

Table of Contents

	Page
Volume I	
List of Acronyms	i
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR	1
COMMENTERS ON THE DRAFT EIR	1
Water Rights Licensee	2
Federal Agencies	2
State Agencies	2
Local and Regional Agencies	3
Environmental Organizations	4
Other Groups	5
Individuals	6
EVALUATION OF COMMENTS	10
Identifying Major Issues	10
Responding to Other Issues	10
Coding of Comments and Responses	18
CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF FINAL EIR19	
Chapter 2. Proposed Project and Project Alternatives	1
PROPOSED PROJECT AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES	1
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	1
Chapter 3. Summary of Major Conclusions	1
MAJOR CONCLUSIONS BY TOPIC AREA	1
Effects on Fisheries	1
Other Major Conclusions	1
ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE	9
Environmentally Superior Alternative Relative	
to the Point of Reference	9
Environmentally Superior Alternative Relative	
to Prediversion Conditions	10
MITIGATION MEASURES	11

Chapter 4. Major Issues and SWRCB Responses	1
INTRODUCTION	1
LEGAL ISSUES (X)	1
X1. Points of Reference Are Not Appropriate or the Project Is Improperly Defined	1
X2. Environmentally Superior Alternative Is Improperly Identified	7
X3. EIR Analyses Do Not Meet Scientific Standards	9
X4. Other CEQA Provisions Are Not Met	10
X5. Public Trust Issues Are Inadequately Addressed	13
X6. Fisheries Laws, Rules, and Regulations Are Inadequately Considered or Applied; Recommendations of the California Department of Fish and Game Must Be Adopted	14
X7. California Air Quality Law (Health and Safety Code Section 42316) Prohibits Interference with LADWP Water-Gathering Activities and Represents a Legislative Balancing of Water Rights and Air Quality Public Trust Values	17
X8. Water Quality and Environmental Impacts of Developing Alternative Water Supplies Are Not Evaluated	18
X9. Effects of the Alternatives on the Threatened or Endangered Status of Mono Lake Brine Shrimp Are Not Addressed	19
X10. An Antidegradation Threshold for Outstanding National Resource Waters Is Improperly Formulated	20
X11. Impact Assessments of Project-Related Irrigation and Grazing Changes Are Absent	22
HYDROLOGY AND FORMULATION OR CHARACTERIZATION OF ALTERNATIVES (A)	23
A1. LAAMP Model Was an Erroneous or Inadequate Basis for Impact Assessments	23
A2. LAAMP Model Results Were Inappropriately Applied for Impact Assessments	32
A3. Mono Lake Water Balance Model Was Erroneous	36
A4. Alternatives Were Not Formulated Using DFG-Recommended Streamflows	39
A5. The Drought Analysis Was Erroneous and Improperly Applied for Impact Assessment	41
WATER QUALITY (B)	42
B1. Mono Lake Salinity Characteristics Were Not Properly Described	42
B2. Upper Owens River and Lake Crowley Reservoir Water Quality Effects Were Not Adequately Considered	44
B3. City of Los Angeles Drinking Water Quality Effects Were Not Adequately Considered	46

Chapter 5. Modified 6,390-Ft Alternative 5-1

Volume II

**Chapter 6. Comment Letters on the Draft EIR and Responses
to Miscellaneous Comments** 6-1

Chapter 7. Errata 7-1

Chapter 8. List of Preparers 8-1

Chapter 9. Citations 9-1

List of Tables and Figures

Table

1-1	Comment Response Codes
3-1	Summary of Mitigation Measures
4-1	Summary of Average Water Budget Terms in LAAMP 2.0 and LAAMP 3.3 for No-Restriction Alternative (TAF/yr)
4-2	No-Restriction Aqueduct Capacities and Constraints in LAAMP 2.0 and LAAMP 3.3
4-3	Comparison of LAAMP 3.3 and Draft EIR Average Simulated Values for 1940-1989
4-4	Streamflows for Simulating DFG Recommendations in LAAMP 3.3

Figure

4-1	Mono Lake Surface Elevation
4-2	Mono Basin Exports
4-3	Mono Exports vs. Runoff
4-4	Total Owens Valley Ground Water Pumping
4-5	Owens Valley Pumping vs. Runoff
4-6	Haiwee Exports to Los Angeles
4-7	Lee Vining Creek Flows
4-8	Rush Creek Flows
4-9	Grant Reservoir Storage
4-10	Mono Exports

- 4-11 Upper Owens Streamflows
- 4-12 Long Valley Reservoir Storage
- 4-13 Long Valley Outflow
- 4-14 Haiwee Exports to Los Angeles