

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ES-1

 ES.1 Introduction ES-1

 ES.2 Summary of Potential Impacts ES-6

1: Introduction 1-1

 1.1 Introduction 1-1

 1.2 EIR Process 1-5

 1.3 Key Areas of Environmental Concern 1-7

 1.4 Organization of the EIR 1-8

2: Project Description 2-1

 2.1 Introduction 2-1

 2.2 Project Location 2-2

 2.3 Project Description 2-2

 2.4 Construction Schedule and Personnel 2-14

 2.5 Permits and Approvals 2-17

3: Environmental Impact Analyses 3.1-1

 3.1 Introduction 3.1-1

 3.2 Hydrology and Water Quality 3.2-1

 3.3 Geology and Soils 3.3-1

 3.4 Biological Resources 3.4-1

 3.5 Cultural Resources 3.5-1

 3.6 Population and Housing 3.6-1

 3.7 Land Use, Planning, and Recreation 3.7-1

 3.8 Agricultural Resources 3.8-1

 3.9 Aesthetics 3.9-1

 3.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 3.10-1

 3.11 Public Services and Utilities 3.11-1

 3.12 Noise 3.12-1

 3.13 Air Quality 3.13-1

 3.14 Transportation and Traffic 3.14-1

4: Cumulative, Growth-inducing, and Significant Unavoidable impacts 4-1

4.1 Introduction 4-1

4.2 Related Projects 4-1

4.3 Cumulative Impacts 4-4

4.4 Growth-Inducing Impacts 4-12

4.5 Significant, Unavoidable Effects 4-13

5: Alternatives to the Project 5-1

5.1 Introduction 5-1

5.2 Alternatives Considered but Rejected 5-1

5.3 No Project Alternative 5-7

5.4 Considered Action Alternatives 5-7

5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative 5-11

6: Report Preparation 6-1

6.1 List of Preparers 6-1

7: References 7-1

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Scoping (NOP and Comment Letters)**
- Appendix B: Plan Drawings**
- Appendix C: Pump Test Results and Hydrologic Data**
- Appendix D: Additional Biological Information**
- Appendix E: Memorandum of Agreement Between Navy and SHPO**
- Appendix F: Upper Little Lake Ranch, Inc. Habitat Restoration and Improvement Plan**

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES 1-1: Project Location ES-2

Figure ES 1-2: Project Components ES-3

Figure 1.1-1: Project Location 1-2

Figure 2.3-1: Project Components 2-5

Figure 2.3-2: Location of Project Components on the Hay Ranch Property 2-6

Figure 2.3-3:	South Well Lift Pump Station, Tank, and Switchyard Layout.....	2-7
Figure 2.3-4:	High Point Water Storage tank Location.....	2-15
Figure 3.2-1:	Study Area Physiographic Features	3.2-4
Figure 3.2-2:	Hydrologic Features of Little Lake Ranch	3.2-7
Figure 3.2-2:	Flow and Water Level Measurements at Little Lake	3.2-10
Figure 3.2-4:	Groundwater Elevation Hydrographs.....	3.2-11
Figure 3.2-5:	Study Area Map and Groundwater Elevation Contour Map – November 2007	3.2-15
Figure 3.2-6:	Inferred Total Dissolved Solids Concentration Distribution.....	3.2-20
Figure 3.2-7:	Stable Isotopes of Waters from Rose Valley and Vicinity	3.2-22
Figure 3.2-8:	Oxygen-18 versus Deuterium for Waters from Rose Valley and the Surrounding Areas	3.2-23
Figure 3.2-9:	Coso Hot Springs Surface Manifestations and Monitoring Points	3.2-27
Figure 3.2-10a:	South Pool	3.2-27
Figure 3.2-10b:	Devil’s Kitchen	3.2-27
Figure 3.2-10c:	Nichol Pool.....	3.2-28
Figure 3.2-10d:	Pipeline Fumarole.....	3.2-28
Figure 3.2-11:	Relative Proportions of Anions and Cations in Coso Surface Manifestations.....	3.2-28
Figure 3.2-12:	Sodium Chloride in Surface Manifestations and Shallow Wells at Coso Hot Springs.....	3.2-29
Figure 3.2-13:	Variations in Chemistry of Nichol Pool.....	3.2-30
Figure 3.2-14:	Predicted Groundwater Drawdown After 30 Years at Full Project Development Rate of 4,839 acre-feet/year	3.2-35
Figure 3.2-15:	Predicted Groundwater Elevation Changes with Time in Wells in Rose Valley for Pumping at 4,839 Ac-Ft Per Year for 30 Years	3.2-37
Figure 3.2-16:	Predicted Groundwater Table Drawdown at the North End of Little Lake Pumping at 4,839 Ac-Ft Per Year for 30 Years	3.2-44
Figure 3.2-17:	Early Pumping Termination (1.2 years) Scenario Results	3.2-44
Figure 3.2-18:	Temperature and Water Level Variations in South Pool Geothermal Production began in October 1987	3.2-53
Figure 3.2-19:	Coso Hot Springs Stable Isotopes Oxygen-18 and Deuterium.....	3.2-54
Figure 3.3-1:	Geologic Units and the Project Vicinity	3.3-3
Figure 3.3-2:	Regional Fault Zones.....	3.3-6
Figure 3.4-1:	Special Status Species in the Project Area.....	3.4-13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figure 3.4-2: Special Status Species in the Project Area 3.4-14

Figure 3.4-3: General Water Dependent Habitat at Little Lake..... 3.4-17

Figure 3.4-4: General Water Dependent Habitat Mapped at Portuguese Bench 3.4-18

Figure 3.5-1: Conceptual Model of the Coso Geothermal System Before and After the Onset of Production..... 3.5-17

Figure 3.7-1: Land Ownership in Inyo County 3.7-2

Figure 3.9-1: Pre Construction View 3.9-9

Figure 3.9-2: Post Construction View 3.9-10

Figure 3.14-1: Highways and Roads in the Project Area 3.14-3

Figure 4.2-1: Related Projects and the Proposed Project 4-2

Figure 5.2-1: Differential Net Output Due to Increased Injection Through 2035..... 5-3

Figure 5.4-1: Hay Ranch Pumping Rates That Can be Sustained for 30 Year Project Life 5-9

Figure 5.4-2: Model Predicted Drawdown at North End of Little Lake for Alternative Development Scenarios 5-10

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES 1-1: Project Elements ES-5

Table ES 1-2: Project Facility Acreage..... ES-5

Table ES 1-3: Required Permits or Approvals for the Proposed Project..... ES-6

Table ES 2-1: Potential Impacts and Mitigation ES-14

Table 1.1-1: Environmental Documents for Coso Geothermal Plants 1-4

Table 2.3-1: Project Elements 2-2

Table 2.3-2: Project Facility Acreage..... 2-3

Table 2.3-3: Pipeline Sections and Sizes 2-12

Table 2.5-1: Required Permits or Approvals for the Proposed Project..... 2-17

Table 3.2-1: Rose Valley EIR –Summary of Bauer (2002) Stream and Spring Flow Measurements..... 3.2-9

Table 3.2-2: Rose Valley EIR November 2007 Groundwater Elevation Data 3.2-14

Table 3.2-3: Rose Valley Conceptual Groundwater Budget..... 3.2-19

Table 3.2-4: Hay Ranch Drinking Water Quality with primary and Secondary Drinking Water Standards 3.2-24

Table 3.2-5: Predicted Maximum Drawdown in Wells in Rose Valley at Full Pumping Rate for 30 Years 3.2-36

Table 3.2-6: Sources of Water Captured by Hay Ranch Wells after 30 Years of Pumping at full Project Rate of 4,839 Acre-ft/yr..... 3.2-42

Table 3.2-7: Drawdown Trigger Levels (in feet)..... 3.2-48

Table 3.3-1: Major Fault Zones in the Project Area 3.3-7

Table 3.4-1: Special status plant species that are known or have some potential to occur in the vicinity of the project site. 3.4-7

Table 3.4-2: Special Status Wildlife Species 3.4-10

Table 3.4-3: Special Status Species Occurring or Potentially occurring at Little Lake 3.4-19

Table 3.4-4: Summary of Temporary and Permanent Habitat Losses and Compensation by Land Management Authority..... 3.4-30

Table 3.5-1: Summary of Sites Identified within the Project Area of Potential Effect..... 3.5-7

Table 3.12-1: Definition of Acoustical Terms 3.12-2

Table 3.12-2: Distances From Sensitive Receptors to Construction Sites..... 3.12-4

Table 3.12-3: Allowable Ambient Noise Exposure for Various Land Uses in Inyo County..... 3.12-4

Table 3.12-4: Maximum Allowable Ambient Noise Exposure by Land Use (County Noise Standards) 3.12-6

Table 3.12-5: Construction Noise Generation..... 3.12-8

Table 3.13-1: State and Federal Air Quality Standard 3.13-2

Table 3.13-2: 2001 EPA Emissions Report, Inyo County, California 3.12-3

Table 3.14-1: Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service 3.14-2

Table 4.3-1: GHG Emissions Strategies, Reduction Methods, and Compliance 4-12

Table 5.2-1: Examples of Power Plant Efficiency Improvements 5-5

Table 5.2-2: Potential Alternative Sources of Water for Injection 5-6

