

SECTION 5

California Environmental Quality Act – Environmental Factors and Mandatory Findings of Significance

This section of the EA/IS includes the CEQA analysis portion of potentially affected issues that may result from implementation of the proposed project. Reference to the “proposed project” in this section is synonymous with the term, “proposed action,” used in other sections. Appendix F contains the CEQA impact determination signature page.

5.1 Discussion of Potentially Affected Environmental Factors

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. Although some project elements could result in an environmental effect, modifications to the project description or mitigation measures have been proposed that would reduce impacts to less than significant. The words “significant” and “significance” used throughout the following checklist and section are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts.

5.2 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, according to a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. After the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact might occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is “Potentially Significant,” “Less than Significant with Mitigation,” or “Less than Significant.” “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect might be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an environmental impact report is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially

Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program environmental impact report, or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier environmental impact report or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans and zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify the following:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impacts to less than significant

5.3 Initial Study/Environmental Impacts Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b, c, d. The project site is not considered a unique scenic vista, nor is the proposed project located within the vicinity of a state-designated scenic highway. The proposed project is consistent with the existing visual character of each property and surroundings. Although construction equipment would be temporarily visible during construction, only a limited number of residents are near (within 0.5 mile) the proposed project location, and once construction is complete, the visual characteristics of the site would remain consistent with the existing setting. Therefore, no additional aesthetic analysis is necessary for the proposed project.</p>				
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))				
(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
See Section 3.2 for a complete discussion of land uses within the project area.				
III. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See Section 3.8 for a complete discussion of air quality impacts.

a. Construction and operation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an air quality plan. FRAQMD is in the process of preparing the PM_{2.5} air quality plan, due to EPA in December 2012, to address attainment of the federal PM_{2.5} standard. The Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Attainment Plan for attaining the state ozone standard was released for review in June 2010. Construction would result in a minor, short-term increase in emissions. The project would incorporate measures during construction to reduce emissions (see Section 3.8). Operation would not be expected to result in a net increase in emissions when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with applicable air quality plans and the impact would be less than significant.

b. As shown in Tables 3-12 and 3-13, construction emissions would be less than the FRAQMD thresholds, so construction would not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard. Therefore, construction of the project would have less than significant impacts on air quality.

Operation of the proposed PMWC well would require electricity to operate the pump; however, this would not generate onsite emissions. The proposed SMWC well would be used for monitoring so there would be no operational features. Therefore, operation of the project would have less than significant impacts on air quality.

c. As shown in Tables 3-12 and 3-13, construction emissions would be less than the FRAQMD thresholds. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions, and the impact would be less than significant. Operation of the project would not result in a considerable net increase in emissions; therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

d. Construction of the project would generate emissions, such as diesel particulate matter from trucks and construction equipment. Current models and methodologies for conducting health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods of 9, 40, and 70 years, which do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities (Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2011). Construction of the project would occur over a 30-day period, and particulate matter emissions would be less than the FRAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the air quality impact would be less than significant. Operation of the project would not generate emissions and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the air quality impact would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>e. Project construction would involve the temporary use of vehicles and construction equipment that would not generate significant odors. Operation of the project would not include operation of sources that create odors. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and there would be no impact.</p>				
<p>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
See Section 3.3 for a complete discussion of biological resources.				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
See Section 3.4 for a complete discussion of cultural resources.				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zoning map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to division of mines and geology special publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a. The project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects.</p> <p>b. The proposed project does not fall within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, as shown in DOC's <i>California Farmland Conversion Report 2004-2006</i> (DOC, 2010). Soil erosion could occur during construction if appropriate BMPs are not implemented. See Section 3.1 for a complete discussion of water quality impacts related to soil erosion.</p> <p>PMWC would make sure applicable BMPs are implemented properly to prevent soil erosion and to prevent significant impacts.</p> <p>c, d, e. The project would not be located on an unstable geologic unit or soil or on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Unified Building Code. There are no septic tanks associated with the project, so there would be no impact.</p>				
<p>VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>See Section 3.9 for a complete discussion of global climate change and GHG emissions.</p> <p>a, b. The project would not generate GHG emissions that would have significant impacts on the environment, nor would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.</p>				
<p>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) If located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b. A minor amount of hazardous waste, if any, is anticipated to be generated by construction activities related to project implementation. Hazardous materials (for example, gasoline, oil, and lubricants) used during construction could be released. However, this impact is considered less than significant because of the small amount of such materials that would be used during construction. See Section 3.1 for a complete discussion of water quality impacts and implementation of BMPs during project construction.</p> <p>PMWC would make sure applicable BMPs are implemented properly to prevent impacts on water quality from unexpected hazardous materials releases and to prevent significant impact.</p> <p>c, d, e, f, g, h. The proposed project is not within 0.25 mile of any schools and would not be located on a site listed in Government Code Section 65962.5. None of the proposed project locations are within the vicinity of a public or private airport or airstrip. The project would not impair an adopted emergency plan or expose people or structures to any risk.</p>				
<p>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge causing a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted ⁸)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁸Well yield is defined as the maximum sustainable pumping rate that can be supplied by a well without inducing a decline in water levels that exceeds the available drawdown. Available drawdown is defined as the height of the column of water between the static water level and the total depth of the well or the depth of the pump intake.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(k) Substantially reduce in-stream flows of rivers and streams?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(l) Cause permanent land subsidence due to water level declines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See Section 3.1 for a complete discussion of impacts on water resources as a result of the proposed project.				
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See Section 3.2 for a complete discussion of land use impacts associated with the proposed project.				
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
a, b. There are no known mineral resources on the project location; therefore, there would be no resulting impacts on mineral resources.				
XII. NOISE. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Expose persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) If within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(f) If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b, c, d, e, f. Noise levels in the project vicinity would temporarily increase above existing ambient noise levels during construction. The most noticeable construction noises likely would be related to vehicle backup warning devices and general construction noise. A limited number of sensitive receptors are in the project area. Proposed well locations are located at least 0.5 mile from the nearest sensitive receptor.</p> <p>Construction activities would be temporary (maximum duration of 6 weeks). Most construction activities would take place on weekdays between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Drilling operations, however, are scheduled to occur on a continuous basis, consisting of 24-hour shifts, for 10 consecutive days. However, only a limited number of sensitive receptors are near (within 0.5 mile) the proposed project sites, so this impact is considered less than significant.</p>				
<p>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b, c. The proposed project would not induce population growth or displace housing or people.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
(i) fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(ii) police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iii) schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iv) parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(v) other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
a. No public services would be affected by the proposed project.				
XV. RECREATION. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion:				
a, b. No recreational facilities would be affected by the proposed project or constructed as a result of the proposed project.				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the proposed project:				
(a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b. Access to the PMWC proposed production well would be via Cranmore Road from Reclamation Road and Pelger Road. Access to the proposed SMWC Option 1 well would be via Tisdale Road from Reclamation Road. Access to the proposed SMWC Option 2 well is directly via Reclamation Road. Access to the proposed SMWC Option 3 well is via Everglade Road from Reclamation Road. Local traffic would increase slightly on these local roadways during the construction period as a result of construction workers entering and exiting the site and general construction traffic, such as dump trucks hauling material to and from the site. This traffic would be temporary (a maximum of 8 weeks in duration) and minimal and therefore would not significantly affect local roadways. This impact is considered less than significant.</p> <p>c, d, e, f. The proposed project would not modify the level of service in the area, affect air traffic patterns, or create traffic hazards or incompatible uses. Emergency access would not be affected, nor would the project conflict with adopted policies or plans established by Sutter County Department of Public Works.</p>				
<p>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposed project:</p>				
(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Water Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the proposed project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a, b, c, d, e, f, g. Wastewater and stormwater facilities would not be affected by the proposed project. Additionally, excavated material would be disposed of onsite at a location approved by the property owner, in accordance with state and federal laws. There would be no resulting impacts on public utilities attributable to project implementation.</p>				
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
(a) Does the proposed project have 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Does the proposed project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Does the proposed project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: None required.</p>				

SECTION 6

List of Preparers and Reviewers

6.1 Bureau of Reclamation

Shelly Hatleberg, Natural Resources Specialist
Amy Barnes, Archeologist
Stanley (Chip) Parrot, Hydrogeologist
Laurie Sharp, Water Conservation Specialist

6.2 Pelger Mutual Water Company

Scott Tucker, Company General Manager, PMWC

6.3 Sutter Mutual Water Company

Max Sakato, Company General Manager, SMWC

6.4 CH2M HILL Consultant Staff

Holly Dawley, Project Manager
Brett Isbell, Project Manager
Mark Oliver, Senior Planner
Heather Perry, Hydrogeologist
Nate Brown, Senior Hydrogeologist
Peter Lawson, Senior Hydrogeologist
Titi Ala, Planner
Heather Waldrop, Planner
Amy Clymo, Air Quality
Natalie Lawson, Archaeologist
Clint Helton, Senior Archaeologist
Victor Leighton, Biologist
Marjorie Eisert, Senior Biologist
Tom Henderson, Project Engineer
Heather Nichols, Technical Editor
Celeste Brandt, Technical Editor

SECTION 7

References

Anderson, J., F. Chung, M. Anderson, L. Brekke, D. Easton, M. Ejetal, R. Peterson, and R. Snyder. 2008. *Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources*. *Climatic Change* 87(Suppl 1):S91-S108 DOI 10.1007/s10584-007-9353-1.

Anderson, Keith E. 1961. *Water Well Handbook*. Missouri Water Well Drillers Association.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2011. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. May.

Bertoldi, G.L. 1991. *Ground Water in the Central Valley, California – A Summary Report, Regional Aquifer-System Analysis-Central Valley, California*. U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 1401-A.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2008. *Scoping Plan*. December.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2007. *Staff Report: California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Limit*. December.

California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Land Resource Protection. 2011. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. *County Important Farmland Data*. Available at: http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/county_info_results.asp. Accessed February 27, 2011.

California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Land Resource Protection. 2010. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. *California Farmland Conversion Report 2004-2006*. Available at: http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/county_info_results.asp. Accessed February 27, 2011.

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2010. "California Geological Survey - Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones." Available at: <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/Index.aspx>. Accessed December 28, 2010.

California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Land Resource Protection. 2008 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. *Sutter County Important Farmland, 2008*.

California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Land Resource Protection. 2002. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2010. *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. May. Available at: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4/2001-10/>. Accessed March 2, 2011.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2007. "Population Projections for California and Its Counties 2000-2050, by Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity." July. Available at:

- <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/p-3/>. Accessed February 27, 2011.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2010. Bulletin 160-2005/09. *California Water Plan*. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2007. Land and Water Use Office. *Land Use Surveys*. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003a. *Sacramento River Basinwide Water Management Plan, Groundwater Hydrology*. January.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003b. Bulletin 118 – Update 2003. *California's Groundwater*. October. Available at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/update2003.cfm>. Accessed 2011.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003c. Bulletin 118 – Update 2003. *California's Groundwater*. "Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin, Sutter Subbasin." Available at: http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/groundwater/bulletin_118/basindescriptions/5-21.62.pdf. Accessed 2011.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003d. Water Data Library. Available at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/>. Accessed 2011.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD). 2011. *Labor Market Info Overview*. Available at: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/>. Accessed March 2, 2011.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD). 2010. *Employment by Industry Data*. Available at: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?pageid=166>. Accessed October 13, 2010.
- CH2M HILL. 2011. *Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and Finding of No Significant Impact/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District Integrated Regional Water Management Program – Groundwater Production Element Project*. August.
- Cleland, Robert Glass. 1962. *The Cattle on a Thousand Hills, Southern California, 1850–1880*. San Marino: The Huntington Library.
- Council on Environmental Quality. 2010. *Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change the Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Available at: http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/regs/Consideration_of_Effects_of_GHG_Draft_NEPA_Guidance_FINAL_02182010.pdf. February.
- Dow, Wayne G. 2008. *History of River Garden Farms Company*. Available at: <http://www.gwdow.net/pdf/files/rivgarfmi.pdf>. Accessed May 17, 2011.
- Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD). 2010a. *2010 FRAQMD Area Designations for State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards*. <http://www.fraqmd.org/2004%20Area%20Designations.htm>. Accessed June 9, 2011.

- Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD). 2010b. *Indirect Source Review Guidelines*. June. Available at: <http://www.fraqmd.org/PlanningTools.htm>. Accessed June 9, 2011.
- Fredrickson, D.A. 1974. "Cultural Diversity in Early Central California: A View from the North Coast Ranges." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 1(1):41-53.
- Hemker, C.J. 2011. MicroFEM Web site. Available at: <http://www.microfem.com>. Accessed July 5, 2011.
- Johnson, Patti J. 1978. "Patwin." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8, California, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 350-360. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- MBK Engineers. 2010. *Final Summary of 2009 Drought Water Bank Water Transfer Monitoring for Pelger Mutual Water Company*. May.
- National Park Service. 2011. *Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. Available at: http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_0.htm. Accessed September 22, 2011.
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). 1995. *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*. Ms. on file. Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento, California. March.
- Olmsted, F.H. and G.H. Davis. 1961. *Geologic Features and Ground-Water Storage Capacity of the Sacramento Valley, California*. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1497. Prepared in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources.
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company. 2011. Small Agricultural Electric Rates. Available at: <http://www.pge.com/notes/rates/tariffs/electric.shtml#SMALLAG>. Accessed July 2011.
- Page, R.W. 1986. *Geology of the Fresh Groundwater Basin of the Central Valley, California, With Texture Maps and Sections*. U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 1401-C.
- Pisani, Donald J. 2002. *Water and American Government, the Reclamation Bureau, National Water Policy and the West, 1902-1935*. University of California Press.
- Rimpo and Associates. 2007. URBEMIS2007 for Windows software. Version 9.2.4.
- Sacramento Valley Air Quality Engineering and Enforcement Professionals. 2010. *Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area, 2009 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan*. June. Available at: http://www.fraqmd.org/air_quality_plans.htm. Accessed June 10, 2011.
- Sutter County. 2010a. *General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. September.
- Sutter County. 2010b. *Climate Action Plan*. July. Available at: http://www.co.sutter.ca.us/doc/government/depts/cs/ps/gp/gp_documents. Accessed June 10, 2011.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2011a. Population Estimates. Available at: <http://www.census.gov/popest/housing/HU-EST2009-4.html>. Accessed March 2, 2011.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2011b. State and County QuickFacts, Median Household Income, 2008. Available at: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/>. Accessed July 2011.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistic Service. 2011. *County Agricultural Commissioners' Data*. Available at: http://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_State/California/Publications/AgComm/Detail/index.asp. Accessed July 2011.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2007. *Census of Agriculture*.
- U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. 2011. Monthly Retail On-Highway Diesel Prices. Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/oog/info/wohdp/diesel.asp>. Accessed July 2011.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2011. *Glossary of Climate Change Terms*. Available at: <http://epa.gov/climatechange/glossary.html>. Accessed July 2011.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010a. *Climate Change, Basic Information*. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/basicinfo.html>. Accessed July 2011.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010b. *Climate Change, Science*. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/index.html>. Accessed July 2011.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2009. Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases, Final Rule (40 CFR Parts 86, 87, 89 et al.) *Federal Register*. 74(209): 56260-56519.
- University of California Cooperative Extension. 2011. Cost of Production Studies. Various Crops and Dates. Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics. Davis, California. Available at: <http://coststudies.ucdavis.edu>. Accessed July 2011.
- Wilson, Norman L. and Arlean H. Towne. 1978. "Nisenan." In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 387-397. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8; William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Yuba City. 2004. *Yuba City General Plan*. April.