

Attachment C

Effects Not Found to be Significant

ATTACHMENT C

EFFECTS NOT FOUND SIGNIFICANT

This attachment briefly discusses possible effects of the proposed project that, regardless of the alternative selected for implementation, would not be significant and which therefore do not require a detailed evaluation in Chapter 3.0 of the EIS/EIR. The range of possible effects is based on the guidance contained in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines. The previous Draft EIS/EIR assessment of effects not found significant was revised and updated based on the current physical, human, and regulatory environment of the proposed project. The revisions also reflect changes to the State CEQA Guidelines that occurred subsequent to circulation of the previous Draft EIS/EIR.

The numeric and lettering system used in this Attachment follows the system used in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines. Note that some numbers and letters are skipped because the respective topics are addressed in Chapter 3.0 of the EIS/EIR.

I. AESTHETICS

(a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? The project area is remote and has a low profile. As such, no scenic vista, view open to the public, or other visual resource would be affected from implementation of the proposed project.

(b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? The canal is not visible from a state scenic highway. Any disturbance to vegetation associated with project construction would be difficult to discern from the State Highway 111, and would not constitute a substantial change to scenic resources.

(c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because the project has a low profile, disturbances would be limited to a linear corridor along the existing canal alignment, and mature vegetation (trees) removed or destroyed during construction would be replaced.

(d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? The proposed project would not create any new source of light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

(a) Would the project 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? Lining the existing canal or constructing a parallel canal would not affect any farmland or grazing land. Accordingly, the project would not convert any farmland—including Prime, Unique, or Statewide Importance Farmland—to non-agricultural uses.

(b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? The proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning because it would not affect the viability of developing agricultural operations on any land zoned for agriculture. Additionally, the proposed project would not change any farmland to non-agricultural use, and it would not affect any lands under Williamson Act contracts.

(c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? Lining the Coachella Canal or constructing a parallel canal would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

(e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? The proposed project would not create any objectionable odors because no objectionable-smelling substances would be required for the construction or maintenance of the canal lining.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

(a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-

related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides? Implementation of any of the project alternatives would result in no net change to the area's existing exposure to earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failures, or similar hazards.

(e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

(c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project, and lining the canal would not require the use of, or result in the generation of, acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes.

(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? There are no airports within the project vicinity; therefore, no hazards would occur due to the location of the project relative to an airport.

(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? There are no airports or private airstrips within the project vicinity.

(g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Due to the remoteness of the project area, there would be no interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan as a result of implementation of any of the project alternatives.

(h) Would the project 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? The proposed project does not involve creating new habitable structures or relocating people to new areas; accordingly, the project would not expose people or structures to wildland fire hazards.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

(g) Would the project 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? The proposed project would not entail the construction of any housing.

(h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? All of the project alternatives would utilize the existing siphons that allow flood flows to pass over the canal alignment; accordingly, there would be no change in 100-year flood flows in the project area.

XI. NOISE

(a) Would the project result in the 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? Project construction would not generate excessive noise, and 97 percent of the project area is undeveloped. Based on these factors, canal lining or the construction of a parallel canal would not expose people to noise generation in excess of standards established in a general plan or noise ordinance.

(b) Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? Lining the existing canal or constructing a new canal would not require activities that generate groundborne noise levels. No blasting is expected to be required during construction of a parallel canal.

(c) Would the project cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? There would be no noticeable long-term increase in noise levels associated with any of the project alternatives.

(d) Would the project cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Construction of the canal lining project would generate noise in the vicinity of the canal site for two to three years. These noise levels would not result in a significant impact because (1) approximately 97 percent of the land along the canal is undeveloped, and (2) construction activity would proceed linearly along the canal, limiting the amount of exposure to any one location.

(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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The proposed project is not located near an airport.

(f) 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? The proposed project is not located near a private airstrip.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

(a) Would the project 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; police protection; schools; parks; or other public facilities? Because construction of the proposed project would result in an insignificant population influx to local communities for a short duration, there would be no need for new or substantial alterations to any of the services or facilities listed above.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

(a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? The proposed project would not generate wastewater and would therefore not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin.

(b) Would the project 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? The proposed project would not generate wastewater and would therefore not require new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

(c) Would the project 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? The proposed project would not require the construction of stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities.

(d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? The proposed project would result in a net increase in the amount of available water in southern California, as described in Chapter 1.0 of the EIS/EIR under the heading, "Purpose and Need."

(e) Would the project 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? The proposed project would not require wastewater treatment services

(f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Construction would generate negligible waste in comparison to regional landfill capacities, and there would be no long-term generation of solid waste associated with the proposed project.

(g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? All construction-related solid wastes would be disposed of in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. There would be no long-term (post-construction) waste generation associated with the proposed project.