

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
BIG PINE DITCH SYSTEM AND KLONDIKE LAKE MODIFICATIONS**

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for the Big Pine Ditch System – Implementation, Water Supply, and Associated Modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project was circulated for public comment from June 6 to July 9, 2003.

Ten letters were received from the following:

Letter 1a	State Clearinghouse receipt confirmation dated July 9, 2003
Letter 1b	State Clearinghouse transmittal of comment letter dated July 15, 2003
Letter 2	Panapidi Indian Trust Property Board of Trustees
Letter 3	Inyo County – Department of Public Works
Letter 4	Caltrans dated July 7, 2003
Letter 5	Owens Valley Committee dated July 9, 2003
Letter 6	Big Pine Community Service District dated July 2, 2003
Letter 7	State of California – Department of Fish and Game dated July 9, 2003
Letter 8	Dagne L. Florine dated June 26, 2003
Letter 9	Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley

The ten letters were scanned into an electronic format. Each of the scanned letters, including responses to the comments contained in the letters, are included in the following pages. (When a comment appears in a letter, a response to the comment has been inserted into the body of the letter immediately below the comment.)

LETTER 1a
State Clearinghouse



Gray Davis
Governor



Tal Finney
Interim Director

July 9, 2003

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse

Clarence E. Martin
Los Angeles County Dept of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514

Subject: Big Pine Ditch Water Supply SCH#: 2002071150

Dear Clarence E. Martin:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on July 8, 2003, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "Terry Roberts".

Roberts

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "Roberts".

Document Details Report

State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2002071150

Project Title Big Pine Ditch Water Supply

Lead Agency Los Angeles County Department of Water and Power

Type Negative Declaration

Description

The proposed amendment of the Water Agreement, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) will make water available for the ditch system via diversions from Big Pine Creek, from a new well in Bell Canyon, and from diversions from the Bell Can on Ditch. Surface water flow in Big Pine Creek will be augmented with groundwater pumped from Well 415, and the surface water flow in the Bell Canyon Ditch will be augmented with groundwater pumped from a new well to be constructed by the LADWP west of Big Pine in Bell Canyon ("the Bell Canyon Well"). The flow in Bell Canyon will be augmented immediately above tile ditch system's Bell Canyon headgates.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Clarence E. Martin

Agency Los Angeles County Dept of Water and Power

Phone 760 873-0342 Fax

email

Address 300 Mandich Street

City Bishop State CA Zip 93514

Project Location

County Inyo

City

Region

Cross Streets U.S. Highway 395 & Glacier Lodge Road

Parcel No. 18-040-07

Township 9S Range 33E Section 24 Base MDM

Proximity to:

Highways 395

Airports

Railways

Waterways Big Pine Creek, Bell Canyon Ditch, Mendenhall Ditch

Schools Big Pine School

Land Use Rural 1 Open Space

Project Issues Air Quality; Agricultural Land; Vegetation; Water Supply

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 6 (Inyo & Mono Region); Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, District 9; Department of Health Services; State Water Resources Control Board, Clean Water Program; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received 06/09/2003

Start of Review 06/09/2003

End of Review 07/08/2003

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

LETTER 1b
State Clearinghouse



Gray Davis
GOVERNOR
July 15, 2003



Tal Finney
INTERIM DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse

Clarence E. Martin
Los Angeles County Dept of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514

Subject: Big Pine Ditch Water Supply SCH#: 2002071150

Dear Clarence E. Martin:

The enclosed comment (s) on your Negative Declaration was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on July 8, 2003. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2002071150) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Terry Roberts".

Terry Roberts
Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044 916-445-0613 FAX 916-323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Letter 1b – Comment

The letter transmitted to the State Clearinghouse was from the Department of Fish and Game and is included in this document as Letter 7.

LETTER 2

Panapidi Indian Trust Property Board of Trustees

Mr. Gene L. Coufal, Manager
Aqueduct Business Group
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop CA 93514

Comment:

RE: CEQA Documents – Big Pine Ditch System

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for the Big Pine Ditch System.

P.4, ~ 4.

Construction of a New Pipeline from the Bell Canyon Well to the Ditch System Headgates.

WHEREAS; A portion of the Old Glacier Lodge Road crosses the west boundary of the Panapidi Indian Trust Property ("Trust Property") at a point approximately 150 feet from the north boundary of said tract of land, and proceeds ENE to a point approximately 425 feet west of the NE corner of the aforesaid Trust: Property where it exits onto L.A.D.W.P. owned land;

THEREFORE; The Board of Trustees of the Trust Property wishes to enter into a Utility Easement Agreement with the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power for the purposes of 1) defining the actual easement and 2) to safeguard the interests and personal property of the residents and property owners of the aforesaid Trust Property in the event of a failure of the proposed underground pipeline within the aforementioned easement.

WHEREAS; The proposed construction of a New Pipeline from the Bell Canyon Well will require installing the aforesaid New Pipeline underground, the installation will require excavating a trench of unspecified width and depth through Trust Property access roads at two points; and

WHEREAS; The aforesaid construction will affect use of the Trust Property access roads for an unspecified period of time;

THEREFORE; Representatives of the Board of Trustees of the Trust Property are requesting a meeting with appropriate staff members of

L.A. D.W. P. to discuss the proposed construction and concerns of the Board of Trustees, Panapidi Indian Trust Property.

Sincerely,

Richard Stewart, Trustee
Panapidi Indian Trust Property 130ard of Trustees P.O. Box 790
Big Pine CA 93513-0790

Cc: David Rambeau, James Westerveldt
Attachments (2)

Letter 2 – Response to Comment 1

LADWP will investigate if construction of the new pipeline and overhead power lines may be within Panapidi Indian property. If the proposed pipeline is within private property, LADWP will request the property owner to grant LADWP an easement for the facilities. The easement agreement would have conditions for future access for operation and maintenance. Any roadway excavated during the pipe installation process will be restored by LADWP and LADWP will minimize interruption to the community during the installation process. Once the property ownership has been resolved, LADWP will contact the Panapidi Indian representatives to discuss the pipeline and power line installations.

LETTER 3
Inyo County – Department of Public Works

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
P.O.DRAWER Q
INDEPENDENCE, CALIFORNIA 93526
(760) 878-0201
(760) 878-2001 FAX

JEFFREY S. JEWETT -Director
MIKE CONKLIN -Deputy Director/Buildings

Mr. Clarence Martin
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514-3449

Subject: Big Pine Ditch System -Implementation, Water Supply, and Associated Modification of Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project.

Dear Mr. Martin:

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact (MNDEI) for the above noted project. Pursuant to adoption of the MNDEI, we offer the following comments:

- 1) "Section 15126. Consideration and Discussion of Environmental Impacts." California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, states "All phases of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment: planning, acquisition, development, and operation." Although the document provides a detailed discussion addressing development of the sources and infrastructure necessary to serve the project, there is no evaluation of impacts resulting from installing the distribution system throughout the community.

Letter 3 – Response to Comment 1

The Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association will obtain all required permits from Inyo County for installation or construction within the public right of way. Most of the piping will be installed within residentially developed areas on private property with the permission of the owners or on areas that have been disturbed with pavement or graded roadway shoulders. Because the majority of these areas have been disturbed with pavement, grading or landscaping, no environmental impact is expected due to the installation of the distribution system throughout the community.

- 2) On the page titled "ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM," item "10." There is a general reference to Inyo County as an agency with approval authority, however, no specific reference is made with respect to permitting authority. Given the project involves some 35 County road crossings and 3 crossings of US 395, both the Inyo County Public Works Department and Caltrans will require encroachment permits to enable the project to proceed.

Letter 3 – Response to Comment 2

As stated above in Comment 1, the Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association will obtain all required permits from Inyo County and Caltrans for installation or construction within the public right of way.

- 3) Any work conducted within County rights-of-way will have to be performed by licensed and bonded Contractors to ensure the public's investment in road improvements.

Letter 3 – Response to Comment 3

Comment noted.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the project. If you need further clarification or assistance with our comments, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey S. Jewett
Public Works Director

CC: Rene Mendez, Chief Administrative: Officer, Inyo County

LETTER 4

Caltrans

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

District 9
500 South Main Street
Bishop, CA 93514
FAX (760) 872-0754
TTY (760) 872-9043

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

July 7, 2003

Mr. Clarence Martin
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514-3449

File .09-INYO
ND
SC #:2002071150

RE: Big Pine Ditch System Negative Declaration (ND) (June 2003)

Dear Mr. Marlin:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the ND for the Big Pine Ditch System.

We have the following comments concerning the proposed project:

- Irrigation pipes at the three U.S. Highway 395 crossing locations, depicted on Figure 2 of the document, are to be replaced by the Big Pine Rehabilitation Project scheduled for the spring of 2004. Caltrans will request that no irrigation water be flowing through this area during construction. We will be in contact with your office as the time approaches.

Letter 4 – Response to Comment 1

The schedule for the initial startup and for the subsequent operation of the ditch system will be coordinated with Caltrans' highway crossing replacement by the Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association.

- The Big Pine Water Association and the ditches existed before the roadway was adopted into the state highway system; hence Caltrans has perpetuated pipe crossings. With the potential formation of new association, the issuance of a new utility encroachment permit and maintenance agreement with the Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association and/or DWP will be needed.

Letter 4 – Response to Comment 2

The Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association will obtain all required permits for installation or construction within the Caltrans right of way. Any necessary maintenance agreement for the portion of the ditch system within the highway right of way will be obtained by the Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association.

Please continue to forward relevant information for our review and records.
Please contact me at (760) 872-0785, if you have any questions. We value our cooperative relationship in matter concerning the Eastern Sierra.

Sincerely,

GAYLE J. ROSANDER
IGR/CEQA Coordinator

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
Terry Gess
Truman Denio

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

LETTER 5
Owens Valley Committee



(760) 876-5807 .Drawer D .Lone Pine, CA 93545

July 9,2003

Mr. Clarence Martin
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514

By Facsimile Copy to (760) 873-0266

Dear Mr. Martin:

The following comments and questions concern the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact: Big Pine Ditch System --Implementation, Water Supply and Associated Modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project.

The statement, "The Department shall make a flow of up to six (6) cfs available to supply the ditch system with water." is in the Long-Term Water Agreement. "A supply of up to 6 cfs" appears several times thereafter in the document. The environmental impact(s) probably vary with the amount of water actually entering and leaving the ditch system but there is no analysis of the expected water usage in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact. Why not?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 1

As stated in Attachment 1, paragraph 3a, “Water annually used by the ditch system is defined as the difference between the measured amount of water that is supplied to the ditch system at the Mendenhall Ditch diversion structure (from Big Pine Creek), the Bell Canyon headgates (from the Bell Canyon well), and at the system’s Bell Canyon diversion box (from the Bell Canyon Ditch), and the measured amount of water that flows out of the ditch system.”

The ditch system will be supplied with a maximum of 6 cfs as required by the Water Agreement; however, the actual amount supplied is dependent on the amount of water that is available from Well 415, the amount of available water from the proposed Bell Canyon well, and the amount of the annual E/M Credit (normally 300 acre-feet).

Water usage within the distribution system in the community is dependent on the actual amount of water supplied and the amount of water consumed within the ditch system. Consumption within the ditch system is dependent on how the residents use the water available from the ditch system and on

percolation and evaporation rates. Because of the uncertainty and variability of the exact amount of the supply and usage, the actual usage is not quantified. However, because the potential for environmental impacts arises from supplying water to the ditch system, not from the amount of usage within the ditch system, the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration fully analyzes the potential impacts of supplying water supply to the ditch system.

Full operation of the Big Pine ditch system would seem to change some environmental factors, certainly along the ditch system, but this was not addressed in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environment Impact. Why not?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 2

As stated on page 33 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, regardless of the amount of water supplied to the ditch system, it is not expected that there will be any adverse environmental impacts resulting from the conveyance of water to the ditch system headgate. Below the headgates, the ditch system will be designed to accommodate the flow, so supplying up to 6 cfs to the system's headgates is not expected to not cause any adverse environmental impacts along the distribution system in the community.

Further, it is anticipated that usage of water from the ditch system by the community may replace some of the currently existing source of water used for irrigation. Therefore, the amount of exterior usage of water within the community is not expected to significantly change as a result of the project. Consequently, whether the ditch system is operated at full capacity or less, it is not expected that there will be significant adverse environmental impact along the ditch system because any water that is not available from the ditch system will be replaced by a resumption of use the water supply used before the implementation of the project.

What is the rationale behind expanding the source of water to supply the ditch system identified in the Project Description (to include Well 415)? In the Initial Study/CEQA checklist one of the few items "With Mitigation Incorporated" concerns depletion of groundwater supplies (p 14 Hydrology and Water Quality (b)). Expanding the source of water beyond one supply well might increase the possibility of environmental consequence and the need for mitigation.

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 3

It is not expected that water production from the Bell Canyon well will be able to fully supply the ditch system; further, the actual production of the new Bell Canyon well will not be known until the well is constructed and tested. Therefore to augment the supply to the ditch system, additional water supplied by Well 415 and from the Klondike Lake transfer was included in the project. Please note that the potential adverse environmental impacts from supplying water from these additional sources is analyzed in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Statements on page 22 under "Potential Impacts of Groundwater Pumping Under the Proposed Project" indicate no expected significant impacts from operation of Well 415 or the new Bell Canyon Well. Yet, the last two statements indicate their operation in combination with other wells could cause significant adverse impacts. No analysis was given, and the mitigation given on pages 22-32 relies on very general procedures to be followed by the Technical Group and the Green Book. Why didn't the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact identify

more specifically what areas (spatially) and what types of impacts might occur? This is especially important with respect to fulfilling the obligation to supply water to the ditch system and to water replacement using water from the Klondike Lake mitigation project.

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 4

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration concludes that the combined operation of the proposed Bell Canyon well and Well 415 will not cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation. However, the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration states that the operation of those wells, in combination with the operation of other wells in the Big Pine area, may cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, or other vegetation.

As stated in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the risk of impacting groundwater dependent vegetation arises from pumping the proposed Bell Canyon well and Well 415 in combination with other wells in the Big Pine area. The total amount of future groundwater pumping and the amount of groundwater recharge that will occur in the Big Pine area is dependent on factors whose parameters are unknowable in advance, such as precipitation, runoff, and LADWP's groundwater and surface water operations. LADWP operations are subject to Water Agreement provisions, including its monitoring provisions. As was noted in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, it appears that the pumping from these two wells alone would not cause adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation.

Although LADWP's operations are subject to the Water Agreement provisions, it would be purely speculative to predict cumulative impacts from the amount of recharge or the amount of pumping. The monitoring provisions of the Water Agreement establish mechanisms which can identify impacts before they occur; however, if significant impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation attributable to pumping or to surface water management practices should occur, the appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented as required by the Water Agreement.

It is impossible to know or to describe specific mitigation measures that would be implemented if groundwater pumping under the proposed project in combination with other groundwater pumping causes significant impacts. The location of such impacts, the size of such impacts, and the specific vegetation that would be affected are unknown. Under these circumstances, the monitoring and mitigation provisions of the Water Agreement provide for mitigation of any significant impacts, cumulative or otherwise, that might occur.

The Water Agreement establishes procedures for managing groundwater pumping in order to limit impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, for monitoring both pumping and surface water management practices in order to identify impacts to vegetation, and for implementing mitigation measures, if necessary. LADWP is committed to conducting its operations in conformance with the Water Agreement. If it is determined that mitigation is required, LADWP will implement mitigation as required under the Water Agreement.

In attachment 1 "Draft Modification of Water Agreement Big Pine Ditch System" under E 2.e, what are possible environmental consequences if water normally diverted for use on Los Angeles owned agricultural lands goes to the ditch system? What is the rationale for cutting off water to Los Angeles owned agricultural lands to supply the ditch system? The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact should disclose the environmental effect of such a diversion of water from irrigated lands. Since irrigated (Type E) lands are mitigation under the 1991 EIR, a reduction in the water supply to these lands constitutes a modification of a mitigation measure, requiring a similar disclosure and approval process as is required for the Klondike Lake mitigation measure (see comment concerning Klondike Lake below).

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 5

Please note that on page 34 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration it is stated that “If diversions to the Cement Ditch are reduced so that the supply to agriculture on Los Angeles-owned lands is reduced, the lessee of such lands will replace the diverted water by pumping water from the Big Pine Canal.” Therefore, there will be no change in the amount of supply to irrigated lands as a result of the proposed project.” (Underlining added for emphasis.)

In Attachment 1 under Replacement Water 3.h, shouldn't the wording be more consistent with that in (g)?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 6

Paragraph 3g addresses the situation where a negative differential is created in one ditch operating season (because of shortfall in replacement water) and where the negative differential has not been made up by “the commencement of the following (or second) ditch operation season”). Paragraph 3h addresses the situation where a negative differential has not been made up during the second operating season, and it provides for a reduction in the E/M credit during the third ditch operating season to make up the negative differential. The difference in the wording of the two paragraphs was intentional.

In Attachment 1 under Replacement Water in sections (e), (g), and implied in (h), LADWP can discontinue supply under certain circumstances. The main document does not address the environmental consequence or mitigation of discontinuing supply to the ditch system. Why not?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 7

In the event that the ditch system supply has to be temporarily discontinued as a result of the circumstances described in Attachment 1, Paragraph 3, it is expected that the users of the ditch system would resume using water from the sources that the users utilized prior to the ditch system. Therefore, no adverse impacts are expected if the supply to the ditch system is temporarily discontinued.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration and Attachment 2 present the modification to the Klondike Lake project as modification of an enhancement/mitigation measure, subject only to agreement by Inyo County and LADWP. However, the Klondike Lake project is also a mitigation measure adopted by the LADWP Board of Commissioners by Resolution 92-099. The Mitigated Negative Declaration fails to disclose this information and fails to address the impact of the proposed reduction in water supply to the continued effectiveness of the mitigation measure. In a report submitted to the Inyo County Board of Supervisors on December 3, 2002, the directors of the Water Department and the Planning Department wrote:

In regard to [enhancement/mitigation projects identified as mitigation measures], Section 7.2 of the 1991 EIR (as modified by the Final EIR -see page 3-19 of the Final EIR) states that:

[N]o enhancement/mitigation project which is an identified mitigation measure for the impacts of the project will be modified or discontinued except in full compliance with CEQA and unless the Standing Committee finds that either:

1. The enhancement/mitigation project, as modified, will continue to reduce the identified adverse effect of the project to a level which is less than significant;
2. A new mitigation measure will be implemented which will reduce the identified adverse effect of the project to a level which is less than significant.

In addition, the department heads concluded that the Standing Committee could only make the above findings on condition that the LADWP Board adopted a mitigated negative declaration or EIR that included (1) justification for the proposed change to the mitigation measure, (2) alternatives to the proposed change or reasons why such alternatives are not feasible, (3) analysis showing that the change will not have a new or adverse effect on the environment, and if it will, that the adverse effect

will be mitigated to less than significant, and (4) with the modification of the mitigation measure and the implementation of new mitigation, mitigation will be provided at a level at least equal to the level of mitigation provided by the original mitigation measure.

LADWP and the County should adhere to this process before modifying the Klondike Lake mitigation measure. Since the modification of the Klondike Lake project is an element of the project under review in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact, why was the above information and CEQA compliance not included in the document?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 8

Please note that the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration expressly recognizes that Klondike Lake is a mitigation measure. (See page 5, bullet 7 under the heading “Approvals and Actions Required to Implement the Project.”) The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration recognizes that the Los Angeles Board of Water and Power Commissioners must make a finding that the project will continue to provide mitigation equal to the mitigation that would be provided if the project were not modified. Therefore, the process referenced in the comment will be followed.

Attachment 2, Memorandum on Modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement! Mitigation Project, states that the "total amount of water supplied to the project over time is estimated to average approximately 1,700 acre-feet/year." Does this amount include the 200 acre-feet per year to be supplied to the waterfowl area to the south of the lake? If so, and since up to 300 acre-feet per year will be applied toward the Big Pine Ditch project, where will the remaining 200 acre-feet per year "freed" by the reduction in the Klondike project be applied?

Letter 5 – Response to Comment 9

The up to 200 acre feet of water for the water fowl habitat is included in the 1700 acre feet annual proposed allotment for Klondike Lake.

As stated on page 35 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, “When the E/M project was approved in the mid-1980s it was estimated that the project would use approximately 2,200 acre-feet of water per year. Water is supplied to the E/M project from the Big Pine Canal via the Lyman Ditch. In late 1994 and early 1995, LADWP re-channelized and cleaned portions of the Lyman Ditch to reduce obstructions and conveyance losses. Diversion structures were installed along the ditch to maintain water releases to areas of native pasture and wetland habitats adjacent to the ditch. Based on a comparison of water uses before and after the re-channelization work, it is estimated that the conveyance losses were reduced by over 200 acre-feet per year.” Therefore, the 200 acre feet per year was conserved as a result of the re-channelization effort and is used by LADWP as deemed appropriate.

In Attachment 2 Memorandum on "Modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project: on page 3, the 3-fold goal is to maintain native pasture and wetland, maintain the lake level, and supply the native habitat area to the south of the lake. Why then should the conveyance losses from supply to native habitat area during a period of the year when water is not conveyed to the lake be deducted from the up to 200 acre-feet per year allotted to maintain the native habitat? It seems the 200 acre-feet of the 500 acre-feet "freed" by channel improvements (and knowing what amount of water the lake requires) should go to the habitat EIM if needed, with the 300 acre-feet per year maintained for the Big Pine ditch "credit".

Letter 5 – Comment 10

This comment expresses a suggestion to the decision making entities. The appropriateness of not crediting the 200 acre feet per year conserved as part of the re-channelization work will be considered by the decision making entities (through the Standing Committee) as part of their consideration of the proposed modification of the Klondike Lake E/M project

Thanks for considering these comments and questions.

Sincerely Yours,

Nancy B. Masters
President, Owens Valley Committee

LETTER 6

Big Pine Community Service District

July 2, 2003

Mr. Gene L. Coufal
Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop, CA 93514

Subject: Big Pine Ditch System -CEQA Comments

Dear Mr. Coufal

After reviewing the CEQA documents relating to the Big Pine Ditch System, the Big Pine Community Service District (BPCSD) Board of Directors has concerns regarding BPCSD facilities. The BPCSD is legally charged to protect the public health and safety by Title 17 of the California Administrative Code that states "The water purveyor has primary responsibility to prevent water from unapproved sources, or any other substance, entering the public water supply system." The Board also has the fiscal responsibility to keep costs at a minimum. Therefore, in an effort to prevent any contamination due to disturbances or damage to our facilities, we would like to have the following items addressed by the appropriate persons and/or agencies.

1. Encroachment permit application(s) shall specify the size, location, elevation of the inlet and outlet, and proposed profile in relation to the crown of the street of all culvert crossings. The BPCSD would like to be consulted prior to issuance of the permit to verify the depth and location of our facilities.

Letter 6 – Response to Comment 1

The Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association will obtain all necessary encroachment permits from Inyo County and/or Caltrans. The Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Association will consult with the Big Pine Community Service District prior to the approval of the encroachment permits.

2. All new facilities to be constructed shall maintain a minimum clearance of twelve (12) inches from BPCSD facilities including, but not limited to, meters, laterals and mains.
3. The placement of culvert joints will not be allowed within five (5) feet either side of the centerline of the water or sewer mains.
4. Any person pumping out of any ditch shall be required to

install a backflow device per Title 17, Chapter V, Section #7583-7622, inclusive, of the California Administrative Code.

5. A bonded or insured licensed contractor will perform all construction work in public right-of-ways.

POST OFFICE BOX 639
BIG PINE, CALIFORNIA 93513

Mr. Gene Coufal
July 2, 2003
Page 2

6. If the BPCSD is requested to relocate any facilities, the BPCSD will estimate the cost of relocation and require a deposit of that amount prior to commencing the work.
7. If any BPCSD facilities are damaged due to construction, operation or maintenance of the ditch system, the BPIIA will reimburse the District in full for any necessary repairs within 30 days.

Letter 6 – Response to Comment 2

Comments 2 through 7 address requirements of the Big Pine Community Service District. Since the comments do not address potential adverse environmental impacts of the project, the comments are noted.

If you have any questions regarding our concerns, please contact Denis Tillemans at 938-2660 or myself at 938-2850.

Sincerely,

Kevin Tillemans
President, Bd. Of Directors

KPT/bmg

c: Mr. Bob Steele, Big Pine Irrigation and Improvement Assoc
Mr. Jeff Jewett, Inyo County Public Works
Mr. Butch Hambleton, Inyo County Supervisor
Mr. Rene Mendez, Inyo County Administrator
Mr. Greg James, Inyo County Water Department

LETTER 7

Department of Fish and Game

STATE OF CALIFORNIA -THE RESOURCES AGENCY GRAY DAVIS, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Eastern Sierra-Inland Deserts Region

Bishop Field Office

407 W. Line Street

Bishop, CA 93514

(760) 872-1171

July 9, 2003

Mr. Gene Coufal

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

300 Mandich Street

Bishop, CA 93514

Subject: Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Big Pine Ditch System

Dear Mr. Coufal:

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the Initial Study (IS) and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Big Pine Ditch System project. The project includes the construction of a new well and increased pumping from an existing well to supply the Improved Big Pine Ditch System, an amendment to the Water Agreement between Inyo County and LADWP, a decrease in the water allotment to the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project, and the construction of several water conveyance systems to supply the ditch system.

The Department is providing comments on this IS/MND as the State agency which has the statutory and common law responsibilities with regard to fish and wildlife resources and habitats. California's fish and wildlife resources, including their habitats, are held in trust for the people of the State by the Department (Fish & Game Code section 711. 7) The Department has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and the habitats necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Fish & Game Code section 1802). The Department's fish and wildlife management functions are implemented through its administration and enforcement of the Fish and Game Code (Fish & Game Code Section 702). The Department is a trustee agency for fish and wildlife under the California Environmental Quality Act (see CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs. Sec. 15386(a)) and a Responsible Agency regarding any discretionary actions (CEQA Guidelines §15381) required by the Department. The Department is providing these comments in furtherance of these statutory responsibilities, as well as its common law role as trustee for the public's fish and wildlife.

The Department finds the IS/MND inadequate. The IS identifies potential adverse impacts and potentially significant cumulative impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, other vegetation, non-LADWP wells in the area, and wildlife habitat associated with the operation of Well 415 and the new Bell Canyon Well. For any analysis of and mitigation for these potential impacts, the document refers to the Water Agreement and associated Green Book. However, these supporting documents do not actually contain any analysis of project specific potential impacts. They only contain guidelines on how an evaluation of impacts should be completed. Therefore, no analysis of potential impacts has been completed as required by CEQA. The Initial Study should be revised to include a project specific analysis of potential impacts due to

LADWP

groundwater extraction.

Letter 7 – Response to Comment 1

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration concludes that the combined operation of the proposed Bell canyon well and well 415 will not cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation. However, the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration states that the operation of those wells, in combination with the operation of other wells in the Big Pine area, may cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, or other vegetation.

As stated in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the risk of impacting groundwater dependent vegetation arises from pumping the proposed Bell Canyon well and Well 415 in combination with other wells in the Big Pine area. The total amount of future groundwater pumping and the amount of groundwater recharge that will occur in the Big Pine area is dependent on factors whose parameters are unknowable in advance, such as precipitation, runoff, and LADWP's groundwater and surface water operations. LADWP operations are subject to Water Agreement provisions, including its monitoring provisions. As was noted in the draft mitigated Negative Declaration, it appears that the pumping from these two wells alone would not cause adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation.

Although LADWP's operations are subject to the Water Agreement provisions, it would be purely speculative to predict cumulative impacts from the amount of recharge or the amount of pumping. The monitoring provisions of the Water Agreement establish mechanisms which can identify impacts before they occur; however, if significant impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation attributable to pumping or to surface water management practices should occur, the appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented as required by the Water Agreement.

It is impossible to know or to describe specific mitigation measures that would be implemented if groundwater pumping under the proposed project in combination with other groundwater pumping causes significant impacts. The location of such impacts, the size of such impacts, and the specific vegetation that would be affected are unknown. Under these circumstances, the monitoring and mitigation provisions of the Water Agreement provide for mitigation of any significant impacts, cumulative or otherwise, that might occur.

The Water Agreement establishes procedures for managing groundwater pumping in order to limit impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, for monitoring both pumping and surface water management practices in order to identify impacts to vegetation, and for implementing mitigation measures, if necessary. LADWP is committed to conducting its operations in conformance with the Water Agreement. If it is determined that mitigation is required, LADWP will implement mitigation as required under the Water Agreement.

The IS/MND also refer to the Water Agreement for defining and determining the significance of project impacts. However, the Water Agreement and Green Book describe the process for determining what is a significant impact but state that an actual determination of significance will be developed on a case by case basis (pg 26, last sentence). The process, as described in the supporting documents, has not been completed for the proposed project. Therefore, the IS/MND contain no criteria to evaluate or determine at what point impacts would be considered significant. As such, the Lead Agency can not make the determination that no significant impacts would occur as a result of the project based on the information contained in the IS.

Letter 7 – Response to Comment 2

See response above.

As noted in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Water Agreement does contain specific criteria for determining whether an environmental impact is significant and if so, how the impact must be mitigated.

In addition, when adopting mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts of a

project to less than significant levels, the lead agency must provide enough specificity to be able to clearly make the determination that impacts will be mitigated to less than significant levels. The proposed mitigation refers again to the information contained in the Water Agreement and Green Book. These documents contain only discussions of how mitigation and monitoring programs should be developed to reduce significant impacts. However, they do not contain any specific mitigation measures or monitoring programs and merely indicate that they will be developed in the future. This defers formulation of project specific mitigation and monitoring and therefore does not provide substantial evidence that the impacts of the project would be mitigated to less than significant levels. Therefore, the proposed mitigation is inadequate. The document should be revised to include project specific mitigation and monitoring that ensure impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

Letter 7 – Response to Comment 3

See response to comment 2.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. Questions regarding this letter should be directed to Ms. Adrienne Disbrow, Environmental Scientist, at (760) 873-4412. Sincerely,

Denyse Racine, Senior Wildlife Biologist
Habitat Conservation Program
cc: Adrienne Disbrow, CDFG
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento
Greg James, Inyo County Water Department

2

LETTER 8

Dagne Florine

111 Post Oak Way
San Antonio, TX 78230
26 June, 2003

Mr Gene Coufal
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich Street
Bishop. CA 93514

Re: Comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for the Big Pine Ditch System

Dear Mr. Coufal:

I have reviewed the above referenced document along with Attachment 1 (Draft. Modification of Water Agreement: Big Pine Ditch System) and Attachment 2 (Memorandum dated 1-29-03 on the Modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project). Thank you for providing me an opportunity to make a few comments.

Unfortunately, I remain concerned about key issues of this proposal. Questions raised in my previous correspondence of September 23, 2002 regarding the previous draft of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Big Pine Ditch System were not addressed; for example, there is no documentation that increased groundwater pumping to supply the Big Pine Ditch System will not, in conjunction with other projects, cumulatively impact vegetation, methods remain vague, quantitation is not addressed and terms are not defined (e.g. "significant adverse impact" and "promptly"). Overall, I remain dissatisfied with the document.

Letter 8 – Response to Comment 1

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration concludes that the combined operation of the proposed Bell canyon well and well 415 will not cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation. However, the draft mitigated Negative Declaration states that the operation of those wells, in combination with the operation of other wells in the Big Pine area, may cause significant adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, or other vegetation.

As stated in the draft mitigated Negative Declaration, the risk of impacting groundwater dependent vegetation arises from pumping the proposed Bell Canyon well and Well 415 in combination with other wells in the Big Pine area. The total amount of future groundwater pumping and the amount of groundwater recharge that will occur in the Big Pine area is dependent on factors whose parameters are unknowable in advance, such as precipitation, runoff, and LADWP's groundwater and surface water operations. LADWP operations are subject to Water Agreement provisions, including its monitoring provisions. As was noted in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, it appears that the pumping from these two wells alone would not cause adverse impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation.

Although LADWP's operations are subject to the Water Agreement provisions, it would be purely speculative to predict cumulative impacts from the amount of recharge or the amount of pumping. The monitoring provisions of the Water Agreement establish mechanisms which can identify impacts before they occur; however, if significant impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation attributable to pumping or to surface water management practices should occur, the appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented as required by the Water Agreement.

It is impossible to know or to describe specific mitigation measures that would be implemented if groundwater pumping under the proposed project in combination with other groundwater pumping causes

significant impacts. The location of such impacts, the size of such impacts, and the specific vegetation that would be affected are unknown. Under these circumstances, the monitoring and mitigation provisions of the Water Agreement provide for mitigation of any significant impacts, cumulative or otherwise, that might occur.

The Water Agreement establishes procedures for managing groundwater pumping in order to limit impacts to groundwater dependent vegetation, for monitoring both pumping and surface water management practices in order to identify impacts to vegetation, and for implementing mitigation measures, if necessary. LADWP is committed to conducting its operations in conformance with the Water Agreement. If it is determined that mitigation is required, LADWP will implement mitigation as required under the Water Agreement.

Other comments are cited below:

p.:3 Who comprises the Technical Group and what are their qualifications ? What tests will be done, what procedures will be used, how often will test be conducted, how will the data be analyzed and how will the results be made available to the public ?

Letter 8 – Response to Comment 2

The Inyo County/Los Angeles Technical Group was formed pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Inyo and the City of Los Angeles in 1982. The Inyo-Los Angeles Agreement provides that the Technical Group will assist the County of Inyo and the City of Los Angeles in implementing the goals and principles of that agreement. That agreement provides that the Technical Group shall be comprised of five representatives selected by Inyo County and five representatives selected by LADWP. The representatives are comprised of technical, legal or managerial staff.

In regard to the analyses required before the construction and operation of new wells, see pages 22 to 25 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The analyses are also described in Section VI of the Water Agreement and Section IV.B of the Green Book.

Meetings of the Technical Group are open to the public and results of analyses, tests and evaluations performed concerning the construction and operation of new wells will be presented at Technical Group meetings.

p.7-c More power poles and above ground pipe will degrade the existing visual character of the area, particularly given the poles already in the region.

Letter 8 – Response to Comment 3

The additional new power poles along Old Glacier Lodge Road will be below the bluff to minimize their appearance. The aboveground piping is within LADWP property and is being placed aboveground to avoid any cultural or archeological disturbances. A section of the aboveground pipe will be visible from West Street, however, most of the piping is not visible and will be covered at dirt road crossings.

p. 8-b. No data are provided for the contention that the reduction in the allotment of water to the Klondike project “is not expected to cause a significant effect on riparian vegetation”.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 4

As stated on in item 1 on page 36 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, “From approximately May to September, a varying amount of water will be supplied to maintain areas of native pasture and wetland habitats adjacent to the Lyman Ditch.” Item 2 on the same page states “ From approximately May to September, a varying amount of water will be supplied, as necessary, to maintain the level of Klondike Lake within 10 inches of the mid-elevation demarcation of the West Headgate Waterman Gate disc (this will maintain the lake level as in 1995 to 2001).” Item 3 on the same page states “A flow of up to 200 acre-feet per year will be released to native habitat area to the south of the lake to promote nesting and feeding areas for water fowl and to maintain habitat in the Klondike drain ditch. The releases of the habitat area will be made from the existing two headgates on the south shore of Klondike Lake. Beginning in May 2003, the Technical Group will conduct test releases to determine the amount of flow that must be released to provide for nesting and feeding and to maintain the habitat. The releases to the habitat area under the proposed project should improve the habitat area.” In view of these provisions, there should be no degradation of riparian habitat. In

fact, under the proposed project, riparian habitat in the area south of Klondike Lake should be improved since the area has not been provided with water in the past.

p. 9-IO a,b,c,d In this document, when compared with the draft of July 30, 2002, the word "substantial" is inserted at strategic points (eg. Would the project have a "substantial" adverse effect on a ...special status species; Would the project have a "substantial" adverse effect on any riparian habitat...; Would the project have a "substantial" adverse effect on any federally protected wetlands...; Would the project interfere "substantially" with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish...) By inserting the word "substantial" in the text of this most recent draft, DWP feels Comfortable designating "no Impact" for each of the items in question. In the July 30, 2002 draft, where "substantial" was omitted, the designation for each item was "less than significant impact". The change in language gives a misleading impression to the public that the project has no potential to impact the biology of the area, in contrast to the earlier draft, which indicated there is potential for impact.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 5

Please note that the California State Clearinghouse periodically revises the format of the CEQA documents. The 2002 draft used an earlier version of the CEQA checklist, the current Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration uses the latest standardized language provided by the State Clearinghouse. Per CEQA guidelines, the project shall be approved if there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. (Underlining added for emphasis.)

p. 14-b The text portion of the negative declaration sheds no substantive information regarding any potential impact of groundwater pumping on groundwater supplies or recharge. If groundwater is mined, groundwater supplies will be depleted with respect to the non-pumping alternative.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 6

See response to Comment 1 above.

p. 20-a The response to the question of whether the project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory is inadequate. Vague forms are used (eg. there is no definition of "significant impact" in the text, nor is any quantitation provided) and no details are provided as to how studies will be conducted. Furthermore, the reader is left in question whether the intent is to shrug off potential damage to the environment with a vague promise of modest remediation, rather than attempt to avoid damage in the first place.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 7

See response to Comment 1 above.

p. 21-b DWP continues to maintain that "the project is not expected to cause any impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable". A comparison of photographs of the Owens Valley over the last century demonstrates significant cumulative impact on the environment as more and more water was sent to Los Angeles.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 8

This comment expresses an opinion and your comment is noted.

p. 35 5 The current proposal permanently permanently reduces the water allotment to

Klondike Lake Mjtigation/Enhancement by 500 acre-feet (23%) while crediting Big Pine with 300 acre-feet. Taking water from Klondike and providing it to Big Pine simply robs Peter to pay Paul.

Letter 8 - Response to Comment 9

This comment expresses an opinion and your comment is noted.

Please note that on Page 5, under bullet 7, of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, it is stated that the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Commissioners must make a determination that the proposed modification of the Klondike Lake Enhancement/Mitigation Project will continue to provide mitigation equal to the mitigation that would be provided if the project were not modified.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to comment on the most recent Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Big Pine Ditch System. Please note I am not opposed to the Ditch System in theory, as we have signed up to have the water traverse our property in Big Pine. I am simply concerned with the bigger picture, and do not want the Beautification of Big Pine to proceed to the detriment of the surrounding region.

Very truly yours,

Dagne L. Florine
cc. Mark Bagley, Teri Cawelti, Greg James

LETTER 9

Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley

BIG PINE PAIUTE TRIBE OF THE OWENS VALLEY

Big Pine Indian Reservation

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Manager Aqueduct Business Group

Mr. Gene Coufal

300 Mandich St.

Bishop, CA 93514

RE: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for the Big Pine Ditch System

Dear Mr. Coufal:

The Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley (Tribe) would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Big Pine Ditch System. In previous correspondence with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) concerning this project, the Tribe has communicated its concerns regarding potential impacts to drinking water wells, loss of vegetation, loss of habitat and other issues associated with an increase in groundwater depth.

The Tribe would like to be informed of any testing schedules pertaining to new wells, increased pumping from existing wells, surface water diversions from Big Pine Creek, and other actions that relate to the supply of water for this project. During any testing schedules, the Tribe can monitor its own drinking water wells, monitoring wells, and irrigation water quantity and ascertain any potential impacts.

Letter 9 - Response to Comment 1

LADWP will notify the Tribe prior to any testing or start up of the new Bell Canyon well and prior to the commencement of increased pumping from the Big Pine town water supply well. Diversions from Big Pine Creek will follow a schedule and priority as stated on pages 33 and 34 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Adjustments to the diversions may be made on a daily basis, especially during irrigation season from April to October.

The flow in Big Pine Creek is measured at a USGS station, located approximately a quarter mile downstream of the Big Pine Powerhouse, and the information is available on LADWP's website under Los Angeles Aqueduct Operation Report, the address is www.ladwp.com. To access the information select Water –Los Angeles Aqueduct – Operations – Northern Owens Valley.

The Tribe is also concerned with the abundance of archaeological resources potentially impacted by this project. Attachment 3 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Archeological Investigations at Big Pine Ditch Well by URS Corporation-dated June 4,2003, describes multiple features present and goes on to state, "...The local Native American community, however, should be contacted before construction in this area. In addition, monitoring is recommended during construction in this vicinity to ensure that unidentified or buried cultural materials are not inadvertently disturbed during excavation procedures." The Tribe requests notification prior to any ground disturbing activities and facilitation of Native American Monitors considering the archaeological resources present.

Letter 9 - Response to Comment 3

An Archeologist consultant has reviewed the areas of disturbance for the pipelines, power poles and well construction. Sensitive archeological areas have been identified and will be avoided. Prior to construction of the proposed well, pipelines and power poles the LADWP will notify the Tribe. The Archeologist will also be present during construction activities near sensitive areas. The Tribe will be provided access to the sites to allow a representative to be present during ground disturbing activities. If an unexpected artifact or site is exposed during excavation activities, the tribe will be notified if a Tribal representative is not present.

As I stated to you in a previous letter regarding this proposed project, "The Big Pine Ditch System is considered mitigation for the community of Big Pine. The Tribe's position is that any draw down that results from this proposed project in supplying the Big Pine Ditch System is

P.O. Box 700 .. 825 South Main Street Big Pine, CA 93513 Office: (760) 938-2003.

Printed on 100% post consumer recycled paper, process chlorine free

unacceptable.. The Tribe does not want to be: in a situation where mitigation has to take place because of the effects of groundwater pumping to supply the Big Pine Ditch System. As I have previously stated, a mitigation project such as the Big Pine Ditch System should not negatively affect the environment and cause another area to require mitigation. LADWP should bear the burden of loss for this mitigation-not the Tribe and surrounding physical environment."

Letter 9 – Response to Comment 4

As stated on page 31 of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Water Agreement provides that “groundwater pumping shall be managed to avoid causing significant adverse effects” to private wells; the Tribe’s water supply wells will be protected under these provisions.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Jason Warren of my staff at 938-3036.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Bacocho
Tribal Chairperson

cc:

Ms. Ten Cawelti, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
Mr. Greg James, Inyo County Water Department
Mr. Rene Mendez, Inyo County Administrator
Inyo County Board of Supervisors