

Chapter 3 Environmental Analysis

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is designed to help readers understand how the environmental impact analysis was conducted for the environmental resources and topics evaluated in the subsequent chapters of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

3.2 Analysis

Chapters 5 through 27, which address topics that are covered by both CEQA and NEPA, are organized according to the following framework.

- Environmental setting
- Methods of analysis
- Impact analysis and mitigation measures

Environmental impacts are discussed for the No Project Alternative/No Action Alternative and the three action alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3). As described further in Section 3.2.1, the term No Project Alternative is primarily used in this document to represent both the CEQA No Project Alternative and NEPA No Action Alternative. Best management practices included as integral components of the Project description are discussed in Chapter 2, *Alternatives Description*, Table 2-18, and are incorporated by reference into the methods of analysis and impact analysis for each environmental topic as appropriate. The impact analysis for each environmental topic includes the assumptions considered and the applicable thresholds of significance. Where feasible, mitigation measures are proposed for impacts determined to be significant to reduce the level of impact.

3.2.1 Existing Conditions and No Project Alternative

This section discusses the existing conditions (i.e., environmental baseline) under CEQA and the No Project Alternative.

Under CEQA, the lead agency assesses the significance of the impacts of a proposed project by comparing those impacts against the environmental baseline. Pursuant to Section 15125(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the baseline generally consists of the physical conditions that exist at the time a Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published for an EIR. Where existing conditions change or fluctuate over time, and where necessary to provide the most accurate picture of a project's impacts, the existing conditions baseline may be defined by referencing historical conditions or conditions that are expected to occur when the project commences its operations. A CEQA lead

agency may also use a future conditions baseline (i.e., beyond the date when project operations commence), but if the agency relies solely on such a future baseline it must demonstrate that use of an existing conditions baseline would be uninformative or misleading. In defining the baseline, the goal is “to give the public and decision makers the most accurate and understandable picture practically possible of the project’s likely near-term and long-term impacts.”

The impact analyses in this RDEIR/SDEIS use an existing conditions baseline that incorporates water supply facilities and ongoing plans and programs that existed as of the January 23, 2017, date for the Authority’s NOP. However, regulatory operating requirements (i.e., Coordinated Long-Term Operations of the CVP and Incidental Take Permit for the Long-Term Operation of the SWP) have changed since January 2017, and an updated baseline is necessary to provide the most accurate picture of the Project’s impacts. Therefore, the existing conditions baseline under CEQA has been updated to capture conditions through 2020. The baseline reflects a range of historical hydrologic conditions (e.g., watershed runoff), current physical conditions (e.g., dams); current regulatory operating conditions of the CVP and the SWP; the water rights orders and decisions and water quality criteria from the State Water Board; current municipal, environmental, and agricultural water uses; current land uses; and relevant current laws, regulations, plans, and policies.

In addition to defining the baseline, CEQA requires analysis of the No Project Alternative, which represents existing environmental conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not implemented. The purpose of the No Action Alternative is to allow the public and the decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. For ongoing activities, the No Project Alternative represents the continuation of existing facilities, plans, programs, and operations into the future, assuming that the Project is not implemented.

NEPA has no baseline requirement but similar to CEQA it requires analysis of the No Action Alternative, which represents a projection of current and reasonably foreseeable future conditions, including the continuation of preexisting, ongoing plans, programs and operations, without any of the action alternatives being implemented. Like the CEQA No Project Alternative, the NEPA No Action Alternative is intended to provide a comparative analysis of the impacts of the proposed action and the impacts of not proceeding with the action. The term *No Project Alternative* is primarily used in this document to represent both the CEQA No Project Alternative and NEPA No Action Alternative. The term NAA or No Action Alternative, which is identical to the No Project Alternative, may be used in the presentation of modeled results throughout this document and is noted where appropriate in resource method sections.

The reasonably foreseeable future conditions under the No Project Alternative would not be materially different from the conditions under the CEQA existing conditions baseline. This is because the existing, ongoing plans and programs that serve as the basis for the existing conditions baseline would reasonably be anticipated to continue to be implemented into the future. This includes the Biological Opinions issued on October 21, 2019, by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the Reinitiation of Consultation on the Coordinated Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and the State Water

Project, Reclamation's February 18, 2020, Record of Decision based on those Biological Opinions, and the California Department of Water Resource's March 31, 2020, Incidental Take Permit for the Long-Term Operation of the State Water Project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. These have all established new regulatory requirements that govern water supply operations and delivery in California. These new requirements have been incorporated into the existing conditions baseline in order to present the most accurate and up-to-date picture of how the proposed Project, if approved and implemented, would affect baseline water supply, water quality, and fisheries conditions. These new requirements are also reasonably anticipated to continue into the future, and it is not reasonably foreseeable at this juncture to speculate about what future requirements, if any, might be adopted in their place and, if so, when.

In addition, historical land use and water demands, hydrology and existing water rights and contracts reflected in the CALSIM model would not be materially different between the No Project Alternative and the existing conditions baseline. The maximum water supplied to a service area, as identified by water rights and contracts, is not expected to change under the No Project Alternative because it represents the maximum water needed by a service area to meet demand over time. CALSIM allocates water supply to different service areas based on specific hydrologic conditions and regulations and the demand under those hydrologic conditions as specified by water rights or contracts. CALSIM rarely provides the maximum amount of water supply to meet the maximum demand because hydrologic conditions and regulations seldom allow for these types of deliveries to different users. Generally, SWP and CVP water users receive less than their full contract amount due to limited water availability. The difference between the existing conditions and the No Project/No Action Alternative assumed water demands is minimal in most areas because the existing conditions assumptions included full use of most CVP and SWP contract amounts for most agricultural uses and CVP and SWP municipal and industrial users that divert water from the Delta, when hydrological conditions allow. This would be the same under existing conditions and the No Project Alternative.

Finally, the physical environmental setting and land uses in Glenn and Colusa Counties, where the reservoir would be located, are not expected to materially change under the No Project Alternative. These two counties have shown limited growth over the last 20 years (approximately 14% for Colusa County and approximately 6% for Glenn County) and are expected to show little to slight growth through 2030 as a result of implementing general plans (approximately 7% for Colusa County and approximately 3.5% for Glenn County; see Chapter 25, *Population and Housing*, Table 25-2).

Disclosure of the potential future effects associated with climate change are addressed in Chapter 28, *Climate Change*. Each of the alternative model runs performed include assumptions associated with sea level rise and other potential climate change variables and potential effects are disclosed.

3.2.2 Regulations and Regulatory Setting

Laws, policies, plans, and regulations applicable to the Project are described in Appendix 4A, *Regulatory Requirements*. Information contained in this appendix is considered in various resource chapters (i.e., Chapters 5 through 30) and inform the existing conditions for these

resources. For example, the federal Endangered Species Act is described in Appendix 4A, as it is applicable to Chapter 9, *Vegetation and Wetland Resources*; Chapter 10, *Wildlife Resources*; and Chapter 11, *Aquatic Biological Resources*.

3.2.3 Study Areas

The introduction of each resource chapter identifies a study area relevant to the existing conditions and the analysis of impacts and effects of that chapter. Study areas are determined in consideration of variables such as the type of resource, the presence or absence of a particular resource, the nature of construction or operational disturbance, the presence or absence of sensitive receptors for a particular resource, and the regulating entities or agencies with jurisdiction over a resource. The study area generally includes the locations of Project components and footprints; however, certain Project components or geographies may be included or excluded from the study area, as appropriate.

3.2.4 Methods

The resource chapters include a description of the methods used to identify and assess the potential environmental impacts that would result from Project construction and operation. These methods included desktop reviews, database queries, and modeling that utilized the available information. Modeling output was used in evaluations for environmental topics such as surface water and groundwater resources, water quality, aquatic biological resources, air quality, greenhouse gases, and transportation. Models are used to assist in comparing the potential impacts between alternatives by using current and anticipated conditions. Modeling output does not predict absolute conditions in the future; rather, the output is intended to show the types of changes under alternative conditions that could occur for comparative purposes.

Multiple models and methods were used as part of an analytical framework to characterize and evaluate the changes in water operations in the CVP and SWP systems under each alternative. The analytical framework, tools, and analyses were formulated for evaluating the benefits and impacts of implementing and operating each of the alternatives. The framework provides for iteratively refining operations criteria to minimize both the systemwide and localized impacts on various resources while meeting the Project objectives and purpose and need. Appendix 1A, *Introduction to Appendices and Models*, provides information on the models used in this document, and each methods of analysis section of the resource chapters specifies the type of models and modeling results used, if appropriate to the impact analysis.

3.2.5 Determination of Impacts

The thresholds and criteria used for the impact analyses in this RDEIR/SDEIS for determining significance are specified in each resource chapter. These criteria were developed in consideration of current regulations, standards (e.g., CEQA Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form), and/or consultation with state and federal agencies; professional judgement; knowledge of the Project design and the area that would be affected; and the context and intensity of the environmental effects. Under CEQA, the impacts of the alternatives are compared to the existing conditions baseline and the No Project Alternative and are classified as follows:

- No impact—No change in the environment would result from implementing the alternative.
- Less-than-significant impact—No substantial adverse change in the environment would result from implementing the alternative.
- Less than significant with mitigation—The implementation of one or more mitigation measures would reduce the impact from an alternative to a less-than-significant level.
- Significant impact—A potentially substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment would result from implementing the alternative based on the evaluation of project effects using specified significance criteria. Mitigation measures are proposed, when feasible, to reduce effects on the environment.

Under NEPA, the impacts of the action alternatives are compared to the No Action Alternative, which is equivalent to the CEQA existing conditions baseline for this RDEIR/SDEIS, and are classified as follows:

- An effect is considered *beneficial* if it would provide benefit to the environment as defined for that resource.
- A finding of *no effect* is identified if the analysis concludes that the alternative would have no effect or would not affect the particular resource in any adverse way.
- A finding of *no adverse effect* is identified if the analysis concludes that it would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment and requires no mitigation.
- A finding of *substantial adverse effect* is identified if the analysis concludes that it would cause a substantial adverse change to the environment even with the inclusion of one or more feasible mitigation measures or could not be mitigated.

Several resource chapters provide an analysis of Alternative 1A and Alternative 1B, which are both considered under Alternative 1. This information is provided for the purposes of the operational impact analysis and is based on modeled results. The model results represent two different operation options under Alternative 1 as a result of the different participation for Reclamation, as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.3. The chapters with operational discussions of Alternatives 1A and 1B are: Chapter 5, *Surface Water Resources*; Chapter 6, *Surface Water Quality*; Chapter 7, *Fluvial Geomorphology*; Chapter 11, *Aquatic Biological Resources*, and the supporting appendices of these chapters.

In addition, as noted in Chapter 2, all Project components are the same between Alternatives 1 and 3. Therefore, in some chapters, the impact analyses for Alternatives 1 and 3 are combined under subheadings. If the impact mechanisms and types of impacts are similar across all three action alternatives, the impact analyses maybe aggregated to reduce redundancy and provide ease of comparisons between alternatives.

3.2.6 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are proposed, where feasible, to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for significant and potentially significant impacts of the alternatives, in accordance

with Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines and the NEPA regulations (40 C.F.R. § 1508.20). To aid the reader, each mitigation measure is identified numerically to correspond with the number of the associated impact.

When significant impacts are identified, feasible mitigation measures are formulated to eliminate or reduce the intensity of the impacts and focus on the protection of sensitive resources. Under CEQA, the effectiveness of a mitigation measure is subsequently determined by evaluating the impact remaining after the application of the mitigation and reaching one of two conclusions: (1) the mitigation reduces the impact to a less-than-significant level; or (2) no feasible mitigation exists to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level and therefore, the impact is determined to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures are needed or proposed when an impact is determined to be beneficial or less than significant. Implementation of more than one mitigation measure may be needed to reduce an impact below a level of significance.

The Authority would be responsible for implementing all mitigation measures identified in this document, except for where Reclamation would retain authority under federal law.

3.3 Additional Analyses

Chapters 28 through 30 address topics that are unique to NEPA. Therefore, the organization and terminology in these chapters are slightly different from that in Chapters 5 through 27, according to the following framework.

- Affected environment
- Methods of analysis
- Environmental consequences

Similar to the discussion above in Section 3.2.4, *Methods*, the approaches for the analysis of effects related to climate change, Indian Trust Assets, and environmental justice included desktop reviews, database queries, and modeling. Modeling was used to analyze socioeconomic and climate change impacts. A range of potential impacts of future climate and sea-level conditions on the Project operation are evaluated. See Appendix 1A, *Introduction to Appendices and Models*, for more information on these models. The environmental consequences analysis discloses the effects of the alternatives on a particular resource. NEPA determinations consist of those identified in Section 3.2.5, *Determination of Impacts*.

3.4 Other Required Analyses

Other CEQA and NEPA analyses are addressed in Chapter 31, *Cumulative Impacts*, and Chapter 32, *Other Required Analyses*. These chapters describe and evaluate the following:

- Cumulative impacts (CEQA and NEPA)

- Growth-inducing impacts (CEQA only) and indirect impacts (NEPA)
- Relationship between short-term uses and long-term productivity and irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments (NEPA only)
- Significant irreversible environmental impacts (CEQA only)
- Mitigation measures with the potential for environmental effects (CEQA only)

Chapter 4 Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals, and Consultation Requirements

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides summary tables of federal, state and local permits, laws, approvals, reviews, and consultation requirements applicable to the Project (Tables 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3). It is included to fulfill CEQA Guidelines § 15124(d)(1) which requires: (1) a list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision-making; (2) a list of permits and other approvals required to implement the project; and (3) a list of related environmental review and consultation requirements. This information will also be useful for NEPA purposes, particularly with respect to the roles and responsibilities of cooperating agencies. It is anticipated that multiple agencies would rely on the analysis in this RDEIR/SDEIS and the future Final EIR/EIS for issuing permits or making decisions, including future decisions that may be made by Federal, State, and Sites storage partners in implementing the project.

Appendix 4A, *Regulatory Requirements* describes in detail the regulatory setting for these various permits, laws, approvals and consultation requirements, as well as other generally applicable environmental requirements that may apply to Project activities or the environmental review, including the relevance to the impact analysis for each environmental topic.

Table 4-1. Federal Permits, Approvals, Reviews, and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, Review or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)	Lead Agency responsible for Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act	<p>Prepare the EIS and issue the ROD as the representative NEPA lead agency for the Department of the Interior. The EIS must also comply with the following laws, regulations, and executive orders:</p> <p>Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), Sections 303, 401, 402, and 404; Rivers and Harbors Act, Sections 9, 10, 14, and 408; Federal Safe Drinking Water Act; Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; Marine Mammal Protection Act; Migratory Bird Treaty Act; Federal Clean Air Act; National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Sections 106 and 110; American Indian Religious Freedom Act; Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; Executive Order 13186 (protection of migratory birds); Executive Order 11990 (protection of wetlands); Executive Order 12898 (environmental justice); Executive Order 11988 (floodplain management); Executive Order 13007 (protection of Indian Sacred Sites on federal land)</p>	1 C.F.R. § 601.5.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	Review of Environmental Impact Statement	USEPA is charged with reviewing and commenting on Environmental Impact Statements for major federal actions under NEPA	Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 7609
	Review of Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permits	USEPA has the authority to restrict, prohibit, deny, or withdraw the use of an area as a disposal site for dredged or fill material if the discharge will have unacceptable adverse effects on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds and fishery areas, wildlife, or recreational areas.	Section 404(c) of the CWA, codified at 33 U.S.C. § 1344(c)

Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals,
and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, Review or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
USEPA/USACE	Compliance with CWA, Section 404(b)(1) guidelines	Determine compliance that no discharge of dredged or fill material are permitted if a practicable alternative exists that is less damaging to the aquatic environment, it violates other laws, significantly degrades waters of the United States, or does not include practicable steps to minimize adverse impacts on the aquatic ecosystem.	Section 404(b)(1) of the CWA codified at 40 C.F.R. Section 230.1
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District	Department of the Army CWA Section 404 Permit	Permit related to the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States (including wetlands).	Section 404 of the CWA, codified at 33 U.S.C. § 1344
	Department of the Army Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10 Permit	Permit related to construction of any structure in or over navigable waters of the United States, the excavation/dredging or deposition of material in these waters, or any obstruction or alteration in navigable waters.	Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, codified at 33 U.S.C. § 403
	33 U.S.C. § 408 Permission	Permit related to any proposed project that may affect any existing USACE and/or State Plan of Control levee in the Central Valley and Delta.	Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, codified at 33 U.S.C § 408
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Section 7 and Section 10 Consultation	Consultation requirement related to determining that any discretionary action authorized, funded, or carried out by a federal agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of their critical habitat.	Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, codified at 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2), and implementing regulations.
USFWS	Incidental Eagle Take Permit; Nest Take Permit	Permit needed for the take of bald and/or golden eagle and their nests.	16 U.S.C. § 668; 54 C.F.R. § 22.26
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP); California Office of Historic Preservation	Section 106 Consultation	Consultation requirement related to considering the effects of a federal undertaking on historic and cultural resources.	National Historic Preservation Act, codified at 36 C.F.R. § 800, and implementing regulations.

Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals,
and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, Review or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs	Section 106 Consultation	Consultation requirement with federally recognized tribes and protection of Indian Trust Assets.	25 USC 1a
U.S. Coast Guard	Private Aids to Navigation Permit	U.S. Coast Guard determination whether proposed activities affect river navigation, warning buoys and signs alerting boaters in navigable waters.	33 C.F.R. § 2.40.
U. S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	Determine compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act	Departments, agencies, independent commissions, and other units of the Federal Government shall identify the quantity of farmland actually converted by Federal programs, and to identify and take into account the adverse effects of Federal programs on the preservation of farmland; consider alternative actions, as appropriate, that could lessen such adverse effects; and assure that such Federal programs, to the extent practicable, are compatible with State, unit of local government, and private programs and policies to protect farmland.	7 USC 4201-4209 & 7 USC 658
U. S. Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration	Western Area Power Administration accepts requests from electric utilities, firm-power customers, private power developers and independent power generators to interconnect with its transmission system	WAPA is a Cooperating Agency and markets power generated by the CVP. If the Project interconnects to WAPA's transmission system, WAPA will wheel power needed by the Project over its transmission system and may also market any available generation,	Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. § 485h(c))

Table 4-2. State Permits, Approvals, Reviews, and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
California Water Commission	Approval of WSIP Funding	Related to the Water Storage Investment Program, which implements Proposition 1, Chapter 8 and its appropriation for the public benefits of water storage projects.	23 C.C.R. Title 23, Div. 7, Ch. 1.
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit	Related to potential adverse effects on state-listed endangered or threatened species or species proposed for state listing.	California Fish and Game Code § 2081
	Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement	Related to: any substantial diversion or obstruction of the natural flow of, or substantial change or use of any material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream or lake; crossing of streams, rivers, or lakes (also for reservoirs, which interrupt streams).	California Fish and Game Code § 1602
California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams	Approval of plans and specifications for the construction or enlargement of a dam or reservoir.	Related to the Department’s oversight of the design, construction, and maintenance of jurisdictional dams in California.	California Water Code Division 3, Dams and Reservoirs, Parts 1 and 2
State Water Resources Control Board; Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Rights Permit	Related to the diversion and utilization of water from existing streamflow.	California Water Code § 5101
	NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities	Related to all construction and land disturbance discharges when clearing, grading, and excavation result in a land disturbance of 1 or more acres. Permittee files a notice of intent to be covered under the statewide general permit.	Section 402 of the CWA
	Section 401 Water Quality Certification	State certification that the Federal permit for discharge of dredged or fill material to waters of the United States does not violate state water quality standards.	Section 401 of the CWA

Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals,
and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
	Waste Discharge Requirements	Compliance for the discharge of reclaimed water on land and to groundwater and waste discharges to non-federally regulated waters of the State	Sections 13260–13276 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
	Section 401 Water Quality Certification	Related to dredged or fill material to waters of the United States	Section 401 of the CWA
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Encroachment Permit(s)	Related to use of California rights-of-way for installation of pipelines along state freeways and roads.	California Streets and Highway Code § 660-759.3.
	Transportation Permit(s)	Related to the transport of heavy or oversized loads on state roads during construction.	California Vehicle Code, Section 35780; California Streets and Highway Code 117, 660-711
California State Lands Commission	Land Use Lease(s)	Related to work in jurisdictional areas (e.g. along the Sacramento River), specifically, placement of fill or structures in navigable waterways or Section 16 or 36 lands.	California Public Resources Code §§ 6000 et seq.
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Encroachment Permit	Related to encroachment onto/through regulated streams and designated floodways. The Flood Protection Board is the nonfederal sponsor agency for 33 U.S.C. § 408 coordination with USACE Civil Works Division.	23 C.C.R. Title 23, Div. 1.
California Air Resources Board	Equipment and vehicle Registrations	Administer the air quality policy to achieve the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (including the NAAQS for USEPA) and State Air Quality Designations related to the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles and other construction equipment that contribute to particulate matter and oxides of nitrogen into the air.	California Legislature

Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals,
and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	Hazardous waste transporter or generator Registration	Compliance with generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste regulations in California	California Health and Safety Code with Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 6 and 13, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 13
California Occupational Safety and Health Administration	Project permits and Annual permits to employers for major activities in construction and permits allowing use of diesel engines in mining and tunneling	Protects and improves the health and safety of working men and women in California during the construction of trenches or excavations 5 feet or deeper and into which a person is required to descend, construction or demolition of any building, structure, scaffolding, or falsework more than three stories high or the underground use of diesel engines in working mines and tunnels.	California Labor Code, Section 6500, CCR title 8, section 341 and 341.1
Native American Heritage Commission/ Local Tribes	AB 52 Consultation	Related to effects on tribal cultural resources.	PRC, Section 21080.3.1
California Public Utility Commission	Interconnection with PG&E Transmission Lines	The CPUC regulates investor-owned electric and natural gas utilities operating in California.	California Public Utilities Code

Table 4-3. Local Permits, Approvals, Reviews, and Consultation Requirements

Responsible Agency(ies)	Permit, Approval, or Consultation Requirement	Description	Authority
Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Yolo Counties, Public Works Departments	Encroachment Permit	Related to use of local jurisdiction’s right-of-way to install pipeline across roadways.	County ordinances
	Transportation Permit	Related to transport of heavy or oversized loads on county roads.	County ordinances
	Building Permit; Street Improvement Permit; Grading Permit.	Related to construction activities within the county jurisdiction.	Uniform Building Codes, as adopted
Yolo County, Planning Departments	Conditional Use Permit	Related to changes to zoning or General Plan designations	County Zoning Code and General Plan
Colusa and Glenn Planning Departments	Conditional Use Permit; Zoning/General Plan Amendment, Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Permit	Related to changes to zoning or General Plan designations and excavation of borrow material	County Zoning Code and General Plan
Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Yolo Counties, Air Pollution Control Districts	Authority to Construct; Permit to Operate.	Related to construction or operation of any nonexempt stationary source of air emissions.	New Source Review regulations; CAA; GCAPCD Article III, Sections 50 to 57; CCAPCD Regulation III, Rules 3.1 to 3.18