

# 1. INTRODUCTION

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed Simulation of Natural Flows in Middle Piru Creek Project (“proposed project” or “project”). In addition to evaluating the impacts associated with the proposed project, this Draft EIR evaluates feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives that would minimize or reduce project-related impacts. Piru Creek is located in northwestern Los Angeles County and eastern Ventura County, California. For the purposes of this document, middle Piru Creek is defined as that portion of Piru Creek that is located downstream of Pyramid Dam and upstream of Lake Piru; it is approximately 18 miles long and flows roughly north to south from Pyramid Dam to Lake Piru. Except for a few private inholdings, middle Piru Creek is surrounded by Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest and primarily is used for recreational purposes.

The proposed project involves the simulation of natural flows within middle Piru Creek by altering the existing water flows released from Pyramid Dam. The primary purpose of the proposed project is to revise the stream release schedule from Pyramid Dam to avoid the “incidental take” of the federally endangered arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*) due to water releases into middle Piru Creek. The proposed project would also allow delivery of up to 3,150 af of State Water Project water per year to United Water Conservation District via middle Piru Creek. A detailed description of the proposed project is provided in Section 2 of this Draft EIR.

This document is intended to serve as an informational document, as outlined in Section 15121(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, as follows:

*An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information which may be presented to the agency.*

Furthermore, this Draft EIR will provide the primary source of environmental information for the lead, responsible, and trustee agencies to consider when exercising any permitting authority or approval power directly related to implementation of the proposed project.

EIRs not only identify significant or potentially significant environmental effects, but also identify ways in which those impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels, whether through the imposition of mitigation measures or through the implementation of specific alternatives. In a practical sense, EIRs function as a technique for fact-finding that allows a project proponent, concerned citizens, and agency staff an opportunity collectively to review and evaluate baseline conditions and potential project impacts through a process of full disclosure.

As the Lead Agency under CEQA, the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) will decide whether or not to approve the proposed project. Implementation will also require amendment of the CDWR’s Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license. The CDWR will consider the information in the project’s Draft and Final EIRs along with other information before requesting a FERC license amendment. The conclusions of the project’s Draft and Final EIRs regarding

environmental impacts do not control the CDWR's discretion to approve, deny, or modify the proposed project; instead they are presented as information intended to aid the decision-making process.

## 1.2 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CEQA requires that an EIR be prepared when a Lead Agency determines that it can be fairly argued, based on substantial evidence, that a proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Sections 21080[d], 21082.2[d]). Based upon this requirement, and in consultation with appropriate State and federal agencies with jurisdiction over resources affected by the proposed project, the CDWR determined that an EIR for the proposed project should be prepared. In making this determination four environmental resource/issue areas were identified that may be significantly impacted by the proposed project, including: biological resources; cultural and paleontological resources; recreation; and water resources. These four issues were noted as being the key environmental concerns in the proposed project's Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated May 19, 2004 (see Appendix A for a copy of the NOP). Following issuance of the NOP, a public scoping meeting was held on June 17, 2004 at the City Council Chambers in the City of Santa Clarita, California to identify other resource- or issue-specific areas that may require detailed evaluation in this Draft EIR. No resource or issue areas other than those noted above were identified at the public scoping meeting. Thus, the focus of this Draft EIR is on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project on:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Recreation
- Water Resources

In addition to addressing potentially significant environmental effects, CEQA requires that an EIR contain a statement that briefly explains the reasons why certain environmental effects associated with a proposed project have been determined not to be significant, and thus not discussed in detail in the EIR (CEQA Section 21100[c]). In accordance with this CEQA requirement and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, it has been determined that the proposed project would have either no impacts or less than significant impacts on the following resource/issue-specific areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Ground Water, Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

The reasons why the impacts associated with these environmental resource/issue areas have been determined to be less than significant are addressed in Section 5 of this Draft EIR.

### 1.2.1 Lead Agency and Other Agency Reviews and Approvals

#### *CEQA Agency Reviews*

Under CEQA the Lead Agency is the California government agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed project and therefore has the principal responsibility for preparing all CEQA documents associated with that project. The CDWR is the Lead Agency under CEQA for the proposed project evaluated in this Draft EIR. The Final EIR must be approved and certified as to its adequacy in complying with the requirements of CEQA by the CDWR before taking any action on the project.

A Responsible Agency under CEQA is an agency other than the Lead Agency that has a legal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. A Responsible Agency must participate in the Lead Agency's CEQA process, review the Lead Agency's environmental review documents, and use the document when making a decision on the project. Under CEQA there are no State agencies acting as a Responsible Agency for the proposed project.

A Trustee Agency is an agency that has jurisdiction over certain resources held in trust for the people of the State, but does not have a legal authority for approving or carrying out a project. A Trustee Agency is generally required to be notified of CEQA documents relevant to its jurisdiction, whether or not it has actual permitting approval or approval power over aspects of the project. Under CEQA the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is the only State agency acting as a Trustee Agency for the proposed project.

The following agencies may have some interest in the proposed project:

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Angeles National Forest
- Los Padres National Forest
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- National Park Service
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- California Department of Forestry
- State Lands Commission
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- Native American Heritage Commission
- California Department of Transportation
- State Water Resources Control Board
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
- Los Angeles County
- Ventura County
- Ventura County Watershed Protection District
- United Water Conservation District
- Casitas Municipal Water District

The California Office of Planning and Research's State Clearinghouse is responsible for distribution of the NOP and this Draft EIR to other State agencies for review. A list of the additional entities notified of the environmental review process for the proposed project is included in Appendix A.

### ***Other Agency Reviews and Approvals***

In addition to the proposed project's CEQA review, the following federal and State approvals and permits were considered during preparation of this document:

- **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission License.** Through the Federal Power Act of 1935, as amended, and the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977, as amended, the FERC is authorized to issue licenses for non-federal hydroelectric project works, including dams, reservoirs, and other works to develop and use power. Under this authority the FERC is responsible for licensing the hydropower facilities of the California Aqueduct (Aqueduct), which constitutes a major portion of the California State Water Project. The Aqueduct is a multi-purpose project designed for the conveyance of water, generation of hydroelectric power, and recreation. Portions of the Aqueduct were licensed (approved) by the FERC on March 22, 1978 as FERC Project 2426. Articles 51 and 52 of the FERC license, as amended, address mitigation for the impacts of FERC Project 2426 on the trout fishery located between Pyramid Dam and Frenchman's Flat. Implementation of the proposed project would require an amendment of Articles 51 and 52 of the FERC license for Project 2426 to alter the flow requirements for the creek's trout fishery. The FERC license amendment is considered a federal discretionary action. The FERC will be the federal Lead Agency for the proposed project's compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The FERC has been kept informed by the CDWR throughout development of the proposed project and has also been notified of the proposed project's environmental review through the project's CEQA noticing process.

- **United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.** A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was executed in 1969 between the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS) and the CDWR for the construction and operation of the Aqueduct on Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest lands. The MOU applies to the project area and contains several provisions related to preserving, protecting, and enhancing resources, including recreation, fishing, and wildlife (Section VIII of the MOU). The Los Padres and Angeles National Forests have been involved in interagency discussions with the CDWR regarding the proposed project. As of the publication date of this Draft EIR, neither the Los Padres National Forest nor the Angeles National Forest has indicated that implementation of the proposed project would require amendment of the MOU.
- **United States Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation.** Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973, as amended, requires that any federal action that may affect a species listed or proposed as threatened or endangered under the FESA, or the proposed or designated critical habitat for such species, must consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). As referenced above, a FERC license amendment would be required for the proposed project. In reviewing the license amendment application, the FERC will be required to make a determination as to whether the proposed project would have an impact on the arroyo toad, or any other species or critical habitat designated under FESA. If the FERC determines that no effects to listed species or critical habitat would occur, there would be no requirement to consult the USFWS. However, if the FERC determines that the proposed project may have an impact on the arroyo toad, and that the change in water flows within middle Piru Creek constitutes a federal action, FERC would be required to consult with the USFWS under Section 7 of the FESA. The purpose of the proposed project is to avoid the take of arroyo toad, thereby avoiding the need for a formal Section 7 consultation. (It is noted that the thresholds for “take” and “adverse effect” are very different. The threshold for needing to enter into a formal consultation [“adverse effect”] could be reached well before “take” occurs.) The USFWS has participated directly in the development of the proposed project, both at interagency meetings and independently with the CDWR. As of the publication date of this Draft EIR, the USFWS has indicated that no adverse impacts to the arroyo toad would be anticipated to result from the proposed project and that several beneficial impacts to the species and its habitat could occur. Consequently, it is not anticipated that a formal Section 7 consultation with the USFWS would be required for the proposed project. The CDWR will continue to coordinate with the USFWS throughout the proposed project’s environmental review process regarding the applicability of a Section 7 consultation. If a Section 7 consultation is required, it is expected to be an informal consultation. An informal consultation would be appropriate if the FERC determined that the revised water release schedule may affect arroyo toad or another listed species, but is not likely to adversely affect these listed species. A project is not likely to adversely affect a listed species if all of its effects are either completely beneficial, insignificant, or discountable.
- **Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Certification.** Section 401 of the Clean Water Act grants each State the right to ensure that the State’s interests are protected on any federally permitted activity occurring in or adjacent to waters of the State. If a proposed project falls under the jurisdiction of a federal agency, or has the potential to impact waters of the State, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) verifies that project activities would comply with State water quality standards through a Water Quality Certification (WQC). The proposed project does require a federal action through its FERC license amendment process. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to alter the existing water quality or chemistry of middle Piru Creek and a WQC is not expected to be required. Through the project’s CEQA process the Los Angeles RWQCB has been notified of the proposed project and provided with the opportunity to comment on whether a WQC is considered necessary. Should the RWQCB in its comments find that a WQC is warranted, the CDWR will proceed with the needed application and coordination for its issuance.
- **California Department of Fish and Game Section 1602 Agreement.** Pursuant to Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, the CDFG regulates all diversions, obstructions, or changes to the natural flow or bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake. Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code states that an entity may not substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream, or lake without submitting a formal notification to the CDFG.

The proposed project does not constitute an obstruction or diversion of "natural flow," since the CDWR would operate Pyramid Dam so that outflow would equal middle Piru Creek inflow. Whether or not the proposed project would substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of the creek, however, is less clear. The USFWS has informed CDWR that the proposed simulation of winter natural flow might result in the scouring of middle Piru Creek by high volumes of water during winter storms, resulting in the reduction of vegetation encroachment, redistribution of sediments, and the creation of sandbars (USFWS, 2003). They conclude that the scouring action of heavy flow may be beneficial to the endangered arroyo toad, precisely because of changes it brings to the banks and bed of the creek. Riparian ecosystems are dynamic by nature. The scouring effects of winter storm flows are an integral part of local stream ecology and play a vital role in the maintenance of habitat for wildlife along the watercourse. The only "change" contemplated by CDWR in proposing the project is the restoration of those natural processes to the extent possible. It does not appear that restoring natural fluctuations in the vegetation line and sediment distribution essential to the formation of wildlife habitat was the sort of change contemplated by the Legislature when it drafted Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. Through the project's CEQA process, the CDFG has been notified of the proposed project and provided with the opportunity to comment on whether a Section 1602 agreement will be necessary.

### **1.2.2 Environmental Review Process**

This Draft EIR has been prepared to meet all of the substantive and procedural requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.). The CDWR is the Lead Agency for the proposed project, taking primary responsibility for conducting the CEQA environmental review and approving or denying the project.

After determining that an EIR should be prepared for the project, the CDWR filed a NOP with the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. The NOP was also distributed to involved public agencies and other interested parties for a 35-day public review period, which ended on June 25, 2004. The purpose of the NOP review period was to solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR. In addition, a public scoping meeting to solicit comments on the content of the Draft EIR was held on June 17, 2004. Relevant comments received from agencies and interested parties that either responded to the NOP and/or participated in the scoping meeting were considered in preparation of this Draft EIR, as appropriate. Appendix A of this Draft EIR contains information regarding the proposed project's CEQA documentation.

This Draft EIR has been filed with the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research and distributed to involved public agencies and interested parties. The document is also available for review at the locations indicated in Section 1.4 of this Draft EIR. During the review period, agencies and the public may submit written comments on the Draft EIR to the CDWR contact person indicated in Section 1.4. In addition, a public meeting regarding the Draft EIR will be held. Agencies and other interested parties will be given the opportunity to submit written comments and/or provide verbal comments on the Draft EIR at this meeting as well.

Following closure of Draft EIR public review period, written responses to comments received on the Draft EIR will be prepared and both the comments and the responses will be included in the Final EIR.

If CDWR decides to carry out the proposed project, it must address in writing each significant impact identified in the Final EIR. These findings must either state that alterations have been made to the project to avoid or substantially reduce each significant impact, or that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make mitigation of a significant impact infeasible. If CDWR decides to move forward with the proposed project even though significant unavoidable impacts would

occur, CDWR must prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains the specific reasons why the benefits of the proposed project make its unavoidable environmental effects acceptable. Such a statement would be prepared, if required, after the Final EIR has been certified but before action to approve the project has been taken.

When a Lead Agency makes the findings described above in conjunction with approving a project, mitigation monitoring must be adopted to ensure that the measures needed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts are implemented.

### 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into ten sections, each dealing with a separate aspect of the required content as described in the CEQA Guidelines. To help the reader locate information of particular interest, a brief summary of the contents of each section of this document is provided. The following sections are contained in this Draft EIR:

- **Executive Summary:** This section contains an overview of the scope of the Draft EIR, as well as a summary of environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, level of significance after mitigation, and unavoidable significant impacts. Also in this section is a summary of project alternatives, areas of known controversy, and project-related issues to be resolved.
- **Section 1. Introduction:** This section provides an overview of the purpose and use of the proposed project's Draft EIR, the scope of the Draft EIR, the environmental review process for the Draft EIR, the general format of the document, availability of the Draft EIR, and points of contact for submitting written comments on the Draft EIR. A glossary of terms and acronyms used in the Draft EIR is also provided in this section.
- **Section 2. Project Description:** This section outlines the project history and objectives and describes the project location.
- **Section 3. Environmental Analysis:** This section describes and evaluates the environmental issues addressed in detail in this Draft EIR, including the existing environmental setting and background, applicable environmental thresholds, environmental impacts (both short-term and long-term), policy considerations related to the particular environmental issue area under analysis, and proposed mitigation measures for minimizing adverse environmental impacts.
- **Section 4. Alternatives Analysis:** This section analyzes feasible alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative and four operational alternatives.
- **Section 5. Issues Upon Which Impacts Would Be Less Than Significant or None:** This section summarizes those environmental resources and issues upon which the proposed project would have less than significant impacts or no impacts.
- **Section 6. Environmentally Preferred Alternative:** This section provides a discussion of the environmentally superior, or preferred, alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).
- **Section 7. Other CEQA Considerations:** This section provides a discussion of the proposed project's growth-inducing impacts, cumulative impacts, irreversible environmental changes, and unavoidable significant impacts.
- **Section 8. Environmental Impact Report Preparers, Contributors, and Reviewers:** This section identifies all individuals responsible for the preparation and review of this document.
- **Section 9. List of Agencies, Organizations and Persons Contacted:** This section provides a listing of all agencies, organizations and persons contacted during the preparation of this Draft EIR.
- **Section 10. References:** This section identifies all references used and cited in the preparation of this report.

The distribution list used for the project's CEQA related noticing is included in Appendix A. Appendix B contains Native American communications conducted prior to and during preparation of this document. Appendix C contains summary reports of monthly creel surveys conducted at middle Piru Creek between October 2003 and September 2004.

#### 1.4 AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR REVIEW

This Draft EIR has been distributed to affected agencies, surrounding cities, counties, and interested parties for a 60-day review period. The duration of the review period exceeds the requirements of Section 15087 of the CEQA Guidelines and is intended to meet the requirements of 18 CFR 4.38(a)(7), which requires that resource agencies and Indian tribes be given at least 60 days to comment on a proposed request for amendment of a FERC license. During the 60-day public review period, the Draft EIR is available for public review at the following locations:

Newhall Public Library  
23743 West Valencia Blvd.  
Valencia, CA 91355  
(661) 259-0750

Blachard/Santa Paula Public Library  
119 North 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Santa Paula, CA 93060  
(805) 525-3625

Valencia Public Library  
23743 West Valencia Blvd.  
Valencia, CA 91355  
(661) 259-8942

Camarillo Public Library  
3100 Ponderosa Drive  
Camarillo CA 93010  
(805) 482-1952

Canyon Country JoAnne Darcy Public Library  
18601 Soledad Canyon Road  
Canyon Country, CA 91351  
(661) 251-2720

Vista del Lago Visitors Center (at Pyramid Lake)  
35800 Vista del Lago  
Gorman, CA 93243  
(661) 294-0219

Interested parties may provide written comments on the Draft EIR prior to the close of the public review period. Comments should be submitted in writing and addressed to:

Dr. Eva Begley  
California Department of Water Resources  
Division of Engineering  
1416 Ninth Street, Room 620  
Sacramento, California 95814  
Phone: (916) 653-5951  
Fax: (916) 653-8250

Information concerning the public review schedule for the Draft EIR can be obtained by contacting Dr. Begley at the address and phone number indicated above.

#### 1.5 GLOSSARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT TERMINOLOGY AND ACRONYMS

Table 1-1 provides a glossary of the terms and acronyms used in this Draft EIR.

Table 1-1 EIR Terminology and Acronyms

<b>A, B</b>	
af	Acre-foot (or feet), the amount of water needed to cover one acre to a depth of one foot, equal to 43,560 cubic feet or 325,851 gallons.
afy	Acre feet per year
Aqueduct	A conductor, conduit, or artificial channel for conveying water, especially one for supplying large cities with water.
<b>C</b>	
Candidate Species	Any fish, wildlife, or plant species or subspecies that has been formally noticed as being under review for consideration as "endangered" or "threatened" under the Federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act.
Catchable Trout	A size category of hatchery-produced trout. Although the California Department of Fish and Game "Operations Manual" defines "catchable" trout as six-per-pound or larger, currently policy dictates catchable trout weigh one-half pound each on average. Catchable trout are used in put-and-take managed fisheries and are expected to be harvested by anglers soon after planting (stocking).
Catch-And-Release	A fishing technique where anglers are encouraged, through a zero to two-per-bag limit, to immediately release all captured fish back into the water.
CDF	California Department of Forestry
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDWR	California Department of Water Resources
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second. One cubic foot per second equals a steady flow of 440 gallons per minute, or approximately 725 acre feet per year.
CHL	California Historical Landmark
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
Conserve	To use all methods and procedures which are necessary bring any endangered or threatened species to the point at which the measures specified by either the Federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act are no longer necessary to protect the species.
CSSC	California Species of Special Concern
CSUF-SCCIC	California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center
CWA	Clean Water Act
<b>D</b>	
Discharge	The rate of flow at a given instant in terms of volume per unit of time.
DOC	(California) Department of Conservation
<b>E</b>	
EDR	Environmental Data Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
Endangered Species	(1) Federal definition: any species or subspecies which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. (2) State definition: a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes.
<b>F</b>	
Farmland of Statewide Importance	Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical properties for the production of crops but has a few minor shortcomings (e.g., steep slopes, inability to hold water).
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FSOC	Federal Species of Concern
<b>G, H</b>	
Hatchery Trout	Any trout hatched and reared in a fish hatchery.
HRI	(California Register of) Historic Resources Inventory
HTRW	Hazardous, toxic, and/or radioactive waste

I	
I-5	Interstate 5
Incidental Take	The take of a federally listed fish or wildlife species that result from, but is not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity.
Listed Species	Any fish, wildlife or plant species or subspecies that has been determined to be "endangered" or "threatened" under the Federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act.
J - M	
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPM	Meyer-Peter, Muller bed load equation (for sediment transport analysis)
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
N	
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen oxides
O	
Overbank Area	The area covered or inundated by water rising above the bank of a stream or river.
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
P	
PHI	(California) Points of Historic Interest
PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulate matter of 10 microns or less
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less
Prime Farmland	Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical properties for the production of crops.
R	
ROG	Reactive Organic Compounds
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
S	
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
Section 7	The section of the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, outlining the procedures for interagency cooperation to conserve federally listed species and designated critical habitat.
Section 7 Consultation	The various Section 7 procedures and processes, including both consultation and conference, for actions involving species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur dioxide
T	
Table A Water (or Amount)	The maximum annual amount of State Water Project water specified in Table A of a State Water Project contract with a local water supply district or agency.
Take	To harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect or otherwise engage in any such conduct affecting wildlife or plant species listed as "threatened" or "endangered."
Threatened Species	(1) Federal definition: any species or subspecies that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range. (2) State definition: a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of special protection and management efforts.
U	
Unique Farmland	Land of lesser quality soils but recently used for the production of specific high economic value crops.
United	United Water Conservation District
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFS	United States Forest Service
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
V	
VCAPCD	Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

W - Z	
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
Wild Trout	Any trout (native or non-native) that is the offspring of parents that spawned naturally and that has spent its entire life in a natural stream or lake environment. Wild trout may include the offspring of hatchery trout that reproduced in a natural environment.
Wild Trout Waters	Waters (streams, lakes, etc.) designated by the California Fish and Game Commission to be managed exclusively for wild trout. Wild Trout Waters are to provide a quality experience for anglers to fish in aesthetically pleasing and environmentally productive waters with trout populations whose numbers or sizes are largely unaffected by the angling process. Hatchery-produced strains of wild or semi-wild trout may be used to supplement populations, but no stocking of domesticated strains of catchable-sized trout is allowed in Wild Trout Waters. Middle Piru Creek is not a California Fish and Game Commission designated Wild Trout Water.
Williamson Act Contract	The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments that are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the State via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971.
WQC	Water Quality Certification