

Chapter 6

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Introduction

The 2001 FEIR concluded that the Project may induce growth in areas south of the Delta, resulting in secondary environmental impacts. This could occur in one of two ways:

- the Project could add water directly for export to municipal water supplies or agricultural production that may support growth; or
- Project water could be used to meet water quality or environmental requirements as a substitute for other water that could be used to support growth.

Although these conclusions remain unchanged, the growth-inducing impact discussion has been updated in this chapter to incorporate the identification of specific places of use for Project water into the Project description.

Summary of Changes, New Circumstances, and New Information

Substantial Changes in the Project

As detailed in the Project Description (Chapter 2), two major changes to the Project have been made since publication of the 2001 FEIR. The major changes are (1) the designation of specific places of use for the Project water and the incorporation of estimated water demands (i.e., quantities of water use) during years with less than full deliveries from the SWP, and (2) the addition of groundwater banks for storage of Project water to allow all Project water to be delivered to the designated places of use in years with actual unmet water demands. In the 2001 FEIR, the proposed Project was identified as having the potential to remove an obstacle for growth; however, because no specific end users of Project water were identified, the lead agency was unable to disclose where growth-inducing impacts of the Project could occur. Because of the referenced changes in the Project description, this EIR discloses where the potential growth could occur.

The Project applicant now plans to provide water to Semitropic, Golden State, and Valley District. An additional likely place of use is Metropolitan and its member agencies' service areas, including Western Municipal. These places of use have demonstrated need and capacity for additional sources of water to improve the reliability of their existing water supplies to meet current demand, and have infrastructure in place for conveyance and transfer of the Project water. The Project water will be used to improve water supply reliability for their current water uses, which include irrigation, domestic, and municipal and industrial beneficial uses. The Affected Environment section below describes these agencies' service areas, where growth could occur.

New Circumstances

Since the 2001 FEIR was completed, additional limitations have been placed on CVP and SWP operations based on ESA compliance with the coordinated operations of the SWP and CVP (see Section 4.5, Fishery Resources). These restrictions have limited water deliveries south of the Delta in recent years. Metropolitan also has entitlements to water from the Colorado River that have been reduced in recent years because of regulatory and climatic factors. Changes in SWP, CVP, and Colorado River water delivery operations related to these new circumstances do not affect the growth analysis in this chapter.

New Information

The water supply planning documents for the designated places of use were consulted for this analysis to determine the anticipated levels of growth and likely uses of Project water at each place of use. These planning documents are listed in Chapter 9, "References," and the levels of growth and likely uses of Project water are described below in the Affected Environment section.

Existing Conditions

Affected Environment

Places of Use

The Project applicant has identified the likely places of use as the service areas of Semitropic, Golden State, Metropolitan, and Valley District. Figures 1-2 through 1-6 in Chapter 1 show the areas served by these water suppliers that may use Project water. As described in Chapter 2, "Project Description," Semitropic provides irrigation water to 140,000 acres of agricultural land in Kern County. Golden State serves 75 communities throughout California; however, the regions of Golden State that would be served by Project water are limited to the 33 water systems and 53 communities shown in Table 6-1. Metropolitan provides municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supplies to a large area of southern

California encompassing 5,200 square miles, which includes 152 cities and 89 unincorporated communities (see Table 6-2). Valley District provides wholesale water to retail water agencies serving the communities of Bloomington, Colton, East Highlands, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Highland, Loma Linda, Mentone, Redlands, Rialto, Yucaipa, San Bernardino, and portions of Riverside County.

Table 6-3 shows a detailed summary of the purpose of water use, geography served, and planned growth within each place of use.

Table 6-1. Golden State Water Company Systems and Communities That May Use Project Water

Systems				
Region 1	Region 2		Region 3	
Edna	Artesia		Apple Valley North	Morongo
Los Osos	Bell/Bell Gardens		Apple Valley South	Placentia
Lake Marie	Culver City		Barstow	San Dimas
Nipomo	Florence Graham		Calipatria	South Arcadia
Ojai	Hollydale		Claremont	South San Gabriel
Orcutt	Norwalk		Cowan Heights	West Orange County
Simi Valley	Southwest		Desert View	Wrightwood
Sisquoc	Willowbrook		Lucerne	Yorba Linda
Tanglewood				
Communities				
Region 1	Region 2		Region 3	
Bay Point	Artesia	Hawaii Gardens	Apple Valley	Lucerne Valley
Clearlake	Athens	Hawthorne	Arcadia	Morongo Valley
Cordova	Bell	Hollydale	Barstow	Pomona
Los Osos	Bell Gardens	Inglewood	Calipatria	Rosemead
Santa Maria	Carson	Lakewood	Claremont	Rossmoor
Orcutt	Cerritos	Lawndale	Covina	San Dimas
Ojai	Compton	Liberty Acres	Cypress	San Gabriel
Simi Valley	Cudahay	Lennox	Duarte	Seal Beach
	Culver City	Norwalk	La Verne	Stanton
	El Camino Village	South Gate	Los Alamitos	Temple City
	Florence	Torrance		
	Gardena	Willowbrook		
	Graham			

Table 6-2. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Member Agencies

Municipal Water Districts (11)		Member Cities (14)			County Water Authorities (1)
Calleguas	Orange County	Anaheim	Glendale	San Marino	San Diego
Central Basin	Three Valleys	Beverly Hills	Long Beach	Santa Ana	
Foothill	Upper San Gabriel Valley	Burbank	Los Angeles	Santa Monica	
Inland Empire	West Basin	Compton	Pasadena	Torrance	
Eastern	Western	Fullerton	San Fernando		
Las Virgenes					
Cities within Member Agencies					
Calleguas MWD	Eastern MWD	MWD of Orange Co (cont'd)			West Basin MWD (cont'd)
Camarillo	East Hemet*	Westminster	Three Valleys MWD		Redondo Beach
Camarillo Heights*	Good Hope*	Yorba Linda			
Fairview*	Hemet	Charter Oak*	Western MWD of Riverside County		
Las Posas Valley*	Homeland*	Claremont			
Moorpark	Lakeview-Nuevo*	Covina Knolls*			
Oak Park*	Mead Valley*	Diamond Bar			
Oxnard	Moreno Valley	Glendora			
Port Hueneme (annexed)*	Murrieta Hot Springs*	Industry			
Santa Rosa Valley*	Perris	La Verne			
Simi Valley	Quail Valley*	Pomona			
Thousand Oaks	Romoland*	Rowland Heights*			
Central Basin MWD	San Jacinto	San Dimas			
Artesia	Sun City*	South San Jose Hills*			
Bell	Sunnymead*	Walnut			
Bellflower	Temecula	Upper San Gabriel Valley MWD			
Cerritos	Valle Vista*	Arcadia			
Commerce	Winchester*	Avocado Heights*			
Cudahy	Las Virgenes MWD	Azusa			
Downey	Agoura Hills	Baldwin Park			
East Compton*	Calabasas	Bradbury			
East La Mirada*	Chatsworth Lake Manor*	Citrus*			
East Los Angeles*	Hidden Hills	Covina			
Florence*	Malibu Lake*	Duarte			
Graham*	Monte Nido*	El Monte			
Hawaiian Gardens	Westlake Village	Hacienda Heights*			
Huntington Gardens*	MWD of Orange County	Irwindale			
La Habra Heights	Aliso Viejo	La Puente			
Lakewood	Brea	Mayflower Village*			
Los Nietos*	Buena Park	Monrovia			
La Mirada	Capistrano Beach*	Rosemead			
Lynwood	Corona del Mar	San Gabriel*			
Maywood	Costa Mesa	South El Monte			
Montebello	Cypress	South Pasadena			
Norwalk	Dana Point	South San Gabriel			
Paramount	El Toro*	Temple City			
Pico Rivera	Fountain Valley	Valinda*			
Santa Fe Springs	Garden Grove	West Covina			
Signal Hill	Huntington Beach	West Puente Village*			
South Gate	Irvine	West Basin MWD			
South Whittier*	Lake Forest	Alondra Park*			
Vernon	Laguna Beach	Angeles Mesa*			
Walnut Park*	Laguna Hills	Carson			
West Compton*	Laguna Niguel	Culver City			
West Whittier*	Laguna Woods	Del Aire*			
Whittier	La Habra	El Nido-Clifton*			
Willowbrook*	La Palma	El Segundo			
Foothill MWD	Los Alamitos	Gardena			
Altadena*	Mission Viejo	Hawthorne			
La Canada	Newport Beach	Inglewood			
La Crescenta*	Orange	Ladera Heights*			
Mintridge	Placentia	Lawndale			
Montrose*	Rossmoor*	Lennox*			
Inland Empire	San Clemente	Lomita			
Chino	San Juan Capistrano	Malibu			
Chino Hills	Seal Beach	Manhattan Beach			
Fontana	South Laguna*	Marina del Rey*			
Montclair	Stanton	Palos Verdes Estates			
Ontario	Tustin	Point Dume*			
Rancho Cucamonga	Tustin Foothills*	Rancho Palos Verdes			
Upland	Villa Park				
			* Unincorporated areas.		

Table 6-3. Project Places of Use

Entity	Estimated Annual Water Demand (taf)	Estimated Maximum Annual Delivery from Project (taf) ¹	Purpose of Use ²	Geography Served	Relevant Planning Document	Anticipated Growth based on Planning Document
Semitropic Water Storage District	420	45	Increase water supply reliability for agricultural irrigation.	140,000 acres of agricultural land in Kern County	Poso Creek Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, published in 2007	2006 population in the Poso Creek planning area was 120,000. Population growth is anticipated to continue at approximately 5% per year. Agriculture is expected to decline accordingly.
Golden State Water Company ³	240 ⁴	20	Increase reliability of existing municipal and industrial deliveries.	53 communities in southern California (see Table 6-1)	19 Urban Water Management Plans, published in 2005	Population growth is expected to increase by approximately 18% by 2030. Among the service areas that have urban water management plans, the population in 2005 was 1,035,000 and is anticipated to be 1,230,000 by 2030; 80 new agricultural service connections are anticipated by 2030.
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	4,100 ⁵	215	Increase reliability of existing agricultural, industrial, and municipal water supplies.	5,200 square miles of residential, municipal, industrial, and agricultural land in southern California, including 152 cities and 89 unincorporated communities (see Table 6-2).	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Regional Urban Water Management Plan, 2005	Population growth in Metropolitan's service area is expected to average just over 150,000 people per year, increasing from an estimated 18.2 million in 2005 to 22 million in 2030. Water demand is anticipated to increase to 4,914,000 acre-feet by 2030.
San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District	103 ⁶	15	Increase reliability of water deliveries to retail water agencies and of supplies used to recharge local groundwater basins.	325 square miles of the San Bernardino Valley, which include 12 communities and portions of Riverside County.	Upper Santa Ana River Watershed Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, 2007	Population growth in the Valley District service area is expected to increase from an estimated 641,000 in 2005 to 784,500 in 2025—a 22.4% increase.

Entity	Estimated Annual Water Demand (taf)	Estimated Maximum Annual Delivery from Project (taf) ¹	Purpose of Use ²	Geography Served	Relevant Planning Document	Anticipated Growth based on Planning Document
<p>¹ Denotes estimates of the maximum annual deliveries of Project water to each place of use, and not average deliveries. The sum of the estimated maximum annual deliveries exceeds anticipated Project yield. Maximum annual deliveries are used to conservatively assess the growth-inducing impacts of the Project.</p> <p>² No new facilities would be needed to convey to or store water at the places of use as a result of the Project beyond those already built or those already analyzed and approved.</p> <p>³ Numbers provided for the Golden State Water Company include only information for those delivery areas with urban water management plans.</p> <p>⁴ Anticipated total water demand by 2030.</p> <p>⁵ Interpolated demand for 2005, as presented in the MWD Regional Urban Water Management Plan, 2005.</p> <p>⁶ SWP Table A quantity.</p>						

CEQA Requirements for Analysis of Growth-Inducing and Indirect Impacts

Regulatory conditions regarding growth-inducing and indirect impacts have not changed since publication of the 2001 FEIR. CEQA requires that an EIR discuss the potential for the proposed Project to remove an obstacle to growth and present the possible secondary effects that could result from growth indirectly induced by a project. Public Resources Code section 21100 requires that an EIR analyze the growth-inducing impacts of a project (Pub. Resources Code, § 21100, subd. [b][5]). According to the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.2(d)), an EIR must discuss how a project could directly or indirectly lead to economic, population, or housing growth. A project can be considered growth-inducing if it removes obstacles to growth, increases the demands on community service facilities, or encourages other activities that cause significant environmental effects.

Sections 15144 and 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines state that an agency must use its best efforts to predict impacts but is not required to predict the unforeseeable. If the agency finds, after a thorough investigation, that an impact is too speculative to evaluate, it should note this conclusion and proceed. Section 15146 states that the specificity of an EIR should correspond to the specificity of the underlying activity being evaluated.

Impact Analysis

The lead agencies prepared the 2001 FEIR based on the assumption that there was unmet demand for water in the SWP/CVP service area and that such demand would exist in the future. For purposes of impact assessment, the 2001 FEIR assumed that water stored on Project Reservoir Islands would be exported using the SWP and CVP facilities. However, the 2001 FEIR considered the specific areas of delivery and end use of Project water to be unforeseeable and too speculative for site-specific analysis.

The impact analysis took a general approach to determining potential growth-inducing impacts of the project based on two assumptions: first, that all project water would be delivered as exports to the SWP/CVP service area (as opposed to in-Delta or outflow uses); and second, that such water would constitute a new source of water that could remove an obstacle to growth.

Now that places of use for Project water have been identified, specific locations where growth may occur have been disclosed (see Tables 6-1 through 6-3), as have the types of growth that are anticipated in those areas (see Table 6-3). Relevant planning agencies in these areas have developed “growth management plans” that address the specific amount and location of growth, as well as possible environmental impacts associated with this growth. The impact analysis in this EIR focuses on determining how the Project could contribute to growth in

the places of use, and on identification and disclosure of the types of indirect impacts that could result from this growth.

No-Project Alternative

A no-project alternative was not analyzed for growth-inducing impacts in the 2001 FEIR. Under the No-Project Alternative, no water would be supplied to any users outside of the Project islands; therefore, there would be no growth-inducing or related indirect environmental impacts.

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 involve storage of water on Project islands and delivery of that water south through the CVP or SWP conveyance facilities to urban and agricultural users in the identified places of use during years when there is unmet demand and to the Semitropic Groundwater Bank and Antelope Valley Water Bank for banking during years when there is not unmet demand. A goal of the Project is to improve the reliability of water delivery to the places of use, meeting demand created by reductions in CVP, SWP, and Colorado River water supply. Although there are many obstacles related to growth in these areas that go beyond the jurisdiction of the lead and responsible agencies, an improvement in water supply reliability could remove a major obstacle to growth in the places of use.

Improved water supply reliability in the places of use could allow planned development to go forward that otherwise may have been hindered by a lack of reliable water supplies. As shown in Table 6-3, relevant planning documents anticipate growth in all of the places of use, and the improved water supply reliability provided by the Project could accommodate a portion of this growth. Types of growth anticipated at the places of use include population growth and housing development, commercial and industrial development, and expansion of areas under agricultural cultivation.

The indirect impacts that could result from urban growth and increased crop cultivation in the identified places of use would vary depending on site-specific conditions. Although it is not possible to quantify specifics related to how and where the proposed Project would result in growth and what environmental impacts would occur from that growth, housing growth and commercial and industrial development in general could result in the following types of environmental impacts:

- loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat and related effects on plant communities and wildlife, including Threatened and Endangered species;
- decreased air quality caused by automobile emissions and industrial pollutants;
- reduced water quality caused by increased urban runoff and industrial discharges;

- destruction of cultural and historical resources located at development sites;
- conversion of prime and productive agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses, and related losses of agricultural employment;
- increased demand for government services, including educational services and police and fire protection services; and
- increased need for public infrastructure, including wastewater treatment facilities, parks, and roadways.

Additionally, if new water sources are used to bring existing fallow or natural lands into production, irrigating and cultivating more farmland could result in similar types of impacts, including:

- the loss of natural vegetation and wildlife habitat and related effects on plant communities and wildlife, including Threatened and Endangered species;
- decreased air quality resulting from generation of dust and applications of pesticides; and
- reduced water quality caused by agricultural runoff to streams and rivers, and related impacts on fish species and habitat.

The environmental documentation prepared by local, state, and federal agencies that approve and provide permits for this growth (e.g., residential, commercial, and industrial projects) would identify the site- and issue-specific environmental impacts. Public involvement and agency consultation would occur during the environmental documentation process for site-specific projects.

As part of the environmental process required by CEQA and NEPA, the significant impacts of this growth would be identified and mitigation of impacts would be adopted and implemented if available and feasible. The responsibility for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures would lie with the specific local, state, or federal agencies with discretionary authority over the projects. Some projects may result in impacts that cannot be mitigated or reduced to less-than-significant levels; in such cases, growth inducement associated with this growth could result in residual significant impacts.

Conclusions

In summary, the additional water supply provided by the Project may remove an obstacle to a portion of the planned growth in the identified places of use, which may result in secondary environmental impacts. More farmland could be brought into production as a result of Project implementation. As stated previously, the environmental documentation prepared by local, state, and federal agencies that approve and provide permits for residential, commercial, and industrial projects in the places of use would identify site- and resource-specific impacts of this growth. Mitigation measures implemented by agencies with jurisdiction over urban development projects would address many of the secondary impacts of this growth.

Although it is speculative to quantify the site- and resource-specific impacts of growth in the places of use identified, it is reasonable to conclude that feasible mitigation may not be available to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Although the Project could remove an obstacle to growth and therefore contribute to impacts related to this growth, neither the lead or responsible agencies nor the Project proponent has the jurisdiction or capabilities to provide the framework for mitigation of the undetermined specific impacts of this growth.