B. Timing Variant Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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