Appendix B

Environmental Checklist

B. Environmental Checklist

Project Title:	Del Rio Tank and Wells Project
Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Modesto Utilities Department P.O. Box 642 (1010 Tenth Street) Modesto, CA 95353
Contact Person and Phone Number:	Tamorah Bryant, Senior Civil Engineer (209) 577-5205
Project Location:	Unincorporated Stanislaus County Site A: APN 004-077-018 and 004-077-019 (718 Ladd Road), southeast of the intersection of Ladd Road and St. John Road Site B: APN 004-102-003, northwest of the intersection of McHenry Avenue and Stewart Road (portion near Stewart Road)
County General Plan Designation:	Site A: AG, Agriculture Site B: PD, Planned Development
County Zoning Classifications:	Site A: A-2-40, 40-acre lot Agriculture Site B: PD, Planned Development
Description of Project:	See EIR Chapter 2, *Project Description*
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	Site A: vacant on the west parcel, 1 single-family house and accessory buildings on the east parcel Site B: vacant land, formerly agriculture
Other Public Agencies whose Approval or Input May Be Needed:	▪ California State Water Resources Control Board ▪ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board ▪ California Department of Public Health ▪ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District ▪ Stanislaus County ▪ Modesto Irrigation District

1. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

In accordance with Section 15168 of the California Code of Regulations, this Initial Study discloses whether the proposed project described in Chapter 2 may cause any project-specific significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for the Water System Engineer's Report (City of Modesto 2010) and whether new or additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be required as a result. The Initial Study thereby documents whether or not the Proposed Project is "within the scope" of the Program EIR. Topics fully evaluated in the EIR for the Proposed Project were chosen because this IS identified the potential for a significant impact beyond that identified and analyzed in the Program EIR. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Program EIR and additional project-specific mitigation measures identified in the Proposed Project EIR would be applied to the Proposed Project as necessary to reduce impacts to a level that is less than significant.

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this Proposed Project (i.e., the Project would involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact"), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

[X] Aesthetics	[ ] Agricultural and Forestry Resources	[X] Air Quality
[X] Biological Resources	[X] Cultural Resources	[X] Geology / Soils
[X] Greenhouse Gas Emissions	[ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials	[X] Hydrology / Water Quality
[X] Land Use & Planning	[ ] Mineral Resources	[X] Noise
[ ] Population & Housing	[ ] Public Services	[ ] Recreation
[ ] Transportation/Traffic	[ ] Utilities & Service Systems	[ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance

2. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

The degree of change from existing conditions resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project is compared to the impact evaluation criteria to determine if the change is significant. Where it is determined that one or more significant impacts could result from implementation of the Proposed Project that was not examined in Program EIR, the topic is carried forward for analysis in the EIR. Existing conditions serve as a baseline for evaluating the impacts of the Proposed Project.

The following terminology is used in this document to describe the various levels of environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project:

- A finding of *no impact* is identified if the analysis concludes that the Proposed Project would not affect a particular environmental topical area in any way.

- An impact is considered *less than significant* if the analysis concludes that the Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the environment.

- An impact would be considered to have *potentially significant issues* if the analysis concludes that the Proposed Project could cause a significant environmental impact. A program that potentially produces significant impact(s) warrants a greater level of analysis and consideration provided by an EIR.

3. CEQA Environmental Checklist

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X		
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a designated scenic highway?	X		
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X		

The Proposed Project would involve construction and operation of quasi-industrial uses (water storage tank, wells, pump station building, security lighting) in an area that is currently occupied by and surrounded by open space, agricultural fields, and residential uses. In addition, the Program EIR identified potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.1-9–3.1-11). The potential exists for the Proposed Project to result in significant impacts. Therefore, a full analysis of the Proposed Project's potential effects on aesthetic resources is provided in the EIR.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Protection (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?			X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.2-5–3.2-8), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use – *No Impact*

According to the California Department of Conservation's map, "Stanislaus County Important Farmland 2014," Site A is designated Rural Residential and Site B is designated as Urban and Built-Up (California Department of Conservation 2015). The pipeline connecting Site A to an existing pipeline at Country Club Drive would be installed fully within the right-of-way of St. John Road and Ladd Road. The pipeline connecting Site B to an existing pipeline on Stewart Road at Grove Point Way would be installed fully within the right-of-way of McHenry Avenue. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be converted to non-agricultural use for this project. No additional impact on Prime Agricultural land is anticipated, compared to the Program EIR. There would be **no impact**.

Note that the Program EIR identified this impact as significant and unavoidable because other projects would adversely affect Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, this Project does not adversely affect any Prime Agricultural land.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract – *No Impact*

According to the California Department of Conservation, no Williamson Act contracts are in effect on the project sites (California Department of Conservation 2012). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract.

Site B is zoned as P-D (Planned Development) and therefore would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use. The Site A and Site B pipelines would be installed within road rights-of-way and therefore would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses.

Site A is zoned as A-2-40 (General Agriculture District), which permits various uses, including (but not limited to) agricultural uses, single-family dwellings, mobile homes, buildings and appurtenances that are incidental or related to farming purposes, garage sales, and temporary agricultural service airports. According to Section 21.20.030 of the Stanislaus County Code, the A-2 district allows "Tier Three" uses that are not directly related to agriculture but may be necessary to serve the A-2 district. Specifically, public buildings and facilities for public utilities may be permitted on parcels zoned A-2, but such uses are subject to permit approval by the Stanislaus County Planning Commission. In addition, the Agricultural Element of the *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015* includes buffer setback guidelines for new or expanding uses in or adjacent to parcels zoned A-2, requiring that all projects incorporate a minimum 150-foot-wide buffer setback (Stanislaus County 2016a). Uses permitted within the buffer area include utilities, drainage facilities, landscaping, parking lots, and similar low-intensity uses.

The proposed facilities would likely meet the "Tier Three" criteria of a permitted use. Although agricultural uses are located immediately east of Site A, a berm and retention basin would be constructed within the 150-foot-wide buffer setback, both of which qualify as permitted buffer uses. As required by County Code, the City would apply for a use permit from Stanislaus County. In addition, Site A is currently occupied by a residence and is not used for agricultural

purposes. For these reasons, the Proposed Project would not result in a conflict with the County's zoning district. There would be **no impact**.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning for forest land. No zoning for forest land or timberland is identified in the project area (Stanislaus County 2015) and Stanislaus County does not classify land as Timberland Protection Zones. There would be **no impact**.

d) Cause a loss of forest lands – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest lands or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No zoning for forest land is identified in the project area (Stanislaus County 2015). There would be **no impact** on forest lands.

e) Cause changes to the existing environment due to conversion of agricultural or forest lands – *No Impact*

As mentioned in items (a) and (b) above, the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly lead to changes in the existing environment that could have adverse effects on agricultural land. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **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:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans?	X		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X		

Explanations

a-d) Conflict with air quality plans, violate air quality standards, result in cumulatively considerable increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The Proposed Project would be located in Stanislaus County, which is one of eight counties that comprise the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (Basin). The County's portion of the Basin has been designated as nonattainment for the federal and state standards for ozone and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), as well as for the state standard for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (CARB 2016, USEPA 2016). The portion of the Basin within Stanislaus County is in attainment or unclassified for all other criteria pollutants. The SJVAPCD has developed air quality plans for ozone and $PM_{2.5}$, as required under the Clean Air Act.

The Proposed Project would have the potential to emit PM from ground-disturbing construction activities and to emit ozone precursor pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides) from fuel combustion by construction equipment, materials delivery and fill hauling vehicles, and construction worker vehicle trips. In addition, diesel PM, a toxic air contaminant, would be emitted from equipment and vehicles using diesel as a fuel source. These construction-related emissions could occur near or adjacent to sensitive receptors. These impacts would be **potentially significant**. This issue is investigated further in the Proposed Project EIR.

The project area is not within an area identified as likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), which is a toxic air contaminant. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Proposed Project's ground-disturbing activities would result in any NOA emissions.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people – *Potentially Significant Issue*

Construction of the Proposed Project components could generate objectionable odors through emissions of diesel particulate matter by construction equipment and through the use of diesel emergency backup generators during project operations. These impacts would be **potentially significant** and are investigated further in the EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X		
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
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?			X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X
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?	X		

Explanations

a) Substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species - *Potentially Significant Issues*

Potential impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species could occur from direct impacts due to construction of Project components, or from Project-related modification of potential habitat. These impacts would be **potentially significant**. The EIR evaluates the potential for candidate, sensitive, or special-status species to occur in proposed improvement locations based on known occurrences and habitat requirements of these species.

b) Substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community – *No Impact*

Riparian habitat occurs in the vicinity of the project area along the Stanislaus River. Other sensitive natural communities may also be present in the project area. Potential impacts on these habitats or communities could occur as a result of construction and/or operation of the proposed wells and tank and proposed transmission pipelines at both project sites.

A field survey of Sites A and B was conducted by a trained biologist on May 4, 2016. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are present within the study area. Thus, **no impact** would result to these habitats or communities.

c) Substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands – *No Impact*

Federally protected wetlands and waters and other surface waters or wetland features may be present in the project area. Activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in the disturbance or loss of jurisdictional wetland and aquatic communities. A field survey of the Site A and Site B study areas was conducted by a trained biologist on May 4, 2016. No waters of the United States (waters of the U.S.) are present within the study area. The study area was surveyed for the presence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. None of these wetland indicators were present in the study area. The Modesto Irrigation District canal immediately south of Site A would not be affected by Proposed Project activities, based on City compliance with construction-related and operational drainage requirements as described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the EIR and in Section IX, “Hydrology,” of this Environmental Checklist. There would be **no impact**.

d) Substantial interference with wildlife movement, established wildlife corridors, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The Proposed Project could interfere with breeding or migration of wildlife species. Specifically, if construction of project components occurs during the breeding season for migratory species, impacts on these species could result. These impacts would be **potentially significant** and are evaluated in the EIR.

e) Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015* Conservation/Open Space Element (Stanislaus County 2016a) establishes several policies (notably Goal One, Policies Three and Four, and Goal Ten, Policy Twenty-nine) to protect sensitive species, along with habitats such as vernal pools, riparian habitats, and oak woodlands. The Proposed Project does not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources because no vernal pools, riparian habitats, or oak woodlands are present in the study area, based on field surveys conducted by a qualified biologist on May 4, 2016. As indicated in item (a) above, impacts on sensitive species are **potentially significant issues** and are evaluated in Chapter 6, *Biological Resources,* of the DEIR.

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 – *No Impact*

The PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation & Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan (PG&E O&M HCP) (PG&E 2006) covers specific PG&E activities throughout nine counties in the San Joaquin Valley, including Stanislaus County. The PG&E O&M HCP complies with the federal and state ESAs and addresses multiple species and critical habitats. The PG&E O&M HCP outlines steps to minimize, avoid, and compensate for possible direct, indirect, and cumulative adverse effects on threatened and endangered species that could result from PG&E operation and maintenance activities in the San Joaquin Valley. The Proposed Project is within the PG&E O&M HCP boundaries but is not within PG&E's service area and is not a covered activity under the PG&E O&M HCP.

Wildlife species covered by the PG&E O&M HCP with the potential to be affected by the Proposed Project are Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl. There is no overlap between the Proposed Project and PG&E's San Joaquin Valley O&M activities, as the Proposed Project is not located within a PG&E service area The Proposed Project would not conflict with implementation of the HCP's conservation strategy for these species because the project is not within a PG&E service area. Therefore, there would be **no impact**. In any event, the EIR for the Proposed Project includes mitigation measures to address any impacts on Burrowing Owls and Swainson's Hawk.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	X		
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in §21074?	X		

Explanations

a-b) Adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or an archaeological resource – *Potentially Significant Issues*

Historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 15064.5, include, but are not limited to, any resource that is listed, or is eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); any resource that is included in a local register of historical resources; or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant by a lead agency. Furthermore, historical resources, as defined under PRC Section 5024.1, include resources listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historical Places; State Historical Landmarks; and points of historical interest.

There is potential for the discovery of new historical resources of an archaeological nature within the project area. Potential impacts on historical resources would occur if these resources are present and would be physically disturbed by project-related construction activities (e.g., direct ground disturbance or vibration from ground disturbance). Impacts that result in de-listing of a resource from the CRHR, or render the resource ineligible for listing in the CRHR, would also be considered significant. These impacts would be **potentially significant.**

The EIR compares the locations of currently known or newly identified historical resources with the activities that make up the Proposed Project to evaluate potential effects to those resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The Proposed Project area is underlain by Pleistocene alluvial deposits consisting of poorly sorted gravel, sand, silt, and clay that are more than 400 feet thick. These materials in the Central Valley are known to contain a variety of fossils, including extinct horses, mammoths, and giant ground sloth. Other animals noted are marine-living animals such as marine turtles, shark teeth, and sea urchins (Sierra College 2016).

Directly below the alluvial deposits is the Mehrten Formation, which was deposited during the Miocene to Pliocene Epochs. The Mehrten Formation is composed of sandstone, breccia, conglomerate, tuff, siltstone, and claystone and is approximately 800 feet thick and may lie as shallow as 400 feet beneath the City of Modesto (Stanislaus and Tuolumne Rivers Groundwater Basin Association 2005). The Mehrten Formation is not known for containing fossils; however, there is a possibility that fossils could be encountered during project construction; which would constitute a **potentially significant** impact. This topic is evaluated further in the EIR.

d) Disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries – *Potentially Significant Issues*

Human remains are not currently known to exist at the project sites; however, they may be present without any surface manifestation and, as a result, could be disturbed by the Proposed Project's activities. This impact would be **potentially significant**. The EIR addresses the potential presence of and impacts on human remains during construction.

e) Adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC 21074 – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The Proposed Project is within a geographic area associated with the Northern Valley Yokuts tribes, which have a traditional and cultural affiliation with the region. Assembly Bill 52, which was enacted on May 12, 2016, requires that a state lead agency consult with California Native American tribes that have a traditional and cultural affiliation to a project area to determine if any tribal cultural resources (TCRs) would be affected by the proposed project. PRC Section 21074 defines TCRs as resources that are historical resources under California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5; cultural landscapes that meet the criteria of CCR Section 15064.5; and as unique archaeological sites under PRC Section 21083.2. There is the potential for TCRs to be located in the project area and for the Proposed Project to have an adverse change to any such resources.

The City will consult with local tribes about the presence of TCRs within the project area and, should any be identified, the protection of TCRs from project-related actions. The consultation efforts and the identification of TCRs, if present, are analyzed in the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death related to:			
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.			X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X	
iv) Landslides?			X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
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?	X		
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?		X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.6-9–3.6-10), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that, with the exception of Checklist item (c), the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to geology or soils have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review of impacts is required under CEQA except for Checklist item (c). Information presented below is based on the geotechnical investigation conducted at Site A (Blackburn Consultants 2012), Phase I Environmental Site Assessments conducted at Site A (ATC

Associates 2012a) and Site B (ATC Associates 2012b), and other information sources identified below. A geotechnical study would be completed at Site B as part of the design process.

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

i) Seismic-related rupture of a known earthquake fault – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo designated hazard zone. The nearest active faults are the Carnegie Fault (approximately 29 miles west), Greenville Fault (approximately 33 miles west), and Ortigalita Fault (approximately 36 miles southwest) (California Geological Survey 2010). Since there are no known faults in the project area, there would be **no impact** from fault rupture.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking – *Less than Significant*

As analyzed in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.6-5), the Central Valley generally experiences lower levels of more infrequent ground shaking than many other regions of California due to the substantial distance to active faults and the underlying geologic and soil conditions. In Stanislaus County, the level of seismic ground shaking ranges from "High" risk along the western border of the County and the foothills of the Diablo Range, to "Moderate" risk in the central part of the County, to "Low" risk in the eastern portion (California Geological Survey 2008). The project area lies within the Central portion of the County and is considered to be at "Moderate" risk for earthquake shaking potential. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent California Building Code seismic standards for construction, ensuring that any adverse effects to structures or people would be **less than significant**.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction – *Less Than Significant*

Settlement is the lowering of the land-surface elevation as a result of the compression, compaction, or consolidation of underlying soils, sediment, or rock. These processes are exacerbated under increased loading (e.g., additional sediment deposition or construction of structures, including fills) or the withdrawal of subsurface water. Soils consisting of fine-grained silts and clays with a high water table are more susceptible to differential settlement. Liquefaction is the temporary transformation of soils that are saturated and have very low cohesion, or are cohesionless, into a viscous liquid as a result of ground shaking. Liquefaction may occur in water-saturated soils during moderate to severe earthquakes. The potential for liquefaction to occur depends on soil composition, soil saturation levels, and the intensity and duration of seismic ground shaking.

The Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.6-9–3.6-10) noted that there may be potentially significant impacts from liquefaction if individual projects were constructed on expansive soils. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 in the Program EIR, the City hired a registered engineer to conduct a project-specific geotechnical investigation at Site A; a geotechnical investigation would be conducted at Site B as part of the design process.

Site A is underlain by Hanford soils generally have a sandy loam texture (Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] 2016). A geotechnical study for Site A (Blackburn Consulting 2012) identified loose to very dense silty sand to approximately 8 feet below ground surface (bgs), loose to medium-dense poorly graded sand to about 13–20 feet bgs, and hard elastic silt with sand to hard sandy silt at greater depths. Groundwater was encountered at 40 feet bgs. Based on the subsurface soil and groundwater conditions and the estimated magnitude and duration of ground shaking at Site A, the potential for liquefaction is considered very low.

Site B is predominantly underlain by Delhi sand with some Oakdale sandy loam (NRCS 2016). Delhi sands generally consist of sand up to 44 inches bgs with loamy fine sand at greater depths. Estimated depth to groundwater ranges between 50 and 60 feet bgs (California Department of Water Resources 2016). Based on the subsurface groundwater conditions and the estimated magnitude and duration of ground shaking at Site B, the potential for liquefaction is considered low. A geotechnical investigation would be conducted at Site B as part of the design process, to confirm the understanding of these conditions.

The proposed transmission lines connecting the new wells at Site A and Site B to the City's existing distribution system would be installed under St. John Road, McHenry Avenue, and Stewart Road. Existing soils under the roadways would be excavated and the new transmission lines constructed using suitable backfill soils and levels of compaction to meet engineering specifications.

Due to the existence of sandy loam and loamy sand soils and a relatively low water table, seismic-induced differential settlement, ground failure, or liquefaction would not be expected. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project includes the installation of production wells and extraction of groundwater resources. Groundwater withdrawal has the potential to result in subsidence and/or collapse during a seismic event and may be **potentially significant**. Analysis of groundwater resources and the Proposed Project's potential risk of land subsidence or collapse will be addressed in detail in Chapter 9, *Groundwater*, of the EIR.

iv) Landslides – *No Impact*

As described in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.6-9–3.6-10), and pursuant to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 in the Program EIR, the City hired a registered engineer to conduct project-specific geotechnical investigation at Site A; a geotechnical investigation would be conducted at Site B as part of the design process. Landslides are not likely to occur on or near the project sites. Landslides are downward movement of a slope, generally increasing in occurrence in relation to steepening slope angles, following precipitation events or saturation of soils, wildfires, and/or human disturbance. Similar to landslides but typically on gentler slopes, lateral spreading or lateral flow can occur where saturated soils lose cohesion and have a rapid, fluid-like movement.

The floor of the Central Valley where the Proposed Project is located is relatively flat, with only minor changes in topography. The Proposed Project does not include any features that would

increase the exposure of people to landslide hazards. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to landslide effects.

b) Substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil – *Less Than Significant*

Site A is underlain by Hanford sandy loam (Blackburn Consultants 2012, NRCS 2016). Hanford sandy loam has moderate infiltration rates, and is deep and well drained with moderately coarse texture. This unit has a moderate susceptibility to erosion. Site B is predominately underlain by Delhi sand with some Oakdale sandy loam (NRCS 2016). Delhi sand and Oakdale sandy loam have high infiltration rates, and are deep and well drained to excessively drained sands and gravels (NRCS 2016). Delhi sand and Oakdale sandy loam have low to moderate susceptibility to erosion.

The Proposed Project may include grading, excavation, trenching, or other construction-related activities that leave soils exposed to erosion; however, after construction, the project sites would be flat, and loss of topsoil and soil erosion would not be substantial. Compliance with statutory regulations governing discharges from construction activities, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the EIR and Section IX, "Hydrology," of this Environmental Checklist, would reduce the potential for erosion and topsoil impacts to a less-than-significant level. During facility operations at Site A, the proposed stormwater retention basin and berm slopes may be susceptible to erosion. As stated in the Project Description, however, the Proposed Project includes planting vegetation on the berms and stabilizing the slopes of the retention basin by hydroseeding or planting with drought-tolerant plants. At Site B, the wells, pipeline, and standby generator would be installed on level ground and the site would connect to the City's storm drainage system in McHenry Avenue. Therefore, these impacts are considered **less than significant**.

c) Location on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse – *Potentially Significant Issue*

Pursuant to the site-specific geotechnical investigations, and as described above in item a) iv), the project sites are located in an area that is relatively flat with only minor changes in topography; landslides and lateral spreading are not likely to occur on either of the proposed sites. Construction-related ground-disturbing or excavation activities could alter the soil stability at the construction locations. Excavation and trenching for the transmission pipelines may create unstable slopes during construction; however, open trenches and excavation would be conducted according to California Building Code standards and engineering plan specifications, ensuring the risk of localized slope failure would be **less than significant**.

As discussed in item a) iii) above, soil and groundwater characteristics for the proposed sites are not conducive to the effects of liquefaction. Impacts related to liquefaction would be **less than significant**.

Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events, effectively eliminating the clay bonds holding the soil grains together. Collapsible soils generally consist of loose, dry, low-density, low-plasticity, silt- to fine-sand-

sized materials that compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Collapse typically occurs in areas underlain by young alluvial fans, debris flow sediments, and loess (wind-blown sediment) deposits. Similar to expansive soils, collapsible soils result in structural damage such as cracking of the foundation, floors, and walls in response to differential settlement. A geotechnical investigation conducted at Site A did not identify geologic or soil conditions susceptible to collapse (Blackburn Consultants 2012). Similar geologic and soil conditions underlie Site B and the pipeline alignment. Impacts related to collapse are considered **less than significant**.

The Proposed Project includes the installation of production wells and extraction of groundwater resources. Groundwater withdrawal has the potential to result in subsidence and/or collapse and may be **potentially significant**. Analysis of groundwater resources and the Proposed Project's potential risk of land subsidence or collapse will be addressed in detail in Chapter 9, *Groundwater*, of the EIR.

d) Location on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property – *Less Than Significant*

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 in the Program EIR, the City conducted a geotechnical investigation at Site A. The geotechnical investigation at Site A indicated that the soils at these sites do not contain a relatively high percentage of clay minerals. Clay minerals have the potential to shrink and swell with changing moisture conditions. Extensive shrinking/swelling can fracture building foundations and damage infrastructure. Instead, Site A is underlain by Hanford soils (NRCS 2016), which are loose to very dense silty sand to approximately 8 feet bgs, loose to medium-dense poorly graded sand to about 13–20 feet bgs, and hard elastic silt with sand to hard sandy silt at greater depths (Blackburn Consulting 2012).

A geotechnical investigation would be conducted at Site B as part of the design process. Site B is predominantly underlain by Delhi sand with some Oakdale sandy loam (NRCS 2016). Delhi sands generally consist of sand up to 44 inches bgs with loamy fine sand at greater depths. Estimated depth to groundwater ranges between 50 and 60 feet bgs (California Department of Water Resources 2016). Soils on the Hanford sandy loam, Delhi sand, and Oakdale sandy have a low plasticity rating (NRCS 2016). These soils are not considered expansive and would not be susceptible to frequent shrinking/swelling. Impacts related to expansive soils are therefore **less than significant.**

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project does not involve construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be **no impact** related to the suitability of soils to support septic tanks or alternative disposal systems.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X		
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purposed of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	X		
c) Encourage activities that result in the use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy, or use these resources in a wasteful manner?	X		

The Proposed Project would involve construction activities, including truck trips, worker vehicle trips, and operation of heavy equipment; all of these activities would result in GHG emissions. Operation-related emissions would result as well, including standby generators, use of electricity, and worker vehicle trips. The potential exists for the Proposed Project to have a significant impact with regard to GHG emissions. Therefore, a full analysis of the Proposed Project's potential effects on greenhouse gas emissions and energy resources is provided in the EIR.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage or disposal of hazardous materials?		X	
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?		X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?			X
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?		X	
e) Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area?			X
f) Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area?			X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X	
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?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.7-8–3.7-11), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials – *Less Than Significant*

Construction of the Proposed Project would involve use of heavy equipment that uses hazardous materials, such as fuel and lubricants. Consistent with the analysis and finding in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.7-8), compliance with existing, standard federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous waste handling and disposal would be sufficient to prevent a significant impact from transport, use, or disposal of such hazardous materials.

Once construction is complete, continued maintenance of the proposed groundwater well and water storage facilities at Sites A and B would require routine transport and use of hazardous materials. In addition, backup generators would require diesel fuel (at both sites) and calcium hypochlorite (at Site A only), which would be stored onsite; diesel fuel and calcium hypochlorite are considered hazardous materials. Routine transport of diesel and calcium hypochlorite to the project sites would be required to maintain project operations. Transport and handling of hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Such regulations would include accidental spill handling and notification procedures such as those issued by City of Modesto Fire Prevention Department; Stanislaus County Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) standards; and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

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 – *Less Than Significant*

As described in item (a) above, construction of the Proposed Project would require use and storage of hazardous materials such as fuel and lubricants. As described in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.7-9), compliance with existing, standard federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous waste handling and disposal would be sufficient to prevent and address release of hazardous materials to the environment.

The Proposed Project would include storage of hazardous materials, including diesel fuel (at both sites) and calcium hypochlorite (at Site A only). Storage and use of such hazardous materials could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through upset and accident conditions (e.g., if storage containers were to leak or rupture, or hazardous materials were to otherwise spill), resulting in a significant impact. Further, as described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the EIR, the Proposed Project sites would be designed according to applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including providing secondary containment for all chemical storage and fuel storage, and compliance with City of Modesto Fire Prevention Department requirements, Stanislaus County SPCC standards, the Uniform Fire Code (UFC), and OSHA requirements. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school – *No Impact*

No portion of the Proposed Project would take place within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest schools to the project sites are Stanislaus Elementary School, 1.9 miles southwest of Site A and 2.75 miles southwest of Site B; and Rio Altura Elementary School, 3.0 miles east of Site A and 2.3 miles southeast of Site B. The Proposed Project would have **no impact** on schools.

d) Located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment – *Less Than Significant*

As analyzed in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.7-9–3.7-10), construction would disturb and excavate soils within existing roadways and undeveloped areas for installation of storage tanks, pipelines, and groundwater wells. However, because the exact locations of these facilities were not finalized at the time the Program EIR was certified, it was not known whether areas of known hazardous material contamination existed within specific project sites. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 in the Program EIR required that, prior to the commencement of construction activities, the City prepare a risk assessment in accordance with ASTM Standard 1527-05, "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process."

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the City conducted Phase I Environmental Site Assessments at Site A and Site B in 2012 (ATC Associates 2012a, 2012b). Site A currently supports a single-family residence and occupied buildings on the east portion of the project site. Historical land uses for Site A (ATC Associates 2012a) consisted of undeveloped land, residential, and agricultural uses. Evidence of large-scale use or disposal of pesticides, herbicides, or fertilizers (such as mixing tanks, chemical storage areas, sprayers, or stressed vegetation) was not observed in aerial photographs, topographic mapping, or a site visit of the property. Database queries of the State and Tribal Registered Underground Storage Tanks (UST, INDIAN UST) list, Historical UST (HIST UST) list, California Facility Manifest Database (CA FID UST), and Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS UST) reported three underground storage tank (UST) sites:

- A 500-gallon diesel fuel UST is located west of Site A beyond the Union Pacific Railroad track. There is no evidence of soil or groundwater contamination related to this UST and no impacts on Site A.

- An Open-Inactive cleanup site listed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is located 446 feet west of Site A. Contamination consists of pesticide or herbicide releases to soils only; groundwater was not affected. There is no evidence of migration of contamination offsite and no impacts on Site A.

- An active 390-gallon gasoline UST for agricultural uses is located 606 feet east of Site A. There are no reports and no evidence of soil or groundwater contamination related to this UST and no impacts on Site A.

Other potential sources of hazardous materials at Site A include asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint within the residential buildings (ATC Associates 2012a). Although the presence of these hazards was not confirmed in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, building materials used at the time of construction of the homestead (circa 1946) commonly contained asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint. Abatement of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based materials during any demolition of existing buildings would be supervised by a contractor certified by the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration and would be conducted in a manner compliant with federal, state, and local regulations. These regulations would protect construction workers by requiring the use of personal protective equipment, and would protect the public by implementing dust-control procedures or other means to prevent the release of airborne particulates.

The homestead is served by an existing septic tank and leach lines located just south of the main residence. Removal or abandonment of the treatment system would be conducted in accordance with local and state regulations to prevent any potential release of or worker exposure to waste material or contaminated soils.

Historical land uses for Site B (ATC Associates 2012b) consist of an agricultural field or undeveloped land. Evidence of large-scale use or disposal of pesticides, herbicides, or fertilizers (such as mixing tanks, chemical storage areas, sprayers, or stressed vegetation) was not observed in aerial photographs, topographic mapping, or a site visit of the property. A database query of the UST and INDIAN UST list reported one 1,000-gallon gasoline UST and one 500-gallon gasoline UST at the property for agricultural uses. Further investigation of county and state resources could not confirm the presence of these USTs, however, and no files, reports of releases, or violations were identified with the property or addresses near Site B.

There are no records of hazardous materials sites or hazardous cleanup sites along St. John Road and the proposed pipeline alignment.

In summary, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments conducted at Sites A and B did not identify any documented hazardous materials storage areas, hazardous materials cleanup sites, or leaking USTs that may affect the project sites. Demolition of existing buildings and wastewater treatment systems would be conducted in accordance with local and state regulations. In addition, the Program EIR included Mitigation Measure HAZ-2, which specifies worker training and mandates City remediation for any unanticipated hazardous waste materials encountered during construction activities. By following regulatory requirements and implementing Mitigation Measure HAZ-2, the potential for hazardous materials to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment is considered **less than significant**.

e) Located within an airport land use plan area, or where such a plan has not been adopted, or be within 2 miles of a private or public airport and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the study area – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public or private airport. The nearest airport or private airstrip is the Modesto City-County Airport, approximately 7.2 miles south of the project sites. As such, there would be **no impact**.

f) Create a safety hazard for people working in the area due to the presence of a private airstrip – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public or private airport. The nearest airport or private airstrip is the Modesto City-County Airport, approximately 7.2 miles south of the project sites. As such, there would be no impact on safety hazards for people due to presence of a private airstrip.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan – *Less Than Significant*

Consistent with the analysis in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.7-11), the majority of the Proposed Project's facilities would be located underground or within the public right-of-way. As such, when fully constructed, the Proposed Project would have no impact on the implementation of, or physical interference with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. However, the Proposed Project would include installation of pipelines within the public right-of-way and other facilities that may require temporary closure of at least one lane of traffic during construction. Depending on the specific location of the proposed facilities and the construction activities required, effects on roads or building ingress and egress could impede the movement of emergency response vehicles or otherwise interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Project facilities would be constructed in accordance with the City's Standard Construction Procedures; these include preparing and implementing a traffic control plan, public notification, and preconstruction meetings. Once constructed, the Proposed Project would not affect implementation of emergency response plans. Consistent with the finding in the Program EIR, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

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 – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project would be located in a rural area surrounded by agricultural lands. Consistent with the analysis and finding in the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.7-11), there are no wildlands in the project area and, therefore, there is no potential for people or structures to be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. There would be **no impact**.

IX. HYDROLOGY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X	
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 ground water table level (for example, 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)?	X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns 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?		X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns 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?		X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X	
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?			X
h) Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
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?			X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.8-17–3.8-22), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that, with the exception of item (b), the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to geology or soils have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA except for item (b).

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements – *Less Than Significant*

Construction of proposed facilities and improvements would involve excavation, grading, and use of heavy construction equipment, all of which would have the potential to cause water quality degradation in local waterways. Use and storage of hazardous materials during construction could also result in water contamination (e.g., from leaks or spills) without adequate safeguards. Because the project sites cover more than 1 acre, project construction would be conducted according to standard protocols of the Clean Water Act Section 402 General Construction Permit (State Water Resource Control Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ). As required under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, a stormwater pollution prevention plan would be implemented for the sites. Proposed storage tanks for diesel fuel (at both sites) and calcium hypochlorite (at Site A only) would be operated and maintained according to federal, state, and local protocols, as discussed in Section VIII, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” of the Program EIR. With implementation of standard construction and operational procedures, this impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level – *Potentially Significant Issue*

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to extract groundwater supplies. The Proposed Project has the potential to interfere with groundwater supplies and recharge to some degree by increasing impervious surface area (e.g., from pump buildings and storage tanks). These impacts are considered **potentially significant** and are evaluated in the EIR.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site, or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR evaluated the potential for projects to affect water quality through changes in drainage patterns and found it to be less than significant (City of Modesto 2010: 3.8-20). The Proposed Project would not alter the course of any stream or river, but would change the existing drainage patterns at the project sites. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of

the EIR, proposed facilities at Site A would result in an increase of impervious surfaces and could, therefore, increase the amount of runoff or otherwise change patterns of drainage and infiltration. Site A includes construction of a stormwater retention basin to capture and infiltrate stormwater runoff from the project site. The basin would be designed with the appropriate capacity to receive rainfall runoff and water from the water storage tank, if it were to fail. Runoff from new impervious surfaces proposed at Site B would be retained onsite.

The Proposed Project would involve grading, excavation, trenching, and other construction-related activities that leave soils exposed to erosion. During construction, runoff at the sites would be controlled through implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan as required under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; after construction, the project sites would be flat, and loss of topsoil and soil erosion would not be substantial. At Site A, the proposed stormwater retention basin and berm slopes may be susceptible to erosion; however, as stated in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the EIR, the Proposed Project includes planting vegetation on the berms and stabilizing the slopes of the retention basin with hydroseeding or planting with drought-tolerant plants.

As described in Section VIII, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” of this Environmental Checklist, potential water quality pollutants, including diesel fuel and calcium hypochlorite, would be handled according to standard federal, state, and local regulations. The Proposed Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation, exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or generate substantial new sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be **less than significant**.

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 resulting in flooding on-site or off-site – *Less Than Significant*

As described in item (c) above, the Proposed Project would alter the existing drainage patterns through addition of impervious surfaces, although these effects are not anticipated to be significant. The amount of increased surface runoff generated from both project sites would be captured and allowed to percolate to groundwater onsite; increased surface runoff generated at the project sites would not be sufficient to result in flooding, either onsite or offsite. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

e) Create runoff that would exceed the existing stormwater systems – *Less Than Significant*

As described in items (c) and (d) above, the Proposed Project would include construction of impervious surfaces that could increase the amount of surface runoff generated at the project sites. Runoff generated at Sites A and B would be captured in onsite retention basins. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

f) Substantially degrade water quality – *Less Than Significant*

Apart from the potential construction-related water quality impacts discussed in item (a) above, the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality. Operation of the Proposed Project facilities would not involve direct discharges to surface waters; stormwater runoff at both sites would be captured and infiltrated to groundwater. Onsite safety measures would be implemented to prevent spills of hazardous materials. Groundwater quality around the well location could be degraded during the well drilling process; however, any turbidity or suspended solids around the well would be flushed out while preparing the well system for operation. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal flood hazard boundary or flood insurance map or other flood hazard delineation map - *No Impact*

The Proposed Project would not involve placement of housing within a flood hazard area. **No impact** would occur.

h) Place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area resulting in impeding or redirect flood flows – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map for the area, Sites A and B are located in Zone X (unshaded) or "areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance flood plain" (ATC Associates 2012a, 2012b). **No impact** would occur.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam – *No Impact*

According to the dam inundation map included in the *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015* (2016a), the Proposed Project is not located in a dam inundation area and is therefore not subject to significant loss due to flooding if an upstream dam were to fail. **No impact** would occur.

j) Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow – *No Impact*

The Proposed Project would be located in the Central Valley of California and is not near any lakes or other large bodies of water. There is no potential for seiche or tsunami in the project area. The topography of the area is generally flat, and mudflow is not a noted hazard in the area. **No impact** would occur.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	X		
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?	X		
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	X		

Explanations

a) Physically divide an established community – *Less Than Significant*

The Proposed Project is expected to improve water system flexibility and reliability and provide additional water supply and storage to accommodate anticipated growth in the Del Rio community. As a result, the Proposed Project would improve development of Del Rio, rather than divide it. During the construction phase, however, the Proposed Project could temporarily disrupt surrounding land uses. Construction vehicles may cause short-term delays on access roads. This issue is considered **potentially significant** and is evaluated further in the EIR.

b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect – *Potentially Significant Issue*

Although the Proposed Project would improve water system flexibility and reliability for the Del Rio community, construction and operation of the Proposed Project could conflict with policies contained in the *Del Rio Community Plan* (Stanislaus County 1992) and *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015* (Stanislaus County 2016a). This impact is considered **potentially significant** and is evaluated further in the EIR.

c) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan – *Potentially Significant Issue*

As described in Section IV, “Biological Resources,” above, the Proposed Project could conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans. This issue is considered **potentially significant** and is evaluated further in the EIR.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X
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?			X

Explanation

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.6-10), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to mineral resources have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a-b) Loss of availability of mineral resources – *No Impact*

The Program EIR found that the proposed infrastructure would have no effect on the availability of sand and gravel operations in the area. Based on review of the *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015* (2016a) and California Department of Conservation Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Mineral Lands Classification mapping (California Department of Conservation 1993), there are no known mineral resource zones or historic or active mines or quarries within the project area. In addition, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not directly affect mineral production sites or prevent future availability of mineral resources. As a result, the Proposed Project would have **no impact** on mineral resources.

XII. NOISE: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	X		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels without the project?	X		
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?	X		
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?	X		

The Program EIR identified several noise-related impacts as significant (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.10-8–3.10-12). Construction activities for the Proposed Project would involve operation of heavy machinery during an approximately 15-month construction period, in the vicinity of residential uses that would be defined as sensitive receptors. Operation of the Proposed Project would involve pumps running an average of 8 hours per day, occasional use of standby generators, and other noise-producing activities. These activities have the potential to result in noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, a full analysis of the Proposed Project's potential effects on noise is provided in the EIR.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.11-7–3.11-11), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to population and housing have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a) Induce population growth, either directly or indirectly – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR evaluated the potential to induce substantial population growth and found it to be a significant and unavoidable impact (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.11-8–3.11-11). This conclusion was primarily based on the determination (p. 3.11-8) that

> *[E]xpansion of and upgrades to the water system to provide new service to currently undeveloped parcels within the communities of North Ceres, Turlock, and Waterford, and the planned urbanizing areas of Del Rio, Grayson, Hickman, and Modesto (including the contiguous service area), would remove an obstacle to population growth*.

This is not the case with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would improve existing water pressure and volume storage deficiencies, ensure that system pressure is sufficient for firefighting, improve water system flexibility and reliability, and provide additional water supply and storage to accommodate the anticipated growth of the Del Rio community in accordance with the *Del Rio Community Plan* and the *Stanislaus County General Plan 2015*.

Throughout the Proposed Project's construction phases, workers would be temporarily employed at project sites. It is anticipated that regional labor could meet the project's construction workforce requirements. While some workers might temporarily relocate from other areas, the increase would likely be minor and short term. It is anticipated that existing City staff

would operate and maintain the project facilities in the long term. The Proposed Project would not result in the construction of new homes. No new long-term employment opportunities or substantial population growth would occur in the project area due to construction of the Proposed Project.

One of the primary objectives of the Proposed Project is to ensure that adequate water supply and appropriate water pressure for fire-fighting services are available to the City's Del Rio service area. The City is also committed to providing water supply to meet the buildout population growth projected by the *Del Rio Community Plan* (Stanislaus County 1992). As such, although the Proposed Project would not include any residential housing or businesses, it would remove potential obstacles to growth in the Del Rio community, and thereby could have an indirect effect on population growth within the Program area. However, because population growth induced by the Proposed Project would occur only within the bounds of planned growth; the Proposed Project would not contribute to unplanned growth. All growth would be consistent with that contemplated in the Program EIR, and therefore this issue is considered **less than significant**.

b) Displace existing housing – *No Impact*

The Program EIR identified no impact with regard to displacement of housing or people (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.11-7–3.11-8). The Proposed Project would be constructed within the public right-of-way and on parcels owned by the City. The Proposed Project would not displace existing housing. **No impact** would occur.

c) Displace existing populations – *No Impact*

The Program EIR identified no impact with regard to displacement of housing or people (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.11-7–3.11-8). As described in item (b) above, the proposed facilities would be constructed within the public right-of-way and would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. **No impact** would occur.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?		X	
b) Police protection?		X	
c) Schools?		X	
d) Parks?		X	
e) Other public facilities?		X	

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.12-9), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to public services have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a-b) Need for additional or physically altered fire and police services – *Less than Significant*

The Program EIR evaluated impacts on fire and police services and found them to be less than significant (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.12-9). As noted in Section XIII, "Population and Housing," of this Environmental Checklist, construction of the Proposed Project would employ construction workers at the project sites, which would likely come from the regional labor force. While some construction workers could temporarily relocate from other areas, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the local population. During construction, potential incidents could require the involvement of local law enforcement, fire protection, or emergency services. However, such increases in incidents are not anticipated to be of a magnitude that would adversely affect response times or other performance objectives of these public services. The Proposed Project's impacts on fire and police services would be **less than significant.** Potential conflicts with emergency response plans are addressed in Section IX, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," and construction-related effects on emergency access are described in Section XVI, "Transportation and Traffic," of this Environmental Checklist.

c-e) Need for additional or physically altered schools, parks, or other public facilities – *Less than Significant*

The Program EIR evaluated impacts on schools, parks, and other public services and found them to be less than significant (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.12-9). As described in items (a-b) above, construction of the Proposed Project would employ construction workers who would likely originate from the regional labor force. While some construction workers could temporarily relocate from other areas, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the local population. In addition, project operations following implementation of the Proposed Project would be similar to existing conditions. No need for additional schools or public facilities or physical modifications to schools or other public facilities would result from the Proposed Project.

Furthermore, during the EIR scoping period, the Stanislaus Union School District submitted a comment letter stating that the school district had no comments or concerns with the Proposed Project (Stanislaus Union School District 2015). The Pacific Gas and Electric Company submitted a comment letter during the scoping period stating that the agency had no comments or concerns regarding the Proposed Project (Pacific Gas and Electric Company 2015).

The project's impacts on local schools, parks, and other public facilities would be **less than significant**. Potential effects on parks are evaluated in Section XV, "Recreation," of this Environmental Checklist.

XV. RECREATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project 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?		X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.13-9), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to recreation have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a) Increase use of existing parks or recreational facilities – *Less than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that there would be no impact on parks and recreational facilities (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.13-9). The Proposed Project would not directly generate increased demand for recreational facilities. Potential increased demand for parks or recreation facilities due to potential population growth is addressed in Section XIII, “Population and Housing,” of this Environmental Checklist. There are no parks or recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project sites. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase the use of any existing parks or recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated. This impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Creation of new or altered recreational facilities – *No Impact*

The Program EIR determined that there would be no impact on recreational facilities (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.13-9). The Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities and would not directly require the construction or alteration of any such facilities. Potential increased needs for new or altered parks or recreation facilities due to potential population growth are addressed in Section XIII, “Population and Housing,” of this Environmental Checklist. There would be **no impact**.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?		X	

Explanations

Based on the below supporting environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.14-15–3.14-19), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the Proposed Project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts related to transportation and traffic have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA.

a-b) Conflict with applicable circulation plans, ordinances or policies or conflict with an applicable congestion management program – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that traffic impacts related to conflicts with plans, ordinances, policies, or congestion management programs were less than significant (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.14-17–3.14-18) because the "minor amount of new trips would not cause a noticeable increase in traffic on adjacent streets." Project construction activities at Sites A and B would result in an estimated 48-52 vehicle trips (refer to Table 2-1 in Chapter 2, *Project Description*). Construction trips would result from the conveyance of equipment to the site and from construction workers arriving and departing the site.

Operation of the wells and tank would result in occasional visits to the site, primarily for maintenance purposes. Operation-related trips to the project sites are estimated to be worker per day.

The Proposed Project would involve no continuous demand for parking for maintenance staff. Any needed parking would be accommodated onsite.

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a temporary increase in roadway traffic in the project area and potentially in the broader area of Modesto and Stanislaus County. In addition, construction of some improvements may require temporary road or lane closures and would be conducted within the road right-of-way. These activities could conflict with applicable circulation plans, ordinances, or policies or congestion management plans. These impacts were disclosed in the Program EIR, however, and no greater impacts would be expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Project. The City's Standard Construction Procedures would be implemented during construction; these include preparing a traffic control plan, public notification, and preconstruction meetings. Adherence to the City's Standard Construction Procedures would ensure a **less-than-significant impact**, consistent with the Program EIR.

c) Change in air traffic patterns – *No Impact*

The Program EIR determined that impacts related to air traffic patterns were not pertinent to the analysis (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.14-16) because no elements of the program would affect air traffic. Neither Site A nor Site B is located near any airport or airstrip, or the infrastructure that would have an effect on air traffic, due to any of its features. This is consistent with the analysis in the Program EIR. Furthermore, the construction of the tank, wells, and associated infrastructure would result in no substantial changes to the affected roadways or traffic on them, after construction is complete. The Proposed Project would not conflict with plans or policies for non-automobile transportation. There would be **no impact**.

d-e) Increased hazards due to design features and inadequate emergency access – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that impacts related to hazards due to design features and emergency access were not pertinent to the analysis (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.14-16) because no program features that would obstruct or change the design of any roadway. At Site A, construction activities would temporarily increase emergency response times due to lane

narrowing or lane closures to allow the installation of approximately 2,500 linear feet of water transmission pipeline in St. John Road from the Site A parcels on Ladd Road to the intersection with Country Club Drive.

At Site B, construction activities would temporarily increase emergency response times due to lane narrowing or lane closures to allow the installation of approximately 500 linear feet of water transmission pipeline from the Site B parcel on McHenry Avenue to the intersection of Stewart Road and Grove Point Drive.

These temporary construction-related impacts were disclosed in the Program EIR, and no greater impacts would be expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Project. The City's Standard Construction Procedures would be implemented during construction; these include preparing a traffic control plan, public notification, and preconstruction meetings. Adherence to the City's Standard Construction Procedures would ensure a **less-than-significant impact**, consistent with the Program EIR.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR determined that impacts related to alternative transportation were not pertinent to the analysis (City of Modesto 2010: p. 3.14-16) because "The program would not generate any substantial traffic and would not place any above-surface facilities within road rights-of-way. Therefore, it would not affect the provision of alternative transportation." The Proposed Project's construction activities, including construction activities to install pipelines within the public right-of-way, could conflict with adopted non-motorized transportation plans, including the Stanislaus Council of Government's *Non-Motorized Transportation Master Plan* (2013). No existing paths or bicycle routes have been identified in the project area. Pedestrian sidewalks, where present, would be closed temporarily during construction. The City's Standard Construction Procedures would be implemented during construction; these include preparing a traffic control plan, public notification, and preconstruction meetings. Adherence to the City's Standard Construction Procedures would ensure a **less-than-significant impact**, consistent with the Program EIR.

The Stanislaus Council of Government's *Non-Motorized Transportation Master Plan* (2013) identifies a future Class 3 bicycle route along McHenry Avenue adjacent to Site B. There are no immediate plans to develop this route, however, and implementation of the bicycle route will depend on available funding. If and when the bicycle route along McHenry Avenue near Site B is implemented, the Site B facilities within the right-of-way (pipeline installed beneath McHenry Avenue) would already be in place and would not impede use of the bicycle lanes. Operational impacts of the Proposed Project on non-motorized transportation would be **less than significant**.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB?		X	
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?		X	
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?		X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	X		
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?			X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X	
g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X

Explanations

Based on the below environmental analysis derived from the Program EIR (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.15-12–3.15-13), and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that, with the exception of Checklist item (d), the proposed project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts on wastewater treatment demands have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA except for Checklist item (d).

a,b,e) Exceed or require new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB – *Less Than Significant*

The proposed new water supply infrastructure at Sites A and B would not directly result in a substantial increase in the demand for wastewater treatment facilities. The Proposed Project

would serve planned growth in the project area, as described in Section XIII, "Population and Housing," of this Environmental Checklist.

This impact is considered **less than significant**.

c) Require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities – *Less Than Significant*

The proposed new water supply infrastructure at Sites A and B would not directly result in a substantial increase in the demand for stormwater drainage facilities. The Proposed Project would serve planned growth in the project area, as described in Section XIII, "Population and Housing," of this Environmental Checklist.

The Proposed Project would result in increased impervious surfaces and subsequent stormwater runoff. However, as described in Section IX, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of this Environmental Checklist, stormwater runoff generated at Sites A and B would be retained and infiltrated onsite.

Based on this evaluation, and pursuant to Sections 15168 and 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that the proposed project is consistent with the project described and analyzed in the Program EIR. No new or additional significant impacts on stormwater drainage demands have been identified for the Proposed Project. Therefore, no further review for this impact is required under CEQA. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to extract groundwater supplies. The Proposed Project would not directly affect surface water supplies or surface water rights. The potential impact of the Proposed Project on groundwater supplies is fully evaluated in the EIR.

f, g) Have available landfill capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste – *Less Than Significant*

The Program EIR evaluated impacts of the program with regard to landfill capacity and determined that they were less than significant (City of Modesto 2010: pp. 3.15-13–3.15-14) because

> *generation of construction waste …would not require existing disposal facilities or conveyance transfer and haul systems to be expanded. The proposed program would not result in the creation of additional solid waste once proposed facilities are operational*.

Construction-related activities for the Proposed Project would generate waste material during demolition of existing structures at Site A, excavation of soils, and installation of new infrastructure. Disposal of all solid waste material would comply with all federal, state, and local

statutes and regulations. Where feasible, the excavated soil and demolition debris would be recycled, reused, and/or disposed of onsite. Excess material may be transported to the Fink Road Sanitary Landfill, located near Crows Landing in Stanislaus County (Stanislaus County 2016b) or other nearby solid waste facilities for disposal. The Fink Road Sanitary Landfill has a remaining capacity of 8 million cubic yards and is not anticipated to reach full capacity until 2023 (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery 2016).

Once construction is completed, no solid waste would be generated at the project sites. There would be **less than significant** impacts on landfill capacity and compliance on solid waste disposal regulations.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Does the project:	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X		
b) 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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	X		
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X		

Explanations

a) Effects on environmental quality, fish or wildlife, and historic resources – *Potentially Significant Issues*

Construction activities associated with the various proposed improvements could result in **potentially significant** impacts on special-status plant and animal species as well as cultural and historical resources. These issues are evaluated in Chapter 6, *Biological Resources,* and Chapter 7, *Cultural Resources,* of the EIR.

b) Cumulative Impacts – *Potentially Significant Issues*

The degree to which project effects would contribute to a significant cumulative impact are evaluated in an EIR. To meet the adequacy standard established by CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, the EIR identifies past, present, and reasonably probable future projects and programs producing related or cumulative impacts.

Stanislaus County adopted its General Plan Update on August 23, 2016. The update is limited to revisions to the land use, circulation, conservation/open space, noise, safety, and agricultural elements but does not change specific land uses in the County. The Del Rio Community Plan Map will be updated to reflect amendments approved since 1992, but the remainder of the plan has not changed. The General Plan Update Draft EIR was circulated for public review between

April 19 and June 3, 2016. The General Plan Update Final EIR was also certified on August 23, 2016.

For the purposes of this initial study, cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biology, cultural resources, global climate change, groundwater supply, land use, and noise, are considered **potentially significant** and are evaluated in the EIR. The potential for cumulatively significant contributions to aesthetics and land use impacts are also evaluated in the EIR.

The following impacts are also considered cumulatively significant in the context of the Proposed Project, and are evaluated below to determine whether the Proposed Project's contribution would be considerable:

- Traffic—Automobile traffic congestion is already a severe problem in the County, particularly within cities. Provisions for adequate automotive transportation networks and reducing automobile traffic by providing alternative means of transportation are identified as key issues to be addressed in general plans. Traffic conditions may worsen as development in the County continues.

- Utilities and Service Systems—Similar to transportation infrastructure, provisions for adequate water, wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste infrastructure are key issues as the County continues to grow.

Cumulative Impacts due to Disruption to Automobile Traffic Patterns (*Less than Significant*) Construction related to the Proposed Project would generate traffic in the form of construction vehicles, deliveries of construction materials, and worker trips. In addition, construction activities may result in temporary lane or road closures. As part of the Proposed Project, however, standard practices would be employed to minimize effects on traffic, including scheduling of work, implementation of a public information program, coordination with appropriate agencies, and implementation of a traffic control plan. In addition, traffic effects in any given location would be short term and affected roadways are not areas where traffic problems exist. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to traffic.

Cumulative Effects on Utilities and Service Systems (*Beneficial*) During construction, standard measures such as notification to public service providers and surveys to locate existing underground utilities would be implemented to avoid any interruptions to utilities and service systems. Over the long term, the Proposed Project would not generate the need for additional stormwater or wastewater infrastructure or increased solid waste disposal needs. The Proposed Project would not generate wastewater or solid waste. Stormwater runoff generated at Sites A and B would be captured and infiltrated onsite. Additionally, the Proposed Project would provide necessary water supply infrastructure to support planned development identified in the *Del Rio Community Plan* (Stanislaus County 1992). As such, the Proposed Project is anticipated to be beneficial from the standpoint of cumulative impacts related to utilities and service systems.

c) Effects on Human Beings – *Potentially Significant Issues*

Construction activities could result in temporary adverse impacts on people due to effects such as air pollutant and GHG emissions, noise disturbances, and increased traffic on local roads. Project operation could result in permanent increases in air pollutant and GHG emissions and noise disturbances. Such impacts are considered **potentially significant** and are evaluated in the EIR in Chapter 4, *Aesthetics;* Chapter 5, *Air Quality*; Chapter 8, *Global Climate Change*; Chapter 10, *Land Use;* and Chapter 11, *Noise,* of the EIR.

C. Determination

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 to the project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	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 an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required.

City of Modesto

T. Bryant

Tamorah Bryant
Senior Civil Engineer

11.3.2016

Date

D. References

ATC Associates. 2012a (February 15). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of 718 Ladd Road, Modesto, California 95356. ATC Project No. 54.42606.0002. Prepared for City of Modesto.

_____. 2012b (February). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of APN 004-102-003 McHenry Avenue and Stewart Road, Modesto, California 95356. ATC Project No. 54.42606.0001. Prepared for City of Modesto.

Blackburn Consultants. 2012 (October). Geotechnical Report – Del Rio Water Tank and Pump Station, Modesto, California. Prepared for NorthStar Engineering Group, Modesto, CA.

California Air Resources Board. 2016. iADAM: Air Quality Data Statistics (Modesto 14th Street station and Turlock S. Minaret Street station). Available at: www.arb.ca.gov/adam. Accessed: August 5, 2016.

California Department of Conservation. 1993. Mineral Land Classification Maps of Central Stanislaus County, California. Available at: maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse. Accessed August 2, 2016.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2012. Stanislaus County Williamson Act FY 2010/2011. Available at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Stanislaus_north_10_11_WA.pdf. Accessed July 24, 2016.

_____. 2015. Stanislaus County Important Farmland 2014. August. Available at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/sta14_no.pdf. Accessed July 24, 2016.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2016. Solid Waste Information System (SWIS) Database Search – Fink Road Sanitary Landfill. Available at: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx. Accessed June 23, 2016.

California Department of Water Resources. 2016 (May). Groundwater Information Center Interactive Map Application – Water Levels.

California Geological Survey. 2008. Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA) Ground Motion Interpolator. Interactive map. Available at: www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/PSHA/psha_interpolator.html. Accessed August 2, 2016.

_____. 2010. Fault Activity Map of California. Geologic Data Map No. 6. Compilation and Interpretation by: Charles W. Jennings and William A. Bryant. Available at: maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam. Accessed June 24, 2016.

City of Modesto. 2010. *2010 Water System Engineer's Report Final Program Environmental Impact Report.* Public Works Department. Prepared by ICF International. February.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2016. Soil Map—Eastern Stanislaus Area, California. Web Soil Survey, National Cooperative Soil Survey. Accessed July 21, 2016.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). 2006. Pacific Gas & Electric Company San Joaquin Valley Operations and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan. Prepared by Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA. Available at: www.fws.gov/ecos/ajax/docs/plan_documents/thcp/thcp_838.pdf.

_____. 2015. Comment letter from Wayne T. Pacheco, Senior Environmental Field Specialist, to Tamorah Bryant, City of Modesto, on July 30, 2015, regarding the Notice of Preparation.

Sierra College. 2016. "Ice Age Fossils Found Locally." Available at: www.sierracollege.edu/about-us/beyond-the-classroom/nat-hist-museum/exhibits-in/local-fossils.php. Accessed June 23, 2016.

Stanislaus and Tuolumne Rivers Groundwater Basin Association. 2005. Final Draft – Integrated Regional Groundwater Management Plan for the Modesto Subbasin. Available at: www.mid.org/water/irgmp/default.html. Accessed September 15, 2015.

Stanislaus Council of Governments. 2013 (October). *Non-Motorized Transportation Master Plan.* Prepared by Fehr & Peers. Available at: www.stancog.org/pdf/documents/bicycle/non-motorized-master-plan.pdf. Accessed August 2, 2016.

Stanislaus County. 1992 (August). *Del Rio Community Plan*. Available at: www.stancounty.com/planning/pl/gp/del-rio-community-plan.pdf.

_____. 2015. Planning Department GIS Maps for Parcels. Available at: gis.stancounty.com/giscentral/public/js/Public_app.html. Accessed September 8, 2015.

_____. 2016a. Stanislaus County General Plan 2015. Conservation/Open Space Element. Adopted August 23, 2016. Available online at: www.stancounty.com/bos/agenda/2016/20160823/PH910.pdf. Accessed September 20, 2016.

_____. 2016b. Fink Road Sanitary Landfill. Available at: www.stancounty.com/er/landfill. Accessed August 2, 2016.

Stanislaus Union School District. 2015. Comment letter from Britta M. Skavdahl, Ed.D., Superintendent, to Tamorah Bryant, City of Modesto, on August 10, 2015, regarding the Notice of Preparation.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. Green Book Nonattainment Areas: National Area and County-Level Multi-Pollutant Information. Available at: www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/multipol.html. Accessed: August 2, 2016.

This page intentionally left blank