2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the EIR

This environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of Santa Cruz (City), which is the lead agency for the Santa Cruz Water Rights Project (Proposed Project). This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which is found in the California Public Resources Code, Division 13, and with the CEQA Guidelines, which are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with Section 15000. Under CEQA, the lead agency for a project is the public agency with primary responsibility for carrying out or approving the project, and for implementing the requirements of CEQA.

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15002, the basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15121, an EIR is an informational document that is required to (1) identify the potentially significant environmental effects of a project on the environment, (2) indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or significantly lessened via the implementation of potentially feasible mitigation measures, (3) identify a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to a project that would eliminate or substantially lessen any significant environmental effects, and (4) identify any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated or otherwise reduced. When considering whether to approve a proposed project, the lead agency's decision-making body (e.g., the Santa Cruz City Council) must consider the information in the EIR along with other information which may be presented to that body. While the information in the EIR does not control the ultimate decision about a project, the decision-making body must consider the information in the EIR and respond to each significant effect identified in the EIR by making findings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002, public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. Furthermore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, CEQA establishes a duty for public agencies to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. In deciding whether changes in a project, such as mitigation measures or alternatives, are feasible, an agency may consider specific economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. As defined in Section 15364 of the CEQA Guidelines, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. Under CEQA case law, "'"feasibility" … encompasses "desirability" to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.'" (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* [2009] 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001, quoting *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* [1982] 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) In addition, in determining whether mitigation measures or alternatives are feasible, agencies may account for the extent to which

they meet project objectives. (*Sierra Club v. County of Napa* [2004] 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509; *Citizens for Open Government v. City of Lodi* [2012] 205 Cal.App.4th 296, 314-315; and *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* [2008] 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166.)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides that, if an agency decides to approve a project that will cause one or more significant effects on the environment, the agency must prepare a "statement of overriding considerations" to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives. The environmental review process is further explained below in Section 2.5, Environmental Review and Approval Process.

2.2 Project Overview

The Proposed Project includes components that are considered in the EIR at a "project" level (project components) and components that are considered at a "programmatic" level (programmatic components), and therefore this EIR is both a project EIR and a program EIR. (See Section 2.3, Type of EIR, for information about the distinction between a project and program EIR.) The programmatic components of the Proposed Project would include potential future activities that may occur after the City water rights are modified. Because most of these activities are considered to be reasonably foreseeable as a logical part in a chain of contemplated actions, but the full physical extent and timing of these improvements are not known at this time, most of these activities are addressed in the EIR at a programmatic level. Some of these actions would be undertaken in conjunction with surrounding water districts and some would be undertaken solely by the City. If warranted, additional environmental analysis will be undertaken at the time these foreseeable future activities or actions are under active consideration. (See Section 2.3 below for a description of the process for determining the extent of any additional analysis.)

This EIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project, which consists of the following primary components:

- Water rights modifications, which are evaluated at a project level in this EIR, including modifications related to place of use, method of diversion, points of diversion and rediversion, underground storage and purpose of use, extension of time and stream bypass requirements for fish habitat (referred to in this EIR as Agreed Flows).
- Water supply augmentation components, which are evaluated at a project or programmatic level in this EIR, including:
    - Aquifer storage and recovery (ASR), which is evaluated at a programmatic level, unless otherwise specified:
        - New ASR facilities at unidentified locations (referred to as "new ASR facilities" in this EIR).
        - Beltz ASR facilities at the existing Beltz well facilities (referred to as "Beltz ASR facilities" in this EIR), which are evaluated at a project level.
    - Water transfers and exchanges and associated intertie improvements, which are evaluated at a programmatic level in this EIR.
- Surface water diversion improvements, which are evaluated at a programmatic level in this EIR, including the Felton Diversion fish passage improvements and the Tait Diversion and Coast Pump Station improvements.

A full description of the Proposed Project, including project and programmatic components, is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description.

2.3 Type of EIR

As indicated in Section 2.2, Project Overview, the Proposed Project includes components that will be considered in this EIR at a "project" level (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15161) and components that will be considered in the EIR at a "programmatic" level (per CEQA Guidelines 15168). Therefore, this EIR is both a project and program EIR. The distinctions between a "project" and "program" EIR and associated analyses are provided below:

- Project EIR: Under the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR is being prepared, in part, as a "project" EIR. A project EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific project. This portion of the EIR will focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from each of the project components identified in Section 2.2. The EIR will examine these components at a site-specific level, including planning, construction, if any, and operation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15161).
- Program EIR: Under the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR is being prepared, in part, as a "program" EIR. A program EIR may be prepared for activities considered to be a logical part in a chain of contemplated actions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(a)(2)). The programmatic components identified in Section 2.2 are being evaluated at a programmatic level as the full physical extent and timing of these improvements is not yet known. Individual projects pursued in the future will be examined in light of the program analysis contained in this EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.
    - If it is determined, through a written checklist or similar device, that an individual project is within the scope of the program EIR, no new environmental document would be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][2] and [c][4]).
    - If an individual project would have effects that were not examined in the program analysis of this EIR, a new initial study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or negative declaration, which may be tiered from the programmatic analysis in this EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][1]). "Tiering" refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152). An EIR, rather than a negative declaration, will be required when the individual project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not adequately addressed in the programmatic analysis of this EIR. Significant environmental effects will be considered to have been "adequately addressed" if (i) they have been mitigated or avoided as a result of mitigation measures or requirements that are set forth in the programmatic analysis of this EIR and are adopted by the City or a responsible agency or (ii) the effects have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the programmatic analysis of this EIR to enable them to be mitigated or avoided by site specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the individual project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[f]).

2.4 Scope of the EIR

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) was published for the Proposed Project to determine the scope and extent of environmental issues to be addressed in this EIR. The NOP/IS is included in Appendix A. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c), an IS was prepared to provide the basis for focusing the EIR on the potentially significant effects of the Proposed Project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to be

Significant, of this EIR provides additional information and further documents the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore were not discussed in detail in the EIR. Based on review of the Project Description (see Chapter 3) and public comments received in response to the NOP (see Section 2.4.1), the City has determined that certain environmental resource topics merit a detailed analysis while others were determined not to be significant and will not be discussed in detail in the EIR. The EIR also evaluates topics required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, including growth inducement, alternatives, and cumulative impacts.

Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to be Significant, includes analyses of the following resource topics: aesthetics, population and housing, and public services.

In the other sections of Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the EIR provides a detailed evaluation of the following environmental resource topics:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use, Agriculture and Forestry, and Mineral Resources
- Noise and Vibration
- Transportation
- Utilities and Energy

As indicated above, the environmental review focuses on the potentially significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a "significant effect on the environment" is "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether a physical change is significant."

In evaluating the significance of the environmental effect of a project, the CEQA Guidelines require the lead agency to consider direct physical changes in the environment and reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes in the environment which may be caused by the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[d]). A direct physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project. An indirect physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment, which is not immediately related to the project, but which is caused indirectly by the project. An indirect physical change is to be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e) further indicates that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment, although they may be used to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment. In addition, where a reasonably foreseeable physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant effect in the same manner as any other physical change resulting from the project.

2.5 Environmental Review and Approval Process

2.5.1 Scoping

CEQA Guidelines Section 15083 authorizes and encourages an early consultation or scoping process to help identify the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed and considered in an EIR, and to help resolve the concerns of affected regulatory agencies, organizations, and the public. Scoping is designed to explore issues for environmental evaluation, ensuring that important considerations are not overlooked and uncovering concerns that might otherwise go unrecognized.

The NOP for this EIR was circulated for a 30-day comment period from October 15, 2018 to November 14, 2018. The NOP was circulated to the State Clearinghouse and to local, regional, and federal agencies in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. Two public scoping meetings regarding the scope of the analysis for the EIR were held on November 7, 2018 in the City of Santa Cruz, and on November 8, 2018 in the community of Ben Lomond.

Written comments were received from thirteen public agencies, organizations and individuals. These comments are included, along with the NOP/IS, in Appendix A. Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter provides a summary of these comments and indicates where they are addressed in the EIR or if they are beyond the scope of the EIR.

2.5.2 Public Review of Draft EIR

This Draft EIR has been published and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day public review period from June 10, 2021 through July 26, 2021. The Draft EIR will be available for public review during the comment period at the following locations:

- City of Santa Cruz Water Department Engineering Counter, located at 212 Locust Street, Suite C in Santa Cruz, by appointment only.[1]
- Online at http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/waterenvdocs.
- Online at the Santa Cruz Public Library at https://catalog.santacruzpl.org/polaris/.
- A hard copy of the Draft EIR is also available at the libraries below; check with https://www.santacruzpl.org/ or call 831.427.7713 for library hours and document access information:
    - Downtown, located at 224 Church Street, in Santa Cruz
    - Boulder Creek, located at 13390 W. Park Avenue, in Boulder Creek
    - Scotts Valley, located at 251 Kings Village Road, in Scotts Valley
    - Felton, located at 6121 Gushee Street, in Felton
    - Live Oak, located at 2380 Portola Drive, in Santa Cruz
    - Capitola, located at 2005 Wharf Road, in Capitola
    - Aptos, located at 7696 Soquel Drive, in Aptos
    - La Selva Beach, located at 316 Estrella Avenue, in La Selva Beach

[1] Due to the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, in-person review of hard copies requires advance appointments, which can be made Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Please email waterengineering@cityofsantacruz.com or call (831) 420-5210 to schedule an appointment.

Written comments on this Draft EIR may be submitted to the City of Santa Cruz at the address below or by email to Sarah Easley Perez at seasleyperez@cityofsantacruz.com.

Sarah Easley Perez, Principal Planner
City of Santa Cruz Water Department
212 Locust Street, Suite C
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

The City encourages public agencies, organizations, community groups, and all other interested persons to provide written comments on the Draft EIR prior to the end of the 45-day public review period.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) provides guidance on the focus of review of EIRs, indicating that in reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies "should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated," and that comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. This section further states that "reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR."

2.5.3 Final EIR/Project Approval

Following the close of the public comment period on this Draft EIR, responses will be prepared for all timely comments received that raise significant environmental issues regarding the Proposed Project. The Final EIR will include written responses to such comments in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 and will also include any text changes to Draft EIR that become necessary after consideration of public comments.

The Final EIR will be presented to the Santa Cruz City Council for a final decision on the Proposed Project. Prior to making a decision to approve a project, the City Council must certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, that the EIR has been completed in conformity with the requirements of CEQA, and that the document reflects the City's independent judgment.

Pursuant to Sections 21002, 21002.1, and 21081 of CEQA and Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects unless both of the following occur:

(a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:

  (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.

  (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternative identified in the environmental impact report.

(b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

Although the Draft EIR must provide information regarding the significant effects of the proposed project, must identify the potentially feasible mitigation measures, and must provide alternatives for consideration by the decision-making body as described in Section 2.1, Purpose of the EIR, above, the decision to approve a project must take into account the findings described above, especially regarding feasibility, based on the entirety of the agency's administrative record as it exists after completion of a Final EIR.

2.5.4 Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that a program to monitor and report on mitigation measures be adopted by a lead agency as part of the project approval process. CEQA requires that such a program be adopted at the time the agency approves a project or determines to carry out a project for which an EIR has been prepared to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be included in the Final EIR.

2.6 Project Approvals and Use of EIR

This EIR is an informational document for agency decision-makers. The EIR includes "project" level and "programmatic" level analyses, meaning that no additional CEQA review should be required for the project components, whereas additional environmental review may be required for the programmatic components. (See Section 2.3, Type of EIR, above.)

The City of Santa Cruz is the lead agency and responsible for approving and implementing the Proposed Project. CEQA requires that decision makers review and consider the EIR in their consideration of this Proposed Project. All potential public agency approvals for the Proposed Project include the following:

Project Components

- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB): Approval of water rights modifications for post-1914 water rights.
- California Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB): Review of Notice of Intent (NOI) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) filed by the City for Beltz Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) component.
- California Central Coast RWQCB: Review of NOI to inject and store treated drinking water in groundwater aquifers through ASR operations under SWRCB WQ Order 2012-0010 (General Waste Discharge Requirements For Aquifer Storage And Recovery Projects That Inject Drinking Water Into Groundwater).
- City of Santa Cruz: Approval of water rights modifications for pre-1914 water rights and approval of Beltz ASR facilities.
- County of Santa Cruz: Approval of a coastal development permit or permit amendment for Beltz ASR facilities located in the coastal zone (i.e., Beltz 8, 9, and 10 ASR facilities) and approval of encroachment permits for work in public roadways.

Programmatic Components

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Approval of Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide or Individual Permits for the Felton Diversion improvements and the Tait Diversion improvements, which involves related federal consultations, including with:
    - National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
    - State Office of Historic Preservation under the National Historic Preservation Act.
- SWRCB: Approval of underground storage supplements to the City's post-1914 appropriative permits and licenses for new ASR facilities. (The City will seek these additional approvals when it is determined how and where the new ASR facilities of the Proposed Project will be implemented.)
- California Central Coast RWQCB: Approval of Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification Permit for the surface water diversion improvements at the Felton Diversion and the Tait Diversion.
- California Central Coast RWQCB: Review of NOI and SWPPP filed by City or neighboring water agencies for intertie improvements or new ASR facilities where components sites are greater than 1 acre.
- California Central Coast RWQCB: Review of NOI to inject and store treated drinking water in groundwater aquifers through ASR operations under SWRCB WQ Order 2012-0010 (General Waste Discharge Requirements For Aquifer Storage And Recovery Projects That Inject Drinking Water Into Groundwater).
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife: Approval of California Fish and Game Code Section 1602, Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement for the Felton Diversion improvement and the Tait Diversion improvement.
- City of Santa Cruz: Approval of interties, Felton Diversion improvements, Tait Diversion and Coast Pump Station improvements, new ASR facilities, and encroachment permits for work in public roadways.
- County of Santa Cruz: Approval of coastal development permits for new ASR facilities in the coastal zone of unincorporated Santa Cruz County and encroachment permits for work in public roadways.
- City of Capitola: Approval of coastal development permits for the Park Avenue pipeline and McGregor Drive pump station upgrade in the coastal zone of the City of Capitola, and encroachment permits for work in public roadways.
- Soquel Creek Water District, Scotts Valley Water District, San Lorenzo Valley Water District and/or Central Water District: Approval of water transfer agreements and intertie facilities, as warranted.

It is noted that while portions of the project site are located within the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County, the City is not required to obtain building or grading permits from the County pursuant to state law. California Government Code section 53091(d) and (e) provides that facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water supplies are exempt from local zoning and building ordinances. However, as noted above, the County of Santa Cruz would issue coastal development permits for components that are located in the coastal zone of unincorporated Santa Cruz County, as the City is not exempt from the Coastal Act and the County's California-Coastal-Commission-certified Local Coastal Program. Likewise, the City of Capitola would issue coastal development permits for components that are located in the coastal zone of the City of Capitola.

2.7 Organization of EIR

The content and format of this EIR are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15122 through 15132). This EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1, Summary**, presents an overview of the Proposed Project, provides a summary of the impacts of the Proposed Project and mitigation measures, provides a summary of the alternatives being considered, includes a discussion of known areas of controversy, and any issues to be resolved.
- **Chapter 2, Introduction**, explains the CEQA process, describes the scope and purpose of this EIR, provides information on the review and approval process, lists the likely approvals for the Proposed Project, and outlines the organization of this EIR.
- **Chapter 3, Project Description**, provides information about the location, setting, and background of the Proposed Project; identifies project-specific objectives; and provides a detailed description of the Proposed Project components.
- **Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**, provides the environmental analysis for the Proposed Project. Section 4.0, Introduction to Analyses, includes a description of the cumulative condition, and Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to Be Significant, describes the topics that do not warrant detailed analyses. For the subsequent sections pertaining to the environmental resource topics for which a detailed analysis is provided, each section presents information in three parts, including existing conditions, regulatory framework, and impacts and mitigation measures. See Section 4.0 for additional information about the organization and content of this chapter.
- **Chapter 5, Growth Inducement**, evaluates the growth-inducing impacts of the Proposed Project, if any.
- **Chapter 6, Other CEQA Considerations**, evaluates the other topics required to be included in an EIR, including significant and unavoidable impacts and significant irreversible environmental changes.
- **Chapter 7, Climate Change Considerations**, evaluates the potential effects of climate change on and/or related to the Proposed Project.
- **Chapter 8, Alternatives**, evaluates alternatives to the Proposed Project that would eliminate or substantially reduce any significant impacts identified in the EIR while feasibly attaining most of the project objectives. Alternatives that were reviewed but eliminated from further consideration in the EIR are also discussed.
- **Chapter 9, List of Preparers**, identifies individuals who were involved in preparing this EIR.
- **Appendices** contain additional information used in preparing this EIR, including:
    - Appendix A contains the NOP/IS and the public comments that were submitted in response to the NOP/IS.
    - Appendix B includes the water rights petitions submitted to the SWRCB for the Proposed Project and related correspondence.
    - Appendix C includes additional background on the minimum instream flow requirements (Agreed Flows), which are a component of the Proposed Project.
    - Appendix D provides the hydrologic, water supply, and fisheries habitat modeling for the Proposed Project.

- Appendix E provides a summary of construction phases, estimated workers and vehicle trips, and construction equipment, as well as the results of the air quality and greenhouse gas emissions modeling conducted for the Proposed Project.
- Appendix F contains the biological resources evaluation tables prepared for the Proposed Project.
- Appendix G contains the Cultural Resources Inventory, Evaluation, and Finding of Effect Report prepared for the Proposed Project
- Appendix H includes results of the noise modeling conducted for the Proposed Project.

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
State Water Resources Control Board	
Requests scientific basis of, or studies completed to develop, Agreed Flows with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) that shows they would be protective of steelhead, salmon and any other fish or wildlife species that may be affected.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix C, Minimum Instream Flow Requirements Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Requests that support from Fishery agencies (CDFW and NMFS) for Agreed Flows should be clarified in EIR.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Baseline instream conditions should be clearly described, and any reasonable alternative flow regimes should be analyzed.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix C, Minimum Instream Flow Requirements Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Identify impacts and constraints to the City's water supply reliability that would occur if changes to water rights are not approved, but the fish flows become a requirement.	Chapter 7, Alternatives Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Describe the interrelationship of the HCP and the Proposed Project.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Not clear what level of evaluation will be conducted on Felton Diversion fish passage improvements. This improvement could be an important component for mitigation of the Proposed Project.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Evaluate the impacts of adding the Felton Diversion as a point of direct diversion.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
EIR shall evaluate all special-status species that may potentially be affected by the Proposed Project.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources
EIR shall evaluate the potential for recreational impacts of the Proposed Project.	Section 4.11, Recreation
EIR shall evaluate all potential and foreseeable impacts that may be caused by the Proposed Project, including the time extension and change petitions.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Cumulative impacts of other foreseeable projects on the SLR must also be evaluated.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Native American Heritage Commission	
The EIR should determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect. Additionally, the letter indicates that AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed. Detailed requirements of AB 52 are also included in the letter.	Section 4.4, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources
Soquel Creek Water District	
The EIR should provide quantified information on existing and proposed revisions to Agreed Flows in terms of seasonality of minimum stream flow requirements and resulting operational restrictions, quantification of proposed pre-1914 water rights changes and bypass requirements; and quantification of changes in water rights associated with places of use.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Without understanding the expected changes in water supply, it is unclear whether there would be an increase in available water supply that could support additional growth, and its related effects on population and housing, recreation facilities, public services, and utilities.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures Chapter 5, Growth Inducement
Hydrology and water quality section indicates conjunctive use would be analyzed as part of the Proposed Project. However, conjunctive use is not described as part of the Proposed Project. A suggestion is provided that the EIR describe and analyze the beneficial uses and conjunctive uses and associated infrastructure improvements that could occur as a result of the Proposed Project and changes to places of use.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Given that no information on location, construction, or operational requirements of programmatic components is identified in the checklist, there is not sufficient information on environmental setting or programmatic components to be able to adequately assess whether substantial environmental impact could occur.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Suggest EIR include additional project description information about the type and scope of programmatic components and that EIR should include program-level analysis of all topics required by CEQA.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Include timing of implementation and cost estimates of each Water Supply Advisory Committee water supply option, as it is understood that if the water rights and water transfer project are more than 130% of the cost of recycled water or desalination, the City would pursue recycled water or desalination instead. Public will need to understand the timing of the cost study, if the City will use 130% threshold, and how it will inform the viability of related projects, such as water transfer option in the Soquel Creek Water District's Community Water Plan.	Beyond the scope of the EIR
The EIR should evaluate other regional water supply projects and planning efforts. The analysis should include all anticipated water supply projects within the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency planning area at a programmatic level and for future project-level EIR for the City's in-lieu and/or aquifer storage and recovery project.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
EIR should consider alternative means of meeting the Agreed Flows and fish enhancements proposed as part of the Proposed Project, such as Water Supply Advisory Committee recommendations related to recycled water. This could include, but not be limited to, the use of recycled water for irrigation, purified water for groundwater recharge or reservoir augmentation, and river/creek augmentation.	Chapter 7, Alternatives
Valley Women's Club of San Lorenzo Valley	
Indicates that the HCP should have been completed before continuing this EIR process. More information is requested about when the Agreed Flows were negotiated, whether the Agreed Flows will be sufficient during drought years, and whether they take into account the significant streambed changes in the River during large storms, such as is evident in the Rincon area of the San Lorenzo River.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix C, Minimum Instream Flow Requirements Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Concerned that allowing year-round diversion, increasing diversion at Felton during the summer would potentially reduce the crucial habitat between Felton and Santa Cruz.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The reasoning about level of impact for population and housing is a concern. Even if annual water extraction is not increased, the City will be able to extract more during dry and drought years. This will increase the available water during those years, with the potential to allowing greater population growth.	Chapter 5, Growth Inducement
The basis for Mandatory Findings conclusion in the Initial Study is not provided.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Water for Santa Cruz County	
The EIR should include a calculation of the amount of available water that will be reduced by implementing the proposed bypass flows on the North Coast streams Majors, Laguna and Liddell. This should be done for each month for each year for the 10-year 2009 to 2018 period.	Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The EIR should include a calculation of the amount of available water that will be reduced by implementing the bypass flows below Tait Street. This should be done for each month of each year for the 10-year 2009 to 2018 period.	Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The EIR should include a calculation of the amount of available water that will reduced by implementing the change of the cubic feet per second (cfs) requirement for minimum bypass flows at the Felton Diversion for adult and spawning fish flows from 20 to 40 cfs in the months of December through May. This calculation should be done for each month and year for the 10-year 2009 to 2018 period.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
For all water flow changes, EIR should present results in a form at least as detailed as the following taken from the Annual Report of the Santa Cruz Water Department.	Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Once we know the amount of the proposed reduction, evaluate the effect on the river's system of increasing the daily cfs permitted to be taken to Loch Lomond from Felton Diversion to 40 cfs when conditions for fish flows downstream are being met. For example, increase the City's daily permissible take from 20 cfs to 40 cfs when the SLR flows exceed 65 cfs and are below 400 cfs.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Regarding the proposed actions by the City Council, please evaluate the risks to the City of committing to reduced flows in advance of having negotiated a long-sought HCP.	Chapter 3, Project Description
All scoping questions should be public information and available verbatim on demand by December 1, 2018.	Appendix A, Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, and Scoping Comments
All public comment on the Draft EIR should be public information and available verbatim on demand within 15 days of the close of the comment period.	Appendix A, Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, and Scoping Comments
Rotary Club of San Lorenzo Valley	
Letter noting receipt of NOP and indicating that some of their members will attend the meeting. An invite to speak to the Rotary was also extended.	No response needed
Bruce Ashley	
EIR cannot be undertaken until the HCP process is completed with citizen participation and environmental review. HCP process has been carried out behind closed doors. When will citizens be given the opportunity to provide input into the HCP process?	Chapter 3, Project Description
Input from public should have been requested by City before Agreed Flows were established. When were the Agreed Flows negotiated? The stream structure is dynamic and may change greatly after large stormflow events. Have the Agreed Flows taken into account the recent streambed changes in the Rincon area of the SLR? The wetted channel has split, dividing winter flows into multiple channels with shallower conditions than previously. Do the bypass flows need to be greater now to ensure adequate adult steelhead and coho salmon migration?	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix C, Minimum Instream Flow Requirements Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The success of the fish migration and rearing are increased by "ideal" flow rates compared to just "minimal" survival volumes that are in the Agreed Flows. Wouldn't it be important to consider how flows might be decreased, especially in normal and dry water years at specific times and places by the modified diversions rates under this plan? A normal year March flow at the Big Trees gauge on the San Lorenzo might be 200 cfs, but with the proposed change in rights and increased maximum diversion rate, the Felton diversion infrastructure may be capable of reducing the bypass flow to the minimum for conjunctive use. How would this affect impact late season fish migration through the Rincon Gorge area below?	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The fish need protected instream flows especially during dry and drought years. Yet this is when the City's water supply is most tested. Any project that will allow modified water diversion rate and greater total volume than is possible under the existing water rights and infrastructure will significantly increase the negative impact to steelhead and coho salmon.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
If you add the Tait Street point of diversion to the Felton diversion permit, then up to the Agreed Flow bypass at Felton may be diverted at Tait Street instead of the 6-cfs limit that presently is permitted at Tait Street. Increasing the number of diversion points will facilitate the City's ability to increase diversion rate compared to existing conditions. This may greatly impact adult salmonid passage to Tait Street during dry and drought years, as well as quicken sandbar closure during spring and early summer to curtail smolt outmigration.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
If the Proposed Project adds the Felton diversion as a point of diversion for the Tait Street diversion permit, you expand the season of diversion at Felton by including it as a year round point of diversion under the Tait Street diversion permit. Then 6 cfs (or a different Agreed Flow bypass) intended for the reach downstream of Tait Street may be diverted at Felton in the summer, greatly reducing steelhead rearing habitat between Felton and Santa Cruz. The fish need all of the available streamflow during the dry season, downstream of Felton to maintain good habitat and growing conditions. Items 4a and 4d on page 18 in the environmental checklist should be checked as potentially significant issues, despite mitigation.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
The Proposed Project will allow an increase in diversion rate above the current 20-cfs limit at Felton, which will allow diversion of a larger proportion of stormflows than under existing conditions during dry and drought years when adult salmonid passage conditions are already limited. This may have significant impact to adult salmonid fish passage during dry/drought years if the Agreed Flows are inadequate. On page 18, the NOP asserts that "changes in stream flows would result in impacts (likely beneficial) on aquatic special-status species." I believe that changes in streamflow, such as increasing the diversion rate at Felton during the winter and spring of a dry or drought year may impede adult salmonid passage. Without seeing the Agreed Flow bypasses that were negotiated and some modeling of how the system would function, it's hard for me to know how effective they would be.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Would it be possible to include in the EIR some graphic depictions of various scenarios that portrayed the comprehensive picture of the water flow rates that will be diverted from the San Lorenzo by location at different times of the year in different water years under the Proposed Project compared to existing conditions? There are many possible variations in water use and weather, and I believe this type of modeling has already been undertaken. The problem is making some significant scenarios comprehensible. A visual, graphic depiction of the river with the various diversions and bypass flows quantified could help us to understand the dynamics better. Perhaps a dozen of these graphics could let us see more exactly the how the Proposed Project will operate?	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Suggest that as part of the Mitigations for Environmental Impacts, section 4d in the checklist regarding, movement of migratory fish, you include fiscal support for the Culvert (Level Control Device) at the San Lorenzo River Lagoon exit. And as the number of Adults adult salmonids in the San Lorenzo watershed is at a critically low point, as a mitigation measure, I strongly recommend that you consider providing financial support for our local fish hatchery, the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project, to recover and restore our steelhead and salmon populations.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Catherine Borrowman	
Is the County of Santa Cruz required to approve or review the Santa Cruz Water Rights Project EIR? It was not listed in the NOP.	Chapter 2, Introduction
Please clarify in the EIR if the City of Santa Cruz will have the right to use water from the Felton and/or Tait diversion above the Agreed Flows when the base flows from the Santa Margarita Groundwater Basin into Bean Creek are higher after a conjunctive use project fills up the Basin.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Why is the City not requesting to increase the amount of water diverted in the wetter months when there will be more flow after storm events? The In-Lieu/ASR strategy relies on the practice of diverting it to areas relying on groundwater. If the City will not be allowed to divert more winter flow water, but instead would be diverting every day that there is more water than the Agreed Flows up to the monthly limit, please clarify if this is expected to meet the City's needs as a drought supply solution if climate change occurs. Please discuss how climate change hydrological models provide data that supports the reasonable and beneficial uses of water from surface water sources.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Will these change petitions cause the City to lose seniority with its water rights? Will increased flexibility with water rights enable the City to make cold water releases from Loch Lomond to improve the temperature instream for anadromous fish one day when the water supply project(s) provide the needed reliability and Loch Lomond is no longer our only insurance in drought conditions?	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
If Agreed Flows are included in water rights, will this limit the City's flexibility in managing the water system before the In Lieu/ASR project components (interties and new wells) are operational? In 2014, the City had to request a temporary reduction in flow releases for health and safety purposes during rationing. Please address in the EIR the short-term environmental impact of an extended drought from 2020 to 2025 and if the Proposed Project may affect them.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Kevin Collins	
To proceed with this water rights modification before the 17 years of delay in completing a City Habitat Conservation Plan is backwards public policy. Any EIR prepared in this reverse of priorities will be invalid.	Chapter 3, Project Description

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
The establishment of base flows after diversions at Felton and Tate St. cannot avoid the impact on salmonids attempting to pass through the lower San Lorenzo Gorge and its rock cascades that are major impediments to fisheries migration during drought years. The same is true of critical riffles that change every year in response to sediment and cobble movement in the riverbed. The depth of these riffles is understood to be a point of contention between the City Water Department and NOAA/NMFS and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. This is despite any recent attempt to avoid this long-standing dispute.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Sediment and other pollution loads in the San Lorenzo are not declining. I have seen no evidence that any improvement in water quality has occurred.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Lydia Hammack	
Please study the methods of injection of water back into wells. What kind of pressure is planned? Sounds too much like fracking which can cause earthquakes.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Mark D. Lee	
NOP is woefully inadequate and not reflective of the true short- and long-term environmental impacts of the City's Proposed Project and how it will affect 20,000 water consumers in the SLVWD. The Proposed Project will have adverse long-term impacts on water consumption related to diversion from SLV and reselling to SqCWD and other POUs. We are very concerned that the Proposed Project will overdraft the Santa Margarita Groundwater Basin with the increased diversion allowed, which will affect SLVWD and SVWD. The EIR needs to explain how the Proposed Project would not cause water scarcity risks for SLVWD. Also concerns expressed about POUs outside of the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency, including the City, which is a second-tier member.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality Section 4.13, Utilities and Energy
The City's proposed amendment to its water right permits cumulatively will long term dramatically affect our own Coho salmon, steelhead trout, other fish and reptiles living within the riparian eco-systems of the San Lorenzo River and eastern and northern tributary system above the Felton diversion dam and Newell Creek junction within the San Lorenzo Valley Water District and Santa Margarita Groundwater Basin.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Proposed scope lacks full and thorough understanding about how the Proposed Project will affect the physical environment; seismic risks; groundwater hydrological risks, and long-term growth-inducing population impacts requiring potentially further water permit amendments. There is absolutely no analysis of economic-financial impacts regionally from diverting surface water to the City without evaluating the long term impacts against a backdrop of erratic and inconsistent supply of surface and ground water resources originating in the SLVWD and SVWD as alluded to in "draft" Scope of Work findings and checklist selection of levels of impact (per CEQA 15082) concerns this reviewer.	Section 4.5, Geology and Soils Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality Chapter 5, Growth Inducement
Provide detailed analysis of the Felton diversion project and the full impacts of amending the water rights permits, including on Newell Creek and Loch Lomond.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Disagreement expressed about impact conclusions for Hydrology and Water Quality section of Initial Study. Should be identified as potentially significant.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
The effects of conjunctive use on recharge are conveniently side-stepped and not realistically evaluated because groundwater recharge has never been done successfully nor proven to actually work, especially with compressed sandstone along the coast.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
EIR must analyze how water redistribution (diverting/exporting) to the City of Santa Cruz and SqCWD will affect SLVWD and SVWD. Also note that SqCWD is outside of the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality Section 4.13, Utilities and Energy
Concern expressed about extending the Felton permit for 25 years without adequate economic and environmental impact analysis and understanding about how it will affect the sustainability of the SLVWD given drought cycles.	Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures Economic analysis beyond the scope of the EIR
Disagreement expressed about less-than-significant conclusions for Section 13 Population and Housing Impacts (a) induce substantial population growth… This conclusion conflicts with Section 16 Transportation and completely ignores the sub regional growth inducement impacts from potentially sending water onto SqCWD under "Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project" as required per CEQA 15126.2(d).	Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to be Significant Chapter 5, Growth Inducement
The City of Santa Cruz Water Advisory Committee has advised the City and made water usage policy recommendations to amend City's water right permits in a vacuum without including detailed analysis of permit amendment proposals without any participation by local ratepayers groups and the SLVWD Board of Directors that may have impacts on the District's own capital facilities projects and environmental impacts of the SLVWD.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Monica McGuire	
Regarding the maintenance of certain flow levels for fish: Include all calculations for the last 10 years (2009-2018) based on historical data, especially for dry years and compare how you would calculate water availability for City of Santa Cruz and compare how you would calculate water available for conjunctive use.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Evaluate risks of not having an HCP in place before the City Council takes action to dedicate minimum fish flows.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Explain all rationale and possibilities of consolidating all of our region's water districts, especially interested in consolidating SCWD and SqCWD, which have such complementary assets and needs (great excess water flow into the Monterey Bay and great water aquifer storage space).	Chapter 7, Alternatives
Jerome Paul	
Please include in all future reports related to the Proposed Project all public comments and questions verbatim. Please ensure that all public comment and questions related to the Proposed Project be made conveniently available verbatim on demand within 15 days of receipt.	Appendix A, Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, and Scoping Comments

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Since it is entirely possible that, presently and in the coming decades, the Proposed Project's measures listed on page 7, Table 3 (modification of City water rights, Places of Use ("POUs"), diversion methods & points, etc.) may be insufficient to provide 100% of the water needed by endangered and threatened species habitat in every month, worst case. Please estimate the shortfall in each respective month.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Seeing as how expansion of the list of Places of Use ("POU List") is key to providing the operational flexibility to substantially enhance a great many desirable environmental outcomes, please optimize the POU list with foresight, to include additional parties.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Please thoroughly evaluate the environmental merits of a regional "Universal POU" to include: aquifers, groundwater agencies, the County, public but independent pumpers (e.g., Cabrillo College, UCSC…), future entities as appropriate, private pumpers, and last but not least, environmentally threatened and/or endangered species habitat. A Universal POU would henceforth improve flexibility of operation, responsiveness to crises, a larger base to support threatened and endangered species, reduced consumption of energy, economic benefits, and a lot more.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Please thoroughly analyze the "energy chain" all of the way back to its sources, which are largely terrible environmentally. Monterey Bay utility gets sustainable energy, but takes it from a pool, which leaves the rest of the world using more coal, nuclear, hydroelectric, etc.	Section 4.13, Utilities and Energy
Once aquifers are filled using the new operational and places of use, storage can be used much more aggressively for habitat and for boosting endangered and threatened species populations. Please estimate how many extra gallons per year would become available once the two main aquifers of the region are recharged to optimal levels.	The assessment of basin recovery of the Mid-County Groundwater Basin and the Santa Margarita Groundwater Basin is a long-term objective anticipated to take place during the 40-year implementation period for the Groundwater Sustainability Plans for both basins. Assessing available water supply and demand at that time is speculative and beyond the scope of this EIR.
Consider fire protection over wider region forest saved, assets saved, money saved.	Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to be Significant Section 4.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire
Shortening days of diversion at Felton should be compensated by more cfs per day when available.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Diversions: Trading tens or taking 80% of what remains until City reaches physical diversion capacity limit of some 70 cfs total in a flow which might be thousands of cfs.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Consider sea level rise.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Deliver timed patterns of flow: e.g., Day 1, 2, 3, 4 may have cfs flow of 1, 0, 7, 3.	Chapter 3, Project Description

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
The City of Santa Cruz Water Department now has a record of the level of the water in Loch Lomond over the past 50 years; please use it to develop a statistical model for predicting on each day of each rainy season the optimal amount of river water to harvest during that day to add to storage for habitat releases in later days of higher environmental need.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Becky Steinbruner	
Evaluate the HCP process, content and risks associated with City Council action to codify pre-1914 stream flows.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Include all NOP comments verbatim in the Draft EIR.	Appendix A, Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, and Scoping Comments
Address Proposed Project impacts to north coast customers and define "limited water service area along the coast north of the City."	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.13, Utilities and Energy
Include quantifiable amounts of water available for transfer and in-lieu storage with neighboring water agencies in dry and very dry years, based on historic data.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Explain differences between post-1914 licensed (Newell Creek) vs permitted San Lorenzo River sources and describe any environmental impacts.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Identify required volumes in all surface water sources for fish populations and show historic data of these flow maintenance levels in very dry and dry years.	Chapter 3, Project Description Appendix C, Minimum Instream Flow Requirements Appendix D, Hydrologic, Water Supply, and Fisheries Habitat Modeling
Consider consolidation of City of Santa Cruz Water Department and SqCWD as an alternative and describe impacts on Place of Use if the two agencies were consolidated.	Chapter 7, Alternatives
Evaluate using neighboring inactive quarries for additional water storage and groundwater recharge.	Chapter 7, Alternatives
Evaluate necessary pipeline and increased intertie connection sized to accommodate maximum conjunctive use needs and environmental benefits for Santa Cruz City and neighboring water agencies.	Chapter 3, Project Description Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
Describe the proposed “traveling brush system” mentioned in the Initial Study related to the Felton Diversion Fish Passage Improvements.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Evaluate Ranney Collectors to augment surface water collection from the SLR during large storm events or post-wildland fire events when streamflow turbidity levels are high as a method of increase security of quality water supply.	Chapter 7, Alternatives
Discuss SLR fully dedicated rights vs. SqCWD adjudicated rights and the associated environmental implications.	Unclear how comment relates to Proposed Project
Evaluate Proposed Project design alternatives with a goal of minimal energy use to supply treatment plant and interties connections with water for City and regional conjunctive use security during emergencies with long-term power outages and relate them to City and County Emergency Response Plan and Disaster Preparedness Plans.	Chapter 7, Alternatives

Table 2-1. Scoping Comment Summary (continued)

Summary of Comment	EIR Section Considered
Evaluate environmental benefit of enhanced water supply availability for Santa Cruz and neighboring agencies with conjunctive use to provide increased fire protection supplies in Santa Cruz and neighboring agencies wildland/urban interface and watershed protection areas.	Section 4.1, Impacts Not Found to be Significant Section 4.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire
Evaluate impact on groundwater levels and stream flows in Soquel Creek and Aptos Creek with indirect effects of in-lieu passive recharge. Incorporate known stream flow increases noted in Soquel Creek when SqCWD ceased pumping at Main Street Well.	Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Evaluate possible increase in development of housing/urban growth in Mid-County areas due to project and programmatic components.	Chapter 5, Growth Inducement
Evaluate impacts of adding Mount Hermon, Trout Gulch Water Mutual and PureSource Water to programmatic intertie connections for enhanced conjunctive use and consider groundwater recharge collection projects in those areas were soils have been identified by Dr. Andy Fisher and the Recharge Initiative to be favorable for passive recharge projects.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Describe preliminary design concepts of the Felton Diversion fish passage improvements with a focus on long-term maintenance and environmentally sustainable security.	Chapter 3, Project Description

Notes: AB = Assembly Bill; ASR = aquifer storage and recovery; CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife; CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; cfs = cubic feet per second; EIR = environmental impact report; HCP = habitat conservation plan; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; NOAA = National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; NOP = Notice of Preparation; POU = place of use; SLR = San Lorenzo River; SLVWD = San Lorenzo Valley Water District; SqCWD = Soquel Creek Water District; SVWD = Scotts Valley Water District; WSAC = Water Supply Advisory Committee.