
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA/IS-09-080)

*BUENA VISTA WASTER STORAGE DISTRICT
BV8 STATE WATER PROJECT TURNOUT*

**Appendix B
California Environmental Quality Act Environmental Checklist**

December 2011

**APPENDIX B
CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title:

BV8 State Water Project Turnout

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

CEQA Lead Agency

Buena Vista Water Storage District
P. O. Box 756
525 North Main Street
Buttonwillow, CA 93206

NEPA Lead Agency

Bureau of Reclamation
South-Central California Area Office
1243 N Street
Fresno, CA 93721

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Dan Bartel, Engineer-Manager
Buena Vista Water Storage District
(661) 324-1101

Rain Healer, Natural Resources Specialist
Bureau of Reclamation
(559) 487-5196

4. Project Location:

Southwesterly quarter of Section 9, Township 30 South, Range 24 East, Mount Diablo Meridian (MDM), between the California Aqueduct and the West Side Canal

See Figures 1-1 and 1-2 of the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for Buena Vista Water Storage District BV8 State Water Project Turnout (EA/IS).

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Buena Vista Water Storage District
P. O. Box 756
525 North Main Street
Buttonwillow, CA 93206

6. General Plan Designation: Intensive Agriculture/Flood Hazard

7. Zoning: Intensive Agriculture/Flood Hazard

8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheet(s) if necessary.)

See page 1 of the EA/IS.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)

See page 2 of the EA/IS.

10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- California Department of Water Resources (Encroachment Permits)
- State Water Resources Control Board (Notice of Intent to Comply with Construction Stormwater Regulations)
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Section 7 Consultation)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401 Water Quality Certification)
- Bureau of Reclamation (2009 Challenge Grant)
- California Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement)
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404 Department of the Army Permit)

B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Land Use/Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation/Traffic
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Agriculture Resources
- Biological Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Mineral Resources
- Population/Housing
- Recreation
- Utilities/Service Systems

C. **DETERMINATION** (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

David F. Scriven
KRIEGER & STEWART, INCORPORATED
District Consulting Engineer
BUENA VISTA WATER STORAGE DISTRICT

Date

D. 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 will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may 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 is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR 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 (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analyses 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 Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which 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, 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:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Facilities pursuant to the Project are primarily belowground, and aboveground portions of the proposed facilities are relatively small and unobtrusive. The Project will not adversely impact a scenic vista.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

There are no officially designated state scenic highways located in Kern County. There are several eligible scenic highways located in the eastern portion of Kern County; however, the nearest one, State Highway 14, is greater than 60 miles easterly of the Project site. Further, facilities pursuant to the Project will be constructed on land between two man-made surface water channels (the California Aqueduct and the West Side Canal), adjacent to a flood plain. The area is sparsely vegetated, and there are no trees or rock outcroppings present; therefore, the Project does not have the potential to substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Facilities pursuant to the Project will be located on vacant land between the California Aqueduct and the West Side Canal. Said facilities will be primarily belowground, and the aboveground portions will be relatively small and unobtrusive and will be located within and adjacent to the two man-made channels cited above. Any visual impacts resulting from the aboveground portions of the proposed facilities will be less than significant. The Project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project site or its surroundings.

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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not include any features that would create substantial new sources of light or glare. Any lighting included in the Project will be for safety and security and will be directed downward.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the Rural Land Mapping Edition Kern County Important Farmland 2006 maps prepared by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the Division of Land Resource Protection, California Department of Conservation, and will not convert any lands so designated to non-agricultural use.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project site is zoned Agriculture/Flood Hazard by the Kern County General Plan (2007); however, public utility uses are approved uses in these zoning designations. There is no Williamson Act contract in effect on the parcels that will be disturbed by the Project. The Project does not have the potential to conflict with existing zoning for agriculture or with a Williamson Act contract.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Project will result in the permanent conversion of 0.9 acres of land designated as Grazing Land by the FMMP to non-agricultural use. Based on the fact that this area of land is not being used for grazing, and its current use appears to be illegal dumping and off-road vehicle use, BVWSD has determined that the conversion of this area to non-agricultural use is less than significant.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

An air quality analysis for the Project is included in Sections 3.8 and 3.9 of the EA/IS. The Project will result in air pollutant emissions during construction and operation; however, said emissions will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The Project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation. See also III.a. above, and refer to the air quality analysis in Sections 3.8 and 3.9 of the EA/IS.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Project region is designated as nonattainment for ozone (federal and state standards), PM_{2.5} (federal and state standards), and PM₁₀ (state standards). The region has been designated attainment for PM₁₀ under federal standards as of December 12, 2008. For all other criteria pollutants (i.e. CO, NO_x, SO₂, SO_x, and lead), the Project area is designated as attainment. The Project is anticipated to generate air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of Project facilities. Air pollutant emissions resulting from construction vehicles and activities will be less than significant and short-term. Additional vehicle trips to the Project site for operation and maintenance include approximately two trips per day, generally during the District's water year (late May to mid-August), which will not result in significant air quality impacts. The Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SJVAB Program region is designated nonattainment. Refer also to the air quality analysis included in Sections 3.8 and 3.9 of the EA/IS, which includes an analysis and discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change impacts relevant to the Project.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Project will not emit substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the nearest potentially occupied building is located approximately one mile from the Project site.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project will not create objectionable odors.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- 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 California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Live Oak Associates, Inc. (LOA) surveyed the Project site on July 3, 2008, and their evaluation of biological resources at the site is included in the report, Biological Evaluation for the Buena Vista Water Storage District Aqueduct Turnout Project, Kern County, California (Alternative 4), dated October 7, 2008 (LOA Report). A copy of the LOA Report is available for review at the BVWSD office upon request.

LOA subsequently performed additional, species-specific surveys during May through July, 2009 for blunt-nosed leopard lizard, San Joaquin antelope squirrel, San Joaquin kit fox, and burrowing owl. The results of these species-specific surveys are included in a letter report, Biological Surveys of the Proposed Buena Vista Water Storage Districts Proposed Turnout at the California Aqueduct, Kern County, California from LOA to the District, dated July 31, 2009 (LOA Additional Surveys Report), a copy of which is available for review at the BVWSD office upon request.

The discussions of biological resources and potential impacts on such resources by the Project included herein are based on information contained in the LOA Report and the LOA Additional Surveys Report cited above. According to these reports, no sensitive species were observed during surveys of the Project area; however, records searches of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Electronic Inventory indicate the potential presence of sensitive species at the Project site. Mitigation measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) intended to avoid, or reduce to a level less than significant, adverse impacts upon biological resources are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix C of the EA/IS.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Construction of the reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) component of the Project includes temporary trenching across the Kern River Flood Channel. Once installation of the RCP is complete, the Kern River Flood Channel will be returned to its original condition and grade.

Once BV8 facilities are constructed, operation and maintenance of said facilities will not interfere with the Kern River Flood Channel. Therefore, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

A wetland delineation was not conducted at the Project site; however, according to the LOA Report, wetland resources are sparse or absent at the Project site and at the Kern River Flood Channel.

As stated in the LOA Report, the Kern River Flood Channel is not identified as a wetland in the Project vicinity; however, USACE and CDFG have each asserted jurisdiction over the Kern River Flood Channel in the past at locations approximately four miles southeast and approximately 22 miles north of the Project site.

The Project is not expected to have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. BVWSD will submit a Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration to CDFG and will apply for a Department of the Army Permit from USACE and a Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, Central Valley Region. The Project will be implemented in conformance with the requirements of the permitting agencies.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

The Project will temporarily disturb approximately 4.1 acres of land, and will permanently disturb approximately 0.9 acre of land, at the Project site. Completed Project facilities will be located primarily belowground and will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Additionally, the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project (copy included in Appendix C of the EA/IS), will be implemented in order to ensure that the Project will not substantially impact any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or their habitats.

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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not conflict with any known local policies or ordinances.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

The following has been excerpted from page 43 of the LOA Report for the Project:

"The Kern Water Bank Habitat Conservation Plan/NCCP service area encompasses the proposed Project Site. Other approved habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, regional or state habitat conservation plans are in effect for the area of the proposed project. These include the Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan (MBHCP) and the Occidental of Elk Hill Section 7 Consultation (OXY Section 7). The proposed project will not conflict with the operation or goals of the Kern Water Bank HCP/NCCP, MBHCP, and OXY Section 7 therefore; the proposed project will have no effect on such plans."

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Three Girls and a Shovel, LLC (TG&S) conducted a cultural resources assessment of the Project site, and the findings and conclusions of said assessment are set forth in the report, A Cultural Resources Assessment for Three Possible Locations for a Water Turnout and Underground Pipeline from the California Aqueduct to the West Side Canal, Kern County, California, dated October 2008 and revised April 2010 (TG&S Report), a copy of which is available for review at BVWSD's office upon request. Discussions included in V.a. and V.b. herein are based upon information included in the TG&S Report.

The Project's Area of Potential Effects (APE) consists of an area 100 feet wide along the Project's pipeline alignment (fifty feet on each side of the centerline) between the California Aqueduct and the West Side Canal. Although there are no resources within the Project's APE that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Inventory of Historic Places, California State Historic Landmarks, or the California Points of Historic Interest, the TG&S Report identified two historic resources and one historic isolate within the Project's APE.

The California Aqueduct and the West Side Canal are each considered historic resources, and have been recorded on appropriate forms. Additionally, the California Aqueduct may be eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criteria A and Criteria C. The West Side Canal may be eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criteria A. Because the Project will not alter the form or function of the California Aqueduct or the West Side Canal, and will not alter, either directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of these two resources that may qualify them for inclusion in the NRHP, the Project will not adversely affect the California Aqueduct or the West Side Canal.

The historic isolate found during the cultural resources survey within the APE is termed Isolate No. 4 and is described in the TG&S Report as follows:

"IF #4 is a medicinal bottle dating to pre-1920. It is 4-1/2 inches high, and the bottom diameter is 1-3/4 inches. It is made in a two part mold and has an obvious pontil mark on the bottom with the number '13' and a diamond shape. The word "LISTERINE" is embossed near the top of the bottle, and the words "LAMBERT PHARMACAL COMPANY" and are embossed near the base. The lip at the bottle opening is ground smooth and would have been stoppered with a cork."

According to the TG&S Report, the flood plain within the APE has been a dumping ground for many years and it is covered with household trash, old tires, and sheep carcasses. It is likely that a number of historic artifacts could be found in the general area, but as remains of individual dumping incidents, they are of little relevance or importance. Isolate No. 4 has been recorded to the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

For the reasons described above, the Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any known historical resources; however, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f), "...a lead agency should make provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction." Such provisions are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration included in Appendix C of the EA/IS.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Based on the TG&S Report, indigenous peoples are known to have occupied the southern San Joaquin Valley for over 10,000 years, and several archaeological sites have been excavated in the region to depths of 10 to 15 feet. Therefore, the region in which the Project is located (southern San Joaquin Valley) is considered to be highly archaeologically sensitive.

One archaeological isolate, Isolate No. 1, was found during the cultural resources survey and was located at the base of the east bank of the Kern River Flood Channel. Isolate No. 1 is described as "an obsidian needle", a naturally formed piece of obsidian approximately 9.2 centimeters long. This artifact is not eligible for listing on the NRHP as it has been removed from its original location and all information potential has been exhausted. Isolate No. 1 has been drawn, photographed, and recorded to the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4) states that "if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment."

For the reasons described above, the Project will not result in a significant impact upon any known archaeological resources; however, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f), "...a lead agency should make provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction." Such provisions are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration included in Appendix C of the EA/IS.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

A paleontological sensitivity analysis was conducted for the Project and is described in the report, Paleontological Sensitivity Analysis for Buena Vista Water District New Canal Construction, dated November 22, 2008 (Paleontological Analysis), a copy of which is included in Appendix F of the Feasibility Study Report for New Turnout from State Water Project Aqueduct (Kennedy/Jenks Consultants 2008), which is available at the District's office for review upon request.

The Paleontological Analysis describes various sediments in the Project area, including near-shore depositional sediments. Of the various depositional environments identified in the Paleontological Analysis, "the near-shore zone is the most likely to contain vertebrate or significant invertebrate fossils. In Ice Age time, animals could have been trapped and preserved in quicksand on the margins of Lake Buttonwillow. Mammoth, bison, horse, and other mammal remains have been found in...other Ice Age lakes in southern California. Fragmentary vertebrate fossil remains, and teeth (rodents) have been found in surface soils throughout the San Joaquin Valley."

The near-shore depositional environment that may be impacted by the Project is described in the text, and depicted in Figure 7, of the Paleontological Analysis (Kennedy/Jenks Consultants 2008). Based upon the recommendations of the Paleontological Analysis, a paleontologist will be present during excavations in the near-shore depositional environment zone in order to identify paleontological resources that may be uncovered. Refer to mitigation measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration included in Appendix C of the EA/IS.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Project facilities will not be constructed in the vicinity of any known cemeteries or burial grounds; however, if human remains are encountered during construction, the County Coroner will be notified immediately, and all work in the area will be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist and historian can evaluate the nature and significance of the find(s). The Project will comply with §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Refer also to Mitigation Measure "CUL 3: Discovery of Human Remains" in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix C of the EA/IS for the Project.

Issues:

	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact			

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Based on the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology publication Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California and Adjacent Portions of Nevada (1998) and Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42, BVWSD's Service Area is not located within a known fault zone. The nearest fault is the White Wolf Fault, which is located approximately six miles southeasterly of the Maples Service Area. The San Andreas Fault (Parkfield) is located greater than twenty miles westerly of the Buttonwillow Service Area. The Project does not include any activities that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See VI.a.i. above.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

See VI.a.i. above.

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

See VI.a.i. above.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not include any activities that would have the potential to result in any soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Refer also to the mitigation measure "BIO 1: Special Status Plant Species", which includes measures involving salvaging topsoil. BIO 1 is included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix C of the EA/IS.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Project facilities are located on soils classified as Buttonwillow clay, drained (map unit symbol 123) and Garces silt loam (map unit symbol 156), according to the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, data generated on 12/31/2009.

The Project does not include construction of any facilities that are intended for human occupation. Facilities pursuant to the Project will not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of said facilities. The Project is not expected to result in loss, injury, or death involving onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

According to the Soil Survey of Kern County, California, Northwestern Part, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service (September 1988), Buttonwillow clay, drained is a fine-textured soil with high shrink-swell potential, while Garces silt loam is not known to be expansive. Although Buttonwillow clay, drained is known to have expansive properties, the facilities proposed pursuant to the Project do not include construction of any facilities that are intended for human occupation and will not create substantial risks to life or property.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project will not generate any sanitary wastewater, and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems are proposed.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not involve the generation of any hazardous emissions or the transport, use, storage, or disposal of any hazardous materials.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not involve the storage or use of hazardous materials and will not 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.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The Project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which 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"/>

The Project site is not located on or adjacent to a site which is included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, as available on www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov, which is a publicly-accessible database maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. The Project will not be impacted by hazardous materials sites.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, 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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The nearest public airport is the Buttonwillow-Kern County Airport, which is located in Section 2, Township 30 South, Range 23 East, MDM, approximately 3.5 miles northwesterly of the Project site. The Project does not include the construction of any facilities or any activities that could pose a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. The Project does not have the potential to interfere with air traffic or flight patterns.

f) For a project 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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Area. See also VII.e. above.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

The Project has no potential to affect any known emergency response or evacuation plan.

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 where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Apart from an insignificant risk of fire from construction activities, the Project has no potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

In implementing the Project, the District will comply with all applicable water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, and the requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be 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 which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The Project does not include the extraction or use of groundwater and will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is mostly located in Zone X, which is defined as "areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain". The northernmost portions of facilities pursuant to the Project, which cross beneath the Kern River Flood Channel and are adjacent to, or in, the West Side Canal right-of-way are located in areas designated Zone A, which is defined as Special Flood Hazard Areas Subject to Inundation by the 1% Annual Chance Flood (100-Year Flood), with No Base Flood Elevations Determined. Flood zones and definitions were obtained from the Flood Insurance Rate Map, Map Number 06029C2225E, effective September 26, 2008, prepared by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Project does not include any features that would substantially alter existing drainage patterns in the site or area.

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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area and will not substantially increase the rate or quantities of surface runoff. See also VIII.c. above.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Facilities included in the Project are primarily belowground. Aboveground facilities include the reinforced concrete turnout on the California Aqueduct, the outlet structure in the West Side Canal (including rip-rap in the discharge area), and the electrical building and its appurtenances. Aboveground facilities are not of a size sufficient to contribute substantial quantities of runoff; therefore, the Project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. See also VIII.c. and VIII.d. above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Standard construction best management practices (BMPs) will be incorporated during construction in order to avoid, or reduce to a level of insignificance, adverse impacts that may occur from soil erosion, storm water runoff, or both, as a result of construction activities pursuant to the Project. Therefore, the Project will not substantially degrade water quality. A list of the District's standard construction BMPs is available from the District upon request. The Project will comply with all water quality requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not include construction of housing or other structures intended for human occupation.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project does not include placement of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows in a 100-year flood hazard area. See also VIII.c. and VIII.e. above.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not include the construction or modification of any facilities that would have the potential to expose people or structures to loss, injury, or death as a result of flooding.

j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project does not include construction of any facilities that are intended for human occupation. Further, the Project area is not located near any bodies of water of a size sufficient to result in seiches or tsunamis. The Project will not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

The Project does not include the construction of facilities with the potential to divide an established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the 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?

The Project does not have the potential to alter existing land uses and does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

See IV.f. herein.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

There are no known mineral resources at the Project site. The Project does not have the potential to impact the availability of any mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See X.a. above.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of 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?

The Project will result in noise generated during construction and operation of BV8 facilities. Construction noise will be less than significant and short-term. Noise generated during operation will result from approximately two vehicle trips by District personnel to the BV8 facilities per day. Noise generated during operation will be minimal and less than significant. All noise resulting from the Project will comply with the Noise Element of the Kern County General Plan (2009) and with the noise control provisions set forth in Chapter 8.36 of the Ordinance Code of Kern County.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The Project will not generate excessive levels of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The nearest potentially occupied building is approximately one mile away from the Project site, and any groundborne noise or groundborne vibration generated during construction activities is not likely to be perceptible at that distance from the site.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Noise resulting from operation and maintenance of the Project facilities will consist of noise generated by approximately two vehicle trips by District personnel to the BV8 facilities on each operational day and will be less than significant. See also XI.a. above.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The nearest public airport is the Buttonwillow-Kern County Airport, which is located in Section 2, Township 30 South, Range 23 East, MDM, approximately 3.5 miles northwesterly of the Project site. The Project will not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. See also XI.a. above.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will not generate any substantial noise, and will not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 road or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project is intended to improve the District's operational flexibility and will have no effect on population growth.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not include any features that will require the destruction or relocation of existing housing or the construction of replacement housing.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not include destruction or construction of any housing, and will not increase or decrease the number of available dwelling units in the area. The Project will not displace any people.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the 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 public services:

Fire protection?

The Project does not include any features or facilities that will require additional or unusual fire protection resources.

Police protection?

The Project does not include any features or facilities that will be occupied or that will otherwise require enhanced levels of police protection.

Schools?

The Project does not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population, and will therefore not result in a greater or lesser demand for schools.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project does not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population, and will therefore not result in a greater or lesser demand for parks.

Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will not adversely affect any public facilities.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. RECREATION. Would the 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population, and will therefore not result in increased or decreased use of parks or other recreational facilities.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

There will be a temporary increase in traffic during construction of the Project facilities, which will be minimal and short-term. Operation of facilities pursuant to the Project is expected to result in two vehicle trips by District personnel per day to the site. Vehicle trips will generally take place on operational days during the District's water year, which typically extends from late May through mid-August.

Traffic resulting from the Project will not increase substantially in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The Project will not result in any substantial changes in land, water, or air traffic patterns.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The Project does not include any features which would significantly impact traffic patterns or which would exceed any level of service standards established for designated roads or highways. See also XV.a. above.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project will have no impact upon air traffic patterns.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will have no impact upon street design and will not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will have no impact on emergency access in the area. See also XV.d. above.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will have no impact on parking capacity in the area. Existing rights-of-way and access roads will allow for parking as needed for operation and maintenance visits to the Project facilities.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project will not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will not generate wastewater.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will not require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will not require or result in the construction or expansion of any storm water drainage facilities.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project consists of constructing and operating new turnout facilities to convey water from the California Aqueduct to the West Side Canal. SWP water that will be conveyed during operation of the Project facilities is that which is included in the District's existing agreements for SWP water. No new or expanded entitlements are needed. The Project will provide the District additional distribution system flexibility in using existing contracted SWP water.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will not generate sanitary wastewater.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Small quantities of solid waste may be generated during construction of facilities pursuant to the Project; however, said quantities of solid waste will be minimal and will be accommodated by a local landfill.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. See also XVI.f. above.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or threatened species 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

If unmitigated, the Project may significantly impact biological, cultural, or paleontological resources; therefore, mitigation measures intended to avoid, or reduce to a level less than significant, adverse impacts to biological, cultural, and paleontological resources are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix C of the EA/IS. With incorporation of said mitigation measures, the Project is not expected to have a significant effect upon the environment. See also Sections IV and V herein.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the 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"/>

The Project is not expected to result in any cumulatively considerable impacts. Mitigation measures intended to avoid, or reduce to a level less than significant, adverse impacts upon biological resources, cultural resources, and paleontological resources are incorporated into the Project. The Project is not expected to result in any cumulatively considerable impacts. A more detailed discussion of cumulative impacts is included in Section 3.10 of the EA/IS.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project is intended to improve operational flexibility and water use efficiency within the District's distribution system. The Project does not include any actions or facilities that will have adverse effects upon human beings.