typical levee for all recharge basins 4-12b

Figure 4-3 View of the Mainstem Mojave River during recharge operations for the 2003-2005 pilot project (typical of view during Proposed Project operations) 4-16a

Figure 4-4 Off-Channel Mojave River Recharge, East Site 4-24a

Figure 4-5 Off-Channel Mojave River Recharge, West Site 4-24b

Figure 4-6 Oro Grande Wash Recharge sites 4-24c

Figure 4-7 Cedar Avenue Detention Basin Recharge Site 4-24d

Figure 4-8 Alto Recharge Site 4-30a

Figure 4-9 Oeste Recharge Site 1 4-30b

Figure 4-10 Oeste Recharge Site 2 4-30c

Figure 4-11 Antelope Wash Recharge Site 4-30d

Figure 4-12 Combined Antelope Wash Recharge site 4-30e

## Tables

Table ES-1. Summary of Alternatives, Mojave Water Agency Water Supply Reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program ES-9

Table ES-2. Impacts of the three Facilities Alternatives. ES-15

Table ES-3. Summary of Mitigation Proposed ES-17

Table 1-1. Summary of estimated MWA recharge requirements 2020) 1-3

Table 1-2. Summary of "high" priority water supply enhancement projects from the 2004 PEIR. 1-6

Table 2-1. Current and Projected Consumptive Use of Water in MWA's Service Area 2-4

Table 2-2. Water balance (supply versus projected consumptive use) for MWA's service area, 2005 through 2020, based on four planning scenarios. 2-6

Table 2-3. Existing MWA facilities for transport and recharge of water. 2-9

Table 2-4. Estimated potential SWP supplemental supply for the year 2000. 2-9

Table 2-5 Existing and Target Annual Dry-Year Yield from All

MWA Final Project EIR

x

Water Supply Reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program January 2006

Sources Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Year 2020 Projections	2-15
Table 3-1. Potential high priority recharge and water supply facilities.	3-1
Table 3-2. Conceptual water banking and exchange account for MWA and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	3-7
Table 3-3. Difference between average indigenous water quality and average SWP water quality in the 4 subareas of the Morongo Basin/Johnson Valley area.	3-17
Table 3-4. Average California Drinking Water Quality standards violated by groundwater in subareas of the Mojave Basin.	3-20
Table 3-5. Proposed Project alternatives, Mojave Water Agency Water Supply Reliability and Groundwater Replenishment Program	3-28
Table 4-1. Range of probable evaporation rates at Proposed Project recharge sites.	4-4
Table 4-2. Facility and Operational Scenarios evaluated for the Proposed Project	4-5
Table 4-3. Metropolitan modeling analysis of potential magnitude of a water banking program with MWA, for the period 2006 through 2025, by project alternative and operation scenario.	4-6
Table 4-4. Probable MWA traditional banking program magnitude: medium estimate of banked water, 2006 to 2025, assuming equal priority deliveries to all Metropolitan water banks.	4-7
Table 4-5. Probable magnitude of a combined traditional banking program and on-going water exchange program: medium estimate of banked water, 2006 to 2025, assuming equal priority deliveries to all Metropolitan water banks.	4-11
Table 4-6. Facilities for the Minimum Facilities Alternative.	4-17
Table 4-7. Probable pipeline alignments for the Well Field Delivery Pipelines	4-17
Table 4-8. Facilities design Parameters, Mainstem Mojave River, Minimum Facilities Alternative.	4-18
Table 4-9. Potential annual recharge for the Minimum Facilities Alternative.	4-18
Table 4-10. Average annual recharge capacity in acre-feet available for banking, Minimum Facilities Alternative, 2005-2020.	4-21
Table 4-11. Proposed additional facilities along the Mainstem Mojave River, Small Project Alternative.	4-24
Table 4-12. Facilities design parameters, Mainstem Mojave River, Small Projects Alternative.	4-25
Table 4-13. Pipeline alignments for Off-Channel Mojave River Recharge Pipeline.	4-26
Table 4-14. Potential annual recharge for the Small Projects Alternative.	4-29
Table 4-15. Proposed new facilities, Large Projects Alternative	4-33
Table 4-16. Design specifications/capacities, new facilities, Large Projects Alternative	4-33
Table 4-17. Recharge and direct return capacity, Large Projects Alternative	4-35
Table 4-18. Estimated mobilization-to-completion time for major elements of the three alternatives.	4-37

Table 4-19. Estimated daily/ total diesel fuel consumption for Proposed Project facilities.	4-42
Table 4-20. Summary comparison of alternatives.	4-46
Table 5-1. Significance of aesthetic impacts associated with potential project alternatives, compared to the 8 criteria for significance.	5-12
Table 5-2. MDAQMD Significance Thresholds for construction and operation emissions (MWA 2004b).	5-17
Table 5-3. 2004 PEIR estimated daily unit construction emissions for a typical recharge basin, well, and pipeline project, MWA service area.	5-17
Table 5-4. Daily Emissions Calculation: Typical 40-acre recharge basin to be constructed in 30 working days.	5-20
Table 5-5. Daily Emissions Calculation: Typical levee construction in floodplain of Unnamed Wash at 400 feet per day.	5-21
Table 5-6. Daily Peak Emissions Calculation: Well construction.	5-21
Table 5-7. Daily Emissions Calculation: Pipeline construction.	5-22
Table 5-8. Daily Emissions Calculation. Berm construction in the Mojave River Mainstem.	5-22
Table 5-9. Estimated daily unit emissions associated with construction activities, including a 25% contingency.	5-23
Table 5-10. Estimated incremental construction-related daily emissions for all Proposed Project facilities, by alternative.	5-24
Table 5-11. Incremental effects of phasing construction to provide for 1 unit of recharge, well, and pipeline construction per day.	5-25
Table 5-12. NOx and PM10 emissions from simultaneous construction of all potential project facilities compared to estimated emissions from commercial truck traffic on major roads in the MWA service area.	5-30
Table 5-13. Major plant communities of the MWA service area that may be affected by Proposed Project alternatives.	5-34
Table 5-14. Summary of Project Effects on Special Status Species and Habitats.	5-58
Table 5-15. Results of literature search and cultural resources survey.	5-75
Table 5-16. Potential land use impacts of Facilities for the Minimum Facilities Alternative	5-96
Table 5-17. Potential land use impacts of facilities for the Minimum Facilities Alternative and Small Projects Alternative	5-97
Table 5-18. Potential land use impacts of facilities for all Project Alternatives	5-99
Table 5-19. Noise regulations in portions of the MWA service area which may be affected by construction and operation of the Proposed Project (from local jurisdiction ordinances)	5-103
Table 5-20. Summary of Potential Noise Impacts, All Alternatives.	5-104
Table 5-21. Public service providers in MWA's service area (MWA 2004b)	5-112
Table 5-22. Monthly Metropolitan deliveries to water banking programs (Arvin-Edison, Semitropic, and Kern Delta), 1993-2004 in acre-feet.	5-134

Table 5-23. Arsenic in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), January 1998 to December 2004 (from DWR 2005), in micrograms/liter (parts per billion).	5-134
Table 5-24. Boron in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-135
Table 5-25. Bromides in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), mg/l (parts per million or ppm).	5-135
Table 5-26. Chlorides in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), mg/l (parts per million).	5-136
Table 5-27. Chromium in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), mg/l (parts per million).	5-136
Table 5-28. Fluoride in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-137
Table 5-29. Lead in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-137
Table 5-30. Iron in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), mg/l.	5-138
Table 5-31. Nitrates in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million)	5-138
Table 5-32. The pH of SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005).	5-139
Table 5-33. Selenium in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-139
Table 5-34. Dissolved sulfate in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-140
Table 5-35. Total dissolved solids (TDS) in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), in mg/l (parts per million).	5-140
Table 5-36. Total Organic Carbon in SWP supplies at the Tehachapi Afterbay (Check 41), 1998 through 2004 (from DWR 2005), mg/l (parts per million).	5-141
Table 5-37. Comparison of Metropolitan deliveries to existing water banks (total deliveries by month for 1993-2003) and mean monthly water quality data for 1998-2004.	5-142
Table 5-38. Relationship between monthly Metropolitan deliveries to water banks (1993-2003) and monthly mean water quality in SWP supplies at Check 41 of the California Aqueduct (Pearson's rank correlation).	5-143
Table 5-39. Comparison of SWP water quality to Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Objectives for the Mojave River Basin.	5-143
Table 5-40. Comparison of SWP water quality to Colorado River Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Objectives for the Lucerne Basin.	5-144
Table 5-41. SWP above-normal-to-wet-year water quality (in mg/l) compared to average indigenous water quality, by subarea	

(Alto Floodplain, Alto Regional, Alto Transition Zone, Oeste Regional, Centro Floodplain, Baja Floodplain, Copper Mountain, Johnson Valley, Means/Ames Valley, and Warren Valley)	5-146
Table 5-42. California Department of Health Services drinking water standards compared to the highest concentrations of mineral constituents in SWP supplies (1998-2004).	5-148
Table 5-43. Hypothetical extension of MWA supply reliability with a net 60,000 acre-foot pre-delivery from banking/exchange programs.	5-152
Table 5-A. Indigenous water quality from two wells located about 1 mile downgradient from the proposed Oeste recharge basins.	5-154
Table 5-B. Indigenous water quality from one well located to the west and downgradient about a mile from the proposed Alto recharge basins.	5-155
Table 5-C. Indigenous water quality from four wells located in the general vicinity of the proposed Oro Grande Recharge basins	5-156
Table 5-D. Indigenous water quality from a well located about 1.5 miles downslope and to the west of the proposed Cedar Avenue Recharge basin	5-157
Table 5-E. Indigenous water quality from a well located about a mile downgradient and to the west of the proposed Antelope Wash recharge basins	5-158
Table 5-F. Indigenous water quality from a well located within the site of the proposed Green Tree recharge basin	5-159
Table 5-G. Indigenous water quality from 3 wells located near the proposed Mojave River Well Field	5-160
Table 5-44. Minimum Facility Alternative water quality tradeoffs: Banking versus normal operations.	5-163
Table 5-45. Minimum Facility Alternative water quality tradeoffs: SWP versus indigenous groundwater.	5-163
Table 5-46. Difference between flows at Hesperia (USGS site 10261100) and Victorville (USGS site 10261500) at the lower Narrows (downstream), January 20, 1983 to May 10, 1983.	5-175
Table 5-47. Volume of inflow in acre-feet to Hesperia and Victorville at the Lower Narrows, January 20, 1983 through May 10 1983.	5-177
Table 7-1. Sensitivity of priority given to construction air quality and SWP water quality.	7-10
Table 7-2. Annual air quality impacts (fuel consumption) compared to SWP water quality (recharge capacity).	7-11
Table 7-3. Benefits of increasing recharge capacity.	7-12
Table 7-4. MWA Water Banking and Exchange Program, summary of environmental effects and mitigation, by facility.	7-17
Table 7-5. Summary Matrix of Impacts, by Facility	7-32
Table 7-6. Comparison Minimum Facilities Alternative versus No Project Alternative, by Category of Impact	7-33
Table 7-7. Comparison of Proposed Project Impacts, Small Projects Alternative versus No Project Alternative, by Category of Impact	7-34

Table 7-8. Comparison of Proposed Project Impacts, Large Projects Alternative versus No Project Alternative, by Category of Impact.	7-36
Table 7-9. Detailed Summary of Mitigation Proposed	7-38
Table 9-1. Summary of Comments, April 27, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting	9-5
Table 9-2. Issues raised in written comments received during public scoping period	9-6

## List of Changes made to the Final EIR

CHAPTER	PAGE(S)	NATURE OF CHANGE
<b>Executive Summary</b>	ES-5	Listing of public comments received
	ES-8	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site
	ES-10	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site
	ES-14	Designation of environmentally superior alternative and proposed project alternative
<b>Chapter 1</b>	1-10	List of comments on the draft EIR
<b>Chapter 2</b>	2-13	Re-phrasing of Metropolitan Water District description
	2-14	Re-phrasing of Metropolitan Water District description
<b>Chapter 3</b>	3-14	Clarification in response to comment from Mr. Chuck Bell
<b>Chapter 4</b>	4-1	Deletion
	4-2	Deletion
	4-6	Change in period of record used for Metropolitan models
	4-31 - 4-33	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, alternative description
<b>Chapter 5</b>	4-47	Addition of Metropolitan as a Responsible Agency
	5-1 - 5-2	Addition to general environmental setting
	5-10	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site
	5-12	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, aesthetics
	5-15	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, aesthetics
	5-26	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, air quality
	5-42	Response to CDFG on Mojave fringe-toed lizard (will include in pre-construction surveys)
	5-45	Data on Pilot Project deliveries per DWR request
	5-46 - 5-47	Clarification on Unnamed Wash impacts for County DPW
	5-55 - 5-56	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, biological resources
	5-58	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, biological resources
	5-60	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, biological resources
	5-64	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, biological resources
	5-66	Response to CDFG regarding mitigation for burrowing owls, discussion of mitigation options
	5-76	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, cultural resources
	5-90	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, geology and soils
	5-93	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, hazards
	5-98	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, land use
	5-107	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, noise
	5-113	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, public services
	5-116	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, recreation
	5-121	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, traffic
	5-152 - 5-161	Clarification of groundwater quality, focused on data from wells near proposed project sites, in response to comment from DWR
	5-169	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, water quality
	5-170	Response to Lahontan RWQCB; description of methods for characterizing soils at recharge and wells and methods for monitoring to ensure against surface water influence on groundwater quality
	5-171	Concurrence with San Bernardino County DPW comment on flood zones.



	5-179	Commitment to coordinate design of facilities in washes with County DPW to avoid obstructing flows
	5-182	Clarification of MWA's approach to regional water management in response to DWR comment
	5-183	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, population and housing
	5-187	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, energy use
<b>Chapter 6</b>	6-3	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, cumulative impacts
<b>Chapter 7</b>	7-6 - 7-7	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site, summary analysis
	7-15 - 7-16	Designation of environmentally superior alternative and proposed project alternative
	Table 7-4	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site
	Table 7-8	RE: relocation of Antelope Wash recharge site
	Table 7-9	RE: mitigation commitments adopted in response to comments
<b>Chapter 8</b>	NO CHANGE	
<b>Chapter 9</b>	9-7 - 9-9	Update of public involvement discussion to reflect comments on Draft EIR
<b>Chapter 10</b>	NO CHANGE	
<b>Chapter 11</b>	NO CHANGE	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Added	Full comments and response to comments