

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
MAMMOTH CREEK FISHERY BYPASS FLOW REQUIREMENTS, WATERSHED
OPERATION CONSTRAINTS, POINT OF MEASUREMENT, AND PLACE OF USE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Project Purpose and Objectives.....	1-1
1.2 Project Location.....	1-2
1.2.1 Project Area.....	1-2
1.2.2 Areas Specifically Not Included.....	1-5
1.3 Project Background.....	1-6
1.3.1 District Water Right Application 25368	1-6
1.3.2 1978 – State Water Resources Control Board Issued Permit 17332	1-7
1.3.3 1986 – State Water Resources Control Board Modified Permit 17332	1-7
1.3.4 1987 to 1989 – Mammoth Community Water District Applied for Temporary Permits 20124, 20250 and 20336	1-8
1.3.5 August 1991 – State Water Resources Control Board Issued Preliminary Cease and Desist Order 9P.....	1-8
1.3.6 December 1991 – Mammoth Community Water District Petitions the State Water Resources Control Board	1-9
1.3.7 1992 – State Water Resources Control Board Hearing to Consider Fishery Bypass Flow Requirements in Preliminary Cease and Desist Order No. 9P	1-9
1.3.8 1994 – State Water Resources Control Board Issued Preliminary Cease and Desist Order 9P.2.....	1-10
1.3.9 1996 – Mono County Superior Court Ruling on Preliminary Cease and Desist Order 9P.2.....	1-10
1.3.10 1997-2000 – Environmental Review Respecting Mammoth Creek Fishery Bypass Flow Requirements	1-10
1.3.11 2004 – CalTrout Petition to the State Water Resources Control Board.....	1-10
1.3.12 Mammoth Creek Collaborative Process	1-11
1.4 Laws Governing Fishery Bypass Flow Issues – California Fish and Game Code Sections 5937, 5946 and 45	1-11
1.5 Issues to Be Resolved and Areas of Known Controversy	1-12
1.5.1 Issues to be Resolved	1-12
1.5.2 Areas of Known Controversy	1-12
1.5.3 Information Incorporated by Reference.....	1-15
1.5.4 Consistency with Applicable Local and Regional Programs and Plans	1-17
1.6 Permits and Other Approvals Required to Implement the Proposed Project	1-18

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.7 Roles and Responsibilities of Trustee and Other Agencies	1-19
1.7.1 California Department of Fish and Game	1-19
1.7.2 University of California, Santa Barbara	1-19
1.7.3 Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.....	1-19
1.7.4 California Department of Public Health's Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management.....	1-20
1.7.5 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1-20
1.7.6 U.S. Forest Service.....	1-20
1.8 Report Organization.....	1-20
CHAPTER 2 - PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1 Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Evaluation	2-1
2.1.1 Proposed Project Alternative.....	2-1
2.1.2 Bypass Flow Requirements Alternative No. 2	2-11
2.1.3 Permit 17332 Bypass Flow Requirements Alternative.....	2-12
2.1.4 No Project Alternative	2-12
2.1.5 Summary Comparison of Alternatives	2-13
2.2 Development of Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Evaluation	2-13
2.2.1 Technical Collaboration Process	2-13
2.2.2 Permit 17332 Alternative Development Process.....	2-19
2.2.3 No Project Alternative Development Process.....	2-21
2.3 Alternatives Considered But Not Carried Forward for Detailed Evaluation	2-21
2.3.1 Water Year Type-Specific Bypass Flow Requirements.....	2-21
2.3.2 Water Conservation or Out of Basin Water Supply Development in Lieu of Mammoth Creek Diversions	2-23
2.3.3 Bypass Flow Requirements that Resemble Historical Natural Flows	2-23
2.3.4 Purchase of Irrigation Leases to Meet Demands and/or Mitigate Impacts	2-24
2.3.5 Alternative with Unimpeded Peak Flows During Normal/Dry Years to Maintain Channel and Habitat.....	2-24
CHAPTER 3 - OVERVIEW OF ANALYTICAL APPROACH	3-1
3.1 Evaluated Environmental Resource Areas	3-1
3.2 Resource Topics, Features and Facilities Dismissed from Further Evaluation.....	3-2
3.3 Framework for Environmental Impacts/Consequences Analyses	3-4
3.4 Overview of the Environmental Setting/Existing Condition	3-5
3.4.1 Hydrologic Characterization and MCWD Model Application	3-5
3.5 Overview of Impact Analyses Comparisons	3-6
3.6 Cumulative Impact Assessment Approach	3-7
3.6.1 Cumulative Impact Assessment Methodology.....	3-7
CHAPTER 4 - HYDROLOGY	4-1
4.1 Environmental Setting	4-1
4.1.1 Surface Water Hydrology	4-1
4.1.2 Groundwater Hydrology	4-8

Section	Page
4.2 Regulatory Setting	4-22
4.2.1 Water Right Permits	4-22
4.2.2 Water Right Licenses	4-23
4.2.3 SWRCB Cease and Desist Order No. 9P.2	4-23
4.2.4 Groundwater Management Act (AB 3030).....	4-23
4.3 Environmental Consequences.....	4-24
4.3.1 Hydrologic Assessment Methods.....	4-24
4.3.2 Surface Water Hydrology Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria.....	4-29
4.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	4-30
4.4 Mitigation Measures.....	4-47
4.5 Potentially Significant Unavoidable Impacts	4-47
4.6 Cumulative Impacts	4-48
4.6.1 Qualitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects	4-48
4.6.2 Quantitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects.....	4-50
CHAPTER 5 - WATER QUALITY.....	5-1
5.1 Environmental Setting	5-1
5.1.1 Physical Characteristics of Surface Water Quality	5-1
5.1.2 Beneficial Uses and Surface Water Quality Associated with Project Area Waterbodies.....	5-2
5.2 Regulatory Setting	5-14
5.2.1 Federal Clean Water Act	5-14
5.2.2 Federal Antidegradation Policy	5-15
5.2.3 California Toxics Rule	5-16
5.2.4 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act	5-16
5.2.5 Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan	5-17
5.2.6 Strategic Plan for the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards.....	5-17
5.2.7 Water Quality Management Plan for National Forest System Lands in California.....	5-18
5.2.8 Safe Drinking Water Act	5-18
5.2.9 Drinking Water Supply Permits	5-18
5.2.10 Town of Mammoth Lakes Storm Drain Master Plan.....	5-19
5.3 Environmental Consequences.....	5-19
5.3.1 Impact Assessment Methods.....	5-19
5.3.2 Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria for Water Quality	5-24
5.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	5-26
5.4 Mitigation Measures.....	5-31
5.5 Potentially Significant Unavoidable Impacts	5-31
5.6 Cumulative Impacts	5-31
5.6.1 Qualitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects	5-31
5.6.2 Quantitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects.....	5-34

Section	Page
CHAPTER 6 - FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES	6-1
6.1 Environmental Setting	6-1
6.1.1 Lake Mary	6-1
6.1.2 Lake Mamie and Twin Lakes	6-2
6.1.3 Mammoth Creek	6-2
6.1.4 Hot Creek	6-37
6.2 Regulatory Setting	6-39
6.2.1 Federal Endangered Species Act.....	6-39
6.2.2 California Endangered Species Act	6-39
6.2.3 California Fish and Game Code 5937 and 5946	6-40
6.2.4 California Fish and Game Code 45.....	6-40
6.3 Environmental Consequences.....	6-40
6.3.1 Impact Assessment Methods.....	6-40
6.3.2 Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources.....	6-47
6.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	6-48
6.4 Mitigation Measures.....	6-58
6.5 Potentially Significant Unavoidable Impacts	6-58
6.6 Cumulative Impacts	6-58
6.6.1 Qualitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects	6-59
6.6.2 Quantitative Analysis of Past, Present and Future Projects.....	6-59
CHAPTER 7 - WILDLIFE AND BOTANICAL RESOURCES	7-1
7.1 Environmental Setting	7-2
7.1.1 Plant Communities	7-2
7.1.2 Wildlife	7-23
7.1.3 Wildlife Movement	7-25
7.1.4 Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands.....	7-29
7.1.5 Sensitive Biological Resources	7-29
7.2 Regulatory Setting	7-71
7.2.1 State of California Fish and Game Code, Section 1602	7-71
7.2.2 Federal Endangered Species Act, Section 10 and Section 7	7-71
7.2.3 The Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan (2007).....	7-73
7.2.4 The Mono County General Plan	7-73
7.2.5 Upper Owens River Watershed Management Plan.....	7-74
7.2.6 USDA Forest Service.....	7-74
7.3 Environmental Consequences.....	7-76
7.3.1 Impact Assessment Methods.....	7-77
7.3.2 Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria for Wildlife and Botanical Resources.....	7-80
7.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	7-81
7.4 Mitigation Measures.....	7-95
7.5 Potentially Significant Unavoidable Impacts	7-95

Section	Page
7.6 Cumulative Impacts	7-95
7.6.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment of Potential Cumulative Impacts.....	7-95
CHAPTER 8 - RECREATIONAL RESOURCES.....	8-1
8.1 Environmental Setting	8-1
8.1.1 Existing Public Recreational Facilities.....	8-1
8.1.2 Recreational Value of the Project Area.....	8-3
8.2 Regulatory Setting	8-7
8.2.1 Inyo National Forest land and Resource Management Plan	8-7
8.2.2 Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan	8-9
8.2.3 Town of Mammoth Lakes Draft Trail System Master Plan	8-12
8.2.4 Town of Mammoth Lakes Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan	8-13
8.2.5 Mono County General Plan Conservation Element.....	8-15
8.3 Environmental Consequences.....	8-15
8.3.1 Impact Assessment Methods.....	8-15
8.3.2 Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria for Recreational Resources	8-16
8.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	8-17
8.4 Mitigation Measures.....	8-35
8.5 Level of Significance After Mitigation.....	8-35
8.6 Cumulative Impacts	8-36
8.6.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment of Potential Cumulative Impacts.....	8-36
CHAPTER 9 - VISUAL RESOURCES	9-1
9.1 Environmental Setting	9-1
9.1.1 Lake Mary	9-2
9.1.2 Bodle Ditch Corridor	9-2
9.1.3 Twin Falls	9-4
9.1.4 Mammoth Creek	9-4
9.2 Regulatory Setting	9-6
9.2.1 National Environmental Policy Act.....	9-6
9.2.2 California Scenic Highway Regulations	9-6
9.2.3 Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan	9-7
9.2.4 Mono County General Plan 2009 Land Use Element.....	9-7
9.2.5 Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	9-8
9.3 Environmental Consequences.....	9-10
9.3.1 Impact Assessment Methods.....	9-10
9.3.2 Impact Indicators and Significance Criteria for Visual Resources	9-13
9.3.3 Analysis of Alternative Comparisons	9-14
9.4 Mitigation Measures.....	9-27
9.5 Level of Significance After Mitigation	9-28

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
9.6 Cumulative Impacts	9-28
9.6.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment of Potential Cumulative Impacts.....	9-28
CHAPTER 10 - OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS.....	10-1
10.1 Surface Water Supply Availability and Reliability	10-1
10.1.1 Environmental Setting.....	10-2
10.1.2 Regulatory Setting.....	10-3
10.1.3 Surface Water Supply Availability and Reliability Assessment Approach.....	10-4
10.1.4 Analysis of Alternatives.....	10-4
10.1.5 Future (No Project and Proposed Project Alternative Future Level of Demand) Water Supply Availability and Reliability.....	10-7
10.2 Socioeconomics	10-8
10.2.1 Study Area Jurisdictions	10-8
10.2.2 Comparison of Project Alternatives	10-12
10.3 Growth Inducement	10-13
10.3.1 Town of Mammoth Lakes.....	10-13
10.3.2 Inyo National Forest	10-16
10.3.3 Mono County	10-19
10.3.4 Project Alternatives.....	10-20
10.4 Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects.....	10-19
CHAPTER 11 - CLIMATE CHANGE CONSIDERATIONS	11-1
11.1 Introduction.....	11-1
11.2 Regulatory Setting	11-1
11.2.1 Federal Climate Change Action Plan.....	11-1
11.2.2 Executive Order S-3-05	11-2
11.2.3 Assembly Bill 32 - The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Health and Safety Code §38501 et seq.).....	11-2
11.2.4 Senate Bill 97, Modification to the Public Resources Code (2007)	11-2
11.2.5 2010 Amendments Incorporating Climate Change into the CEQA Guidelines	11-3
11.3 Environmental Consequences.....	11-3
11.3.1 Potential for the Proposed Project to Contribute to Greenhouse Gas Emissions Or Other Effects Related to Global Warming.....	11-4
CHAPTER 12 - CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	12-1
12.1 Public Involvement.....	12-1
12.1.1 2005 NOP and Public Scoping Process	12-2
12.1.2 2007 NOP and Public Scoping Process	12-2

Section		Page
12.2	Consultation and Coordination with Resource Agencies.....	12-2
12.2.1	California Department of Fish and Game (California Endangered Species Act Compliance and Coordination)	12-2
12.2.2	United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Federal Endangered Species Act Compliance and Coordination)	12-3
12.2.3	State Water Resources control Board (California Water Code and Public Trust Resources Compliance and Coordination)	12-3
12.3	Public Review of the Draft EIR	12-3
CHAPTER 13 - LIST OF PREPARERS		13-1
CHAPTER 14 - REFERENCES		14-1

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Notice of Preparation and Public Comments
Appendix B	Mammoth Community Water District Water Conservation Measures
Appendix C	Mammoth Community Water District Water Balance Operations Model Technical Appendix
Appendix D	Hydrologic Model Output Results
Appendix E	Fish Populations of Mammoth Creek, Mono County, California (1998-2008)
Appendix F	Plant and Wildlife Species Compendium

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
Figure 1-1.	Mammoth Lakes Basin Including the Project Area.....	1-3
Figure 2-1.	Flow Measurement Locations in the Mammoth Lakes Basin.....	2-7
Figure 4-1.	Classification of Runoff Years during the Modeled Hydrologic Period.....	4-3
Figure 4-2.	Springflow for Valentine Spring (1993-2001) and Mammoth Creek Flow (1993-2009) (Ken Schmidt & Associates 2009).....	4-5
Figure 4-3.	The Six Distinct Major Watersheds of the Mammoth Area Drainage Basin (Boyle 2005).....	4-7
Figure 4-4.	Hot Creek Fish Hatchery (Jellison et al. 2007)	4-8
Figure 4-5.	Mammoth Groundwater Basin (Modified from Wildermuth 2009).....	4-10
Figure 4.6.	MCWD Well Locations	4-14

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 6-1. The Mammoth Creek Basin and Location of the Eight Fish Sampling Sites	6-4
Figure 6-2. Annual Standardized Abundance Estimates (Fish/Mile) of Owens Sucker, Owens Tui Chub, Brown Trout and "Wild" Rainbow Trout in Reach E of Mammoth Creek, 1988-2008	6-12
Figure 6-3. Annual Standardized Abundance Estimates (Fish/Mile) of Owens Sucker and Tui Chub, in Reach E of Mammoth Creek and Two Annual Expressions of OLD395 Flows during 1988-2008: (a) OLD395 High Flow and (b) OLD395 Low Flow	6-14
Figure 6-4. Annual Standardized Abundance of Owens Sucker (Fish/Mile) as a Function of OLD395 Low Flow (cfs) and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008.....	6-15
Figure 6-5. Annual Standardized Abundance of Owens Tui Chub (Fish/Mile) as a Function of OLD395 Low Flow (cfs) and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008.....	6-15
Figure 6-6. Annual Standardized Abundance of Owens Sucker (fish/mile) as a Function of OLD395 High Flow (cfs) and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008.....	6-16
Figure 6-7. Annual Standardized Abundance of Owens Tui Chub (fish/mile) as a Function of OLD395 High Flow (cfs) and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008.....	6-16
Figure 6-8. Standardized Average Annual Abundance Estimates (Number/Mile) for "Wild" Rainbow Trout during Each Year of Monitoring, Compared to the Overall Annual Average Abundance over the 17-year Period of Record.	6-19
Figure 6-9. Standardized Average Annual Abundance Estimates (Number/Mile) for Brown Trout during Each Year of Monitoring, Compared to the Overall Annual Average Abundance over the 17-year Period of Record.....	6-20
Figure 6-10. Annual Brown Trout Abundance Estimates (Bars), Estimated 95% Confidence Intervals (Error Bars) and Fitted Regression Line for Mammoth Creek between Sherwin St. and the Confluence with Hot Creek.....	6-22
Figure 6-11. Annual YOY Brown Trout Abundance Estimates (Bars), Estimated 95% Confidence Intervals (Error Bars) and Fitted Regression Line for Mammoth Creek between Sherwin St. and the Confluence with Hot Creek.....	6-22
Figure 6-12. Annual Average YOY Brown Trout Density Estimates (Bars) and Fitted Regression Line for Mammoth Creek between Sherwin St. and the Confluence with Hot Creek	6-23
Figure 6-13. Annual Average YOY Brown Trout Density Estimates (Bars) and Fitted Regression Lines in the Four Surveyed Reaches of Mammoth Creek from 1988 through 2008	6-24
Figure 6-14. Annual Average YOY Brown Trout Density Estimates (Bars) in Mammoth Creek and the Fitted Regression Line for the Period 1999-2008	6-25
Figure 6-15. Annual Average YOY Brown Trout Density Estimates (Bars) and Fitted Regression Lines in the Four Surveyed Reaches of Mammoth Creek for the Period 1999-2008	6-26

Figure	Page
Figure 6-16. Influence of Annual Average Reach Densities on Annual Average YOY Brown Trout Density Trends in Mammoth Creek during 1999-2008.....	6-27
Figure 6-17. Annual Mammoth Creek Average YOY Brown Trout Density as a Function of OMR Low Flow Quartile and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008.....	6-28
Figure 6-18. Annual Mammoth Creek Average YOY Brown Trout Density as a Function of OMR Low Flow and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008	6-28
Figure 6-19. Annual Mammoth Creek Average YOY Brown Trout Density as a Function of OMR High Flow and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008	6-29
Figure 6-20. Annual Mammoth Creek Average YOY Brown Trout Density as a Function of One-Year-Lagged OMR High Flow and Corresponding Fitted Linear Regression Line for the Period 1988 through 2008	6-29
Figure 6-21. Hot Creek Hatchery Bioassessment Monitoring Sites	6-38
Figure 6-22. Correlation Between the Brown Trout Annual Abundance CUSUM and the CUSUM of Annual Average OMR Mean Daily Flow, OMR High Flow, OMR Low Flow and OMR Low Flow Quartile under the Existing Condition during the Years 1988 to 2007.....	6-44
Figure 7-1.1. Plant Communities	7-4
Figure 7-1.2. Plant Communities	7-5
Figure 7-1.3. Plant Communities	7-6
Figure 7-1.4. Plant Communities	7-7
Figure 7-1.5. Plant Communities	7-8
Figure 7-1.6. Plant Communities	7-9
Figure 7-1.7. Plant Communities	7-10
Figure 7-1.8. Plant Communities	7-11
Figure 7-1.9. Plant Communities	7-12
Figure 7-1.10. Plant Communities	7-13
Figure 7-1.11. Plant Communities	7-14
Figure 7-1.12. Plant Communities	7-15
Figure 7-1.13. Plant Communities	7-16
Figure 7-1.14. Plant Communities	7-17
Figure 7-1.15. Plant Communities	7-18
Figure 7-1.16. Plant Communities	7-19
Figure 7-2. Location of Sensitive Plants.....	7-69
Figure 7-3. Critical Habitat for the Owens Tui Chub	7-72
Figure 7-4. Photographs of Riparian-Wetland Plants Along Mammoth Creek.....	7-88
Figure 8-1. Bodle Ditch, in the Vicinity of Mary Lake Road Multi-Use Path.....	8-5

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 2-1.	Proposed Additions to the District's Authorized Place of Use	2-4
Table 2-2.	Summary Comparison of Operational Differences Associated with the Alternatives Considered in the Mammoth Creek Draft EIR, Compared to the Existing Condition.....	2-14
Table 2-3.	Month-by-Month Selection of the Higher Fishery Bypass Flow Requirements Associated with Collaborative Alternative No. 2	2-17
Table 2-4.	Comparison of the Two Studies Used to Develop Recommended Minimum Fishery Bypass Flow Requirements for Mammoth Creek	2-20
Table 3-1.	Summary of Comparisons of Scenarios Evaluated in this Draft EIR	3-6
Table 4-1.	Key Hydrologic Monitoring Stations within the Project Area	4-2
Table 4-2.	Production Wells Located Within the District's Service Area	4-12
Table 4-3.	Annual District Groundwater Pumping in Acre-Feet Per Year	4-12
Table 5-1.	Lahontan RWQCB Water Quality Objectives for Mammoth Creek	5-7
Table 5-2.	Mammoth Creek Water Quality Conditions.....	5-8
Table 5-3.	Water Quality Monitoring Results for Mammoth Creek (2000-2005) Comparing the Number of Exceedances to Basin Plan Criteria.....	5-9
Table 5-4.	Lahontan RWQCB Water Quality Objectives for Hot Creek.....	5-11
Table 5-5.	BMI Sampling Sites in Mammoth Creek and Hot Creek from 2000 through 2006	5-12
Table 6-1.	Standardized Abundances of Owens Sucker and Tui Chub for the 17 Annual Electrofishing Surveys Conducted in Mammoth Creek Reach E	6-12
Table 6-2.	Standardized Abundance Estimates (Number/Mile) for "Wild" Rainbow Trout Captured at Each of the Mammoth Creek Electrofishing Sites, 1988-2008. Bold Numbers Indicate the Highest Value for Each Site.....	6-18
Table 6-3.	Standardized Abundance Estimates (number/mile) for Brown Trout Captured at Each of the Mammoth Creek Electrofishing Sites, 1988-2008. Bold Numbers Indicate the Highest Value for Each Site	6-20
Table 7-1.	Plant Communities Within the Project Area.....	7-3
Table 7-2.	Sensitive Wildlife Species	7-32
Table 7-3.	Sensitive Plant Species	7-48
Table 7-4.	PFC Standard Checklist	7-85
Table 7-5.	Average Riparian Zone Widths of Mammoth Creek at Equilibrium (in feet) ...	7-89
Table 8-1.	Comparison of the Proposed Project Alternative to the Applicable Recreational Resources Policies of the Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	8-23
Table 10-1.	Maximum Buildout of the Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan	10-14
Table 10-2.	Past, Present, and Projected Water Demand in Acre-Feet	10-15

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 10-3.	UWMP Current and Projected Water Supplies in Acre-Feet Per Year.....	10-16
Table 10-4.	Comparison of the Project Alternatives to the Growth Policies of the Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.....	10-19
Table 12-1.	Locations Where the Draft EIR is Available for Public Review	12-4
Table 13-1.	Lead Agency Representatives Who Participated in the Preparation of the Draft EIR.....	13-1
Table 13-2.	List of Persons that Assisted the Lead Agency in the Preparation of the Draft EIR.....	13-1