Stockton East Water District

Calaveras River Habitat Conservation Plan EA/IS

Appendix C

CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

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

I. Aesthetics

Impacts

a. Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista,

Or

b. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The Proposed Action would take place within river channels that are enclosed by levees and are not within view of nearby residences or within view of a scenic vista. Activities would be nearly indistinguishable from existing conditions since all the activities would continue to occur within the channel and the alignment of the river/slough will not be altered. Therefore, there will be no impact to views surrounding the Lower Calaveras River and Mormon Slough. Mitigation is not warranted for any effect on views surrounding the Proposed Project.

c. ***Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?***

Impacts to scenic resources located along a scenic highway or roadway are generally considered potentially significant. However, in this case all the proposed activities would occur within the river/slough channel. Neither the alignment of the channel nor any roadway crossings would be altered. Therefore, there will be no impacts on scenic resources from or near a state scenic highway.

d. ***Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

The Proposed Project does not introduce lighting sources or materials that would induce glare. Additionally, construction and periodic maintenance activities associated with the conservation strategies would occur only during daylight hours, so no construction lighting would be required. Therefore, no long- or short-term lighting or glare impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐

II. Agricultural Resources

Impacts

a. Would the potential project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

None of the farmland served by the District's water supplies would be converted to non-farm uses as a result of the implementation of the CHCP.

b. Would the potential project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Or

c. Would the potential project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to reduce potential "incidental take" of Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed fish while continuing to provide approximately 50,000 acre feet of surface water annually to the District agricultural service areas. A total of 194 diversions have been identified within the District service areas. These agricultural diversions are small

pumped diversions that are individually owned and operated by agricultural customers of SEWD.

Participating in the installation of screens at the individual private agricultural sites as proposed in the CHCP could be an economic burden to agricultural customers. With the provisions incorporated into the CHCP (listed below), mitigation is not warranted for any effect on agriculture.

Conservation strategies proposed in the CHCP will not change current crop production types and procedures or the timing/volume of water supplied during the irrigation season. With the provisions incorporated into the CHCP (listed below), mitigation is not warranted for any effect on agriculture.

It is the intent of the District to continue to serve its agricultural customers under the CHCP. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in physical changes that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Implementation of the CHCP will promote better fishery conditions while retaining current water supply allocations to agricultural providers. With the provisions listed below incorporated into the CHCP, mitigation is not warranted for any effect on agriculture.

To ensure that the Proposed Project would not either directly or indirectly result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland), to non-agricultural use as a result of: 1) changing the flow regime of the river and resulting diversion schedule; or 2) overburdening agricultural users with capital expenditures, the CHCP calls for:

- Conducting a stakeholder workshop within six months of the ITP issuance to educate private diverters regarding fish entrainment issues and how they can obtain funding for screening individual diversions.

- Helping the landowners to locate and apply for funding opportunities that will allow cost-effective placement of screens at their facility including a capital amortization program to help landowners offset some of their construction costs.

- Implementing a stakeholder education program via periodic workshops, annual newsletters and/or a regularly updated website to ensure that local landowners understand: 1) basin fishery issues; 2) their role in providing good fishery conditions; and 3) the potential implications (e.g., delay of flashboard dam installation and water diversions if it is determined that watering of certain crops can be initiated later in the spring).

- Providing advisory assistance to the landowners to ensure that they understand the ESA issues and requirements necessary for installing a screen at their diversion structure.

- Identifying and prioritizing diversion facilities for screening and develop an implementation schedule for individual facilities.

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 Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

III. Air Quality

Air Quality Standards

Emissions of particulate matter or visible emissions are regulated by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) under Regulation 6 "Particulate Matter and Visible Emissions." Specifically, visible particulate emissions are prohibited where the particulates are deposited on real property other than that of the person responsible for the emissions and cause annoyance.

The Proposed Project is within a non-attainment area for federal $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} standards. Therefore, per 40 CFR Part 93 analyses are required for conformity purposes. However, the EPA does not require hot-spot analyses, qualitative or quantitative, for projects that are not listed in section 93.123(b)(1) as an air quality concern. It was determined that the Proposed Project will not contribute to a $PM_{2.5}$ or PM_{10} hot spot that will cause or contribute to a violation of the federal $PM_{2.5}$ or PM_{10} standards.

Table X: Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the San Joaquin Valley

POLLUTANT	FEDERAL STANDARDS	STATE STANDARDS
Ozone - 1 hour	No Federal Standard	Non-attainment/Extreme
Ozone - 8 hour	Non-attainment/Serious	Non-attainment
PM_{10}	Non-attainment/Serious	Non-attainment
$PM_{2.5}$	Non-attainment	Non-attainment
CO - San Joaquin County	Unclassified/Attainment [1]	Attainment
NO_2	Unclassified/Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Unclassified	Attainment
Lead	*No Designation	Attainment
Hydrogen Sulfide	*No Federal Standard	Unclassified
Sulfates	*No Federal Standard	Attainment
Visibility Reducing Particles	*No Federal Standard	Unclassified

Source: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, October 2006. www.valleyair.org

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The Proposed Project will not substantially increase vehicle emissions. Implementation of the Proposed Project will be similar to what occurs under existing conditions. Therefore, while the Proposed Project site is located within a non-attainment area for federal ozone and PM, $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} standards, such limited emissions will not affect the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b. Would the proposed project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Air pollutant emissions associated with the Proposed Project would occur over the short term from construction and periodic maintenance, such as fugitive dust from repairing/replacing the earthen dams and equipment exhaust associated with heavy equipment used for this construction. Compliance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Rules and Regulations during construction will reduce construction-related air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions from construction, grading and quarrying operation and construction equipment emissions to a less than significant impact when performing maintenance and construction activities. These regulations include the following best management practices:

- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials
- Apply water three times daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

c. Would the proposed project 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)?

Serpentinite and ultramafic rocks have been commonly used for unpaved gravel roads, landscaping, fill projects and other improvement projects in some localities. Asbestos may be released to the atmosphere due to vehicular traffic on unpaved roads and during grading for various construction projects. These activities may have the effect of releasing potentially harmful asbestos into the air. Natural weathering and erosion processes can act on asbestos bearing rock and make it easier for asbestos fibers to become airborne if such rock is disturbed. (Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse, Memorandum, October 26, 2000). The New Hogan Dam area includes an ultramafic rock unit that is more likely to contain NOA. However, no project activities are proposed in the New Hogan Dam area and the other Proposed Project Areas do not contain known deposits.

d. Would the proposed project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Air pollutant emissions associated with the Proposed Project would occur over the short term from construction and periodic maintenance, such as

fugitive dust from repairing/replacing the earthen dams and equipment exhaust associated with heavy equipment used for this construction and for the seasonal installation removal of the seasonal dams. Only a few instream structure sites (< 5) are within the vicinity of residential areas and none are near schools and hospitals. In the context of existing practices, the small disturbance areas, moist soils, and brief nature of the work, the emissions from the maintenance activities will be negligible.

Because of its short duration, health risks from construction emissions of diesel particulate would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect. No new, long-term regional emissions would result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

Implementation of BMP AIR-1 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

e. Would the proposed project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people or subject people to objectionable odors.

BMP AIR-1 – Fugitive Dust and Equipment Exhaust. Compliance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Rules and Regulations during construction will reduce construction-related air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions from construction, grading and quarrying operation and construction equipment emissions to a less than significant impact when performing maintenance and construction activities. These regulations include the following best management practices:

- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials.
- Apply water three times daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IV. Biological Resources

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Or

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Or

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?

Or

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The District's operations have the potential to impact federally listed Central Valley steelhead and multiple runs of Chinook salmon that may opportunistically utilize the Calaveras River from the various ongoing activities. The ongoing activities and potential take are summarized in Environmental Assessment/Initial Study Table 8 - Potential Effects to Steelhead and Salmon from No Action Alternative Activities.

Implementation of the conservation strategies proposed in the CHCP (See Environmental Assessment/Initial Study Table 2 - Conservation Strategies of the CHCP) will ensure that impacts to salmonid fish species will be less than significant.

Several other special-status species have been documented to occur or have the potential to occur in the Calaveras River watershed (see Appendix A of the CHCP). Some of these species occupy riparian habitats and may occur near the various facilities operated by SEWD. The routine operation of the

various water district facilities is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on any of these species. However, if maintenance activities associated with the operations of these facilities require the removal of riparian vegetation the potential for negative effects on species associated with such habitat should be addressed. To the extent possible, impacts to areas of riparian vegetation and wetlands would be avoided wherever possible.

Implementation of BMP BIO-1 to BMP BIO-3 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No local ordinances and policies conflict with the CHCP.

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?

There are no other adopted conservation plans on or along the Calaveras River.

BMP BIO-1—Special-Status Non-Salmonid Species—Pre-Construction Surveys: Pre-construction surveys for special-status non-salmonid species will be conducted prior to disturbing riparian vegetation according to SJMSCP (SJCOG 2000) protocols. If special-status non-salmonids are identified, District staff will confer with a qualified biologist to quantify and determine impacts and prescribe feasible incidental take minimization measures.

BMP BIO-2—Special-Status Non-Salmonid Species—Avoidance Timing: Timing of construction will be limited to those periods specified by the SJMSCP (SJCOG 2000) for special-status non-salmonid species determined to potentially be within the vicinity of a Proposed Project site.

BMP BIO-3—Disturbance of Riparian and Wetland Habitats: To the extent possible, impacts to areas of riparian vegetation and wetlands will be avoided. Incidental take minimization measures and compensation requirements will be implemented according to SJMSCP (SJCOG 2000) protocols.

BMP BIO-4—Salmonids—Direct Loss During Construction and Maintenance: Construction and maintenance activities will be scheduled for periods when fish do not have access to Project Areas (i.e., during periods when flood control releases and freshets are not projected to occur) according to the SEWD and CDFW RMA. Provisions are made to allow migrating salmonids to bypass work areas in the channel in the event that unanticipated flood control releases or freshets occur.

BMP BIO-5—Salmonids—Increased Turbidity Impacts: Monitor water turbidity levels during instream construction activities according to a Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 water quality permit. Monitoring would ensure that increases in turbidity over background conditions would not exceed levels specified by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Section 401 permits require preparation and implementation of an erosion control plan and/or a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). At a minimum, the plan would contain the following types of BMPs:

- Complete revegetation and stabilization of disturbed soils in the Proposed Project footprint, including stream banks.
- Placement of interceptor ditches to direct water away from the tops of cut-and-fill slopes.
- Implementation of Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board-approved BMPs for sediment catch basins or traps to prevent sediment from being transported away from construction sites. These would be designed to minimize impacts to riparian, wetland, and open-water areas. Traps to be considered could include filter berms, straw-bale barriers, filter inlets, vegetative filter strips, culvert risers, coir and straw logs, and other erosion control BMPs as approved by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Provisions of the erosion control plan and SWPPP (if required) would be included in conditions of the Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Sections 1600-1606 of the Fish and Game Code.

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

V. Cultural Resources

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

Or

b. Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?

Or

c. Would the proposed project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Or

d. Would the proposed project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The Proposed Project is an undertaking, as defined at 36 CFR §800.16(y), which has the potential to cause effects on historic properties (36 CFR §800.3(a)), and it is necessary to identify cultural resources within the APE that may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Accordingly, LSA has prepared a cultural and

paleontological study (see Environmental Assessment/Initial Study Appendix B) in support of the CHCP and application for incidental take. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that every federal agency "take into account" the effect of its undertakings on historic properties. This study was conducted at a programmatic level and is based on previous cultural resources and paleontological studies conducted within and adjacent to the Project Area. The record search indicated only a very small portion of the Project Area has been systematically surveyed for cultural resources. The survey report titles are included in the References Consulted section of the Cultural and Paleontological study.

An online fossil locality search was done in January 2007, using the Berkeley Natural History Museums (BNHM) online database, specifically data from the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), Berkeley. The Project Area spans a range of geologic units including Jurassic, Cretaceous, and Tertiary of the Sierra Foothills, to the Quaternary alluvial deposits of the Sacramento Valley. The fossil locality search and a literature review revealed a total of six fossil localities: five localities lie within approximately 10 miles of the Project Area and one vertebrate fossil locality lies within the Project Area. Fossil specimens from these localities include mammoths and elephants (Order Proboscidea), horse (Family Equidae), rodents (Order Rodentia), birds (Class Aves), rabbits (Order Lagomorpha), and amphibians (Class Amphibia). These fossils only represent a few examples of the vertebrate fossil taxa commonly found in similarly aged sediments. The locality within the Project Area, identified within the Mormon Slough area of San Joaquin County, represents Late Pleistocene Rancholabrean land mammal fossils. These fossils include horse (Class Equidae) and mammoth (*Mammuthus columbi*) and are found in Pleistocene sandstone. All six fossil localities are located in geologic units that are represented in the Project Area and are considered paleontologically sensitive.

The Project Area is sensitive for both prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites. Settlement pattern data from previous cultural resources studies of the area indicate that the favored locations for prehistoric village sites were at low elevations on the flat valley floor and terraces near rivers and main tributaries. Despite only a very small portion of the Project Area having been systematically surveyed, Gilbert (1990) lists 21 prehistoric archaeological sites and one built environment site previously recorded in the Project Area. Historic-period archaeological resources in the Project Area can include, but are not limited to, settlements/homesteads, transportation-related resources, mining-related resources, cemeteries, and river crossings. In addition, any equipment, infrastructure, or facilities related to water resource management, such as fish ladders, dams, or gauging stations, over 50 years of age are considered

historic-period resources and need to be addressed at the project-level when encountered.

Proposed Project activities that would involve earthmoving in conjunction with maintenance and construction have the potential to impact:

- Prehistoric archaeological sites or the one built environment site.
- Historic-period archaeological resources in the Project Area which could include settlements/homesteads, transportation-related resources, mining-related resources, cemeteries, and river crossings. In addition, any equipment, infrastructure, or facilities related to water resource management, such as fish ladders, dams, or gauging stations, over 50 years of age are considered historic-period resources and need to be addressed at the project-level when encountered.
- Paleontological resources.

Implementation of BMP CULT-1a – 1b and CULT-2 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

BMP CULT-1a—Historic/Archaeological/Paleontological Resources. Before construction, all construction personnel would be instructed on the protection of cultural resources. SEWD would instruct construction workers that cultural resources might be present at the Proposed Project site. They would be trained to stop work near any discovery and notify SEWD's General Manager (GM) of their discovery. The GM would stop work to confirm if the resource could be avoided and consult with a qualified archeologist.

BMP CULT-1b—Historic/Archaeological/Paleontological Resources: Known significant cultural resources would be fenced and a minimum distance maintained for work disturbances.

BMP CULT-2—Human Remains: Should human remains be discovered, construction shall cease immediately, and the county coroner's office and the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified and consulted with regarding actions to be taken.

VI. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☒	☐
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VI. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Impacts and Mitigation

a(i). Would the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Or

a(ii). Would the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Or

a(iii). Would the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Earthquakes occur along fault lines buried beneath the surface of the ground. Faults within the region include the Melones, Bear Mountain, Midway, Black Butte, Patterson Pass, Tesia Fault, San Andreas, Hayward, Calaveras, Midland, Green Valley-Concord, or Stockton Fault, Carson Valley Faults. The most likely sources of seismic hazards are from the San Andreas, Hayward, Calaveras, Midland, Green Valley-Concord, or Tracy-Stockton Faults.

Of the known fault lines within the immediate in the Project Area (Melones, Bear Mountain), none are classified by the State Geologist as active and the potential for seismically induced ground shaking is lower in the Project Area than much of California. Moreover, no activity in the CHCP has any potential to lead to the failure of New Hogan Dam. The Proposed Project involves the modification of instream structures (e.g., flashboard dams), and these structures could fail during seismic shaking. However, these structures are not located in areas where persons would be exposed to increased risks and the potential for landslides, debris flows, swelling or collapsible soils, or other damaging geologic hazards is low. Because these events are highly improbable and would occur during a given short interval, and because improvements associated with the Proposed Project would not increase hazards to levels significantly above current conditions, these impacts do not cross a threshold of environmental significance.

a(iv). Would the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

The areas having landslide potential associated with steep ravines and gulches are found between Canyon and Shelton Road (Reaches 2 and 3). Artificial slopes associated with the existing tailings from the Teichert Aggregates gravel quarry are also located within Reach 2. Slope failures have the potential to impact the river channel affecting downstream water quality and fish habitat. Risk of landslide would not be increased as a result of any of the ongoing or future activities identified in the CHCP. Nor would any of the covered or future covered activities result in an increased risk to persons or structures within or adjacent to the CHCP Proposed Project area. No mitigation is warranted.

b. Would the proposed project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Soils in the Project Area above Jenny Lind (Reaches 1-3) are generally shallow, very rocky, medium textured. Soils in Reach 4 (Shelton Road to Bellota) are typically gravelly, medium textured. Areas with moderate to high erosion hazard in the Project Area can be found in Reach 2 (Canyon to Jenny Lind), which has the highest gradient section of the river, dropping approximately 300 feet in elevation over the course of a few miles, while the area immediately below New Hogan Reservoir and below Bellota are characterized by a relatively low to moderate gradient with a broader floodplain. Construction and maintenance activities would have the potential to exacerbate erosion and adversely affect salmonid habitat. Implementation of BMP GEO-1 and GEO 2 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

c. Would the proposed project 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?

Such conditions are generally not present in the Project Area above Bellota. However, west of Bellota, where the Project Area and Stockton fault zone intersect, localized liquefaction is a significant seismic hazard. Risk of liquefaction would not be increased as a result of any of the ongoing or future activities identified in the CHCP. Nor would any of the covered or future covered activities result in an increased risk to persons or structures within or adjacent to the CHCP Proposed Project site.

The use of unconsolidated materials for levee construction increases the risk of slope failure and flooding. While the Mormon Slough and Stockton

Diversion Canal are contained by levees, these levees were constructed of engineered fill minimizing the risk of slope failure and flooding.

d. Would the proposed project 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?

Such conditions are generally not present in the Project Area. Expansive soils can be unstable. Risk of soil instability due to the presence of expansive soils would not be increased as a result of any of the ongoing or future activities identified in the CHCP. Nor would any of the covered or future covered activities result in an increased risk to persons or structures within or adjacent to the CHCP Proposed Project site.

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

The CHCP would not alter the generation or disposal of waste water within or outside the Project Area.

BMP GEO-1—Soil Erosion: To avoid or minimize impacts related to increased erosion and sedimentation, an erosion control plan for construction activities will be developed which, at a minimum, will contain the following BMPs:

- Supervisory construction personnel will be informed of environmental concerns, pertinent laws and regulations, and final rehabilitation specifications and design.
- Environmental protection measures will be enforced in the field during construction.
- Interception ditches will be provided to direct water away from the tops of cut-and fill slopes.
- Small sediment catch basins or traps will be provided to prevent sediment from being transported away from development sites. The locations and sizes of these basins will be designed to minimize impacts to riparian and wetland areas. Types of sediment traps to be considered include filter berms, straw-bale barriers, filter inlets, vegetative filter strips, and culvert risers.
- Disturbed soils will be revegetated and stabilized. Reseeding and mulching work will be performed following completion of the Proposed Project. If erosion control practices were not installed one year after completion, exposed soils could require additional treatment following seasonal rains and subsequent erosion.
- Non-noxious weed competition will be discouraged, and noxious weeds would be controlled.
- Details regarding seed material, fertilizer, and mulching will be provided. The seed material will include native plant species and be approved by a revegetation specialist or erosion control specialist. Special emphasis would be given to native plant assemblages characteristic of the site prior to construction.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The District's routine use of hazardous materials is limited to gas, diesel fuel and other products needed to power vehicles and equipment for operation and maintenance of diversion and water treatment facilities. The minor construction activities anticipated as part of the CHCP would not constitute a significant change in the use of these materials. In the unlikely event of a spill, fuels would be controlled and disposed of in accordance with county and state regulations.

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?

There is a low potential that a release of hazardous material may occur during construction activities. Petroleum products such as diesel fuel, oil, and unleaded gasoline are the primary hazardous materials associated with construction equipment that may be used within the Proposed Project sites. Implementation of BMP HAZ-1 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

N/A.

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?

The surrounding land uses include agriculture, open space, residential, commercial, and recreation. The Cortese List of hazardous materials sites prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, provides information about the location of hazardous materials release sites throughout the state. A review of the Cortese List uncovered at least two hazardous waste sites with the potential to expose people to potential health hazards associated with soils, groundwater and/or surface water contamination are located within the vicinity of the Proposed Project.

The *McCormick & Baxter Superfund Site (M & B).* The McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co. located in an industrial area near the Port of Stockton at 1214 W. Washington Street, Stockton, CA 95203, San Joaquin County is a 29-acre former wood-preserving facility. Approximately 105,000 people live and work within four miles of the site. The site is bordered on the north by Old Mormon Slough, which is connected to the Stockton Deepwater Channel. Past uses that caused contamination of involved the manufacturing of lumberwood products. Potential media affected include groundwater (uses other than drinking water), sediments, soil, and surface water. Proposed Project clean-up is being funded jointly with state and federal funds with oversight by the RWQCB Central Valley District.

The American Moulding And Millwork (A.M.M.C.). The site is located at 2801 North West Lane, Stockton, CA 95204, San Joaquin County, and was listed on the 1989 Bond Expenditure Plan (BEP). Subsequent investigations evaluated potential areas of concern on the 60-acre site relating to the releases of hazardous substances to soils and groundwater. Site investigations have shown concentrations of pentachlorophenol (PCP), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), heavy metals and dioxins. Investigations and soil removal activities have been conducted under San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department with oversight and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A Voluntary Cleanup Agreement has been completed and signed for the Site to address specific areas of investigation associated with previous Site activities. Clean-up oversight activities are being handled by the San Joaquin County District - Site Mitigation and Brownfield Reuse Program.

Both sites are outside of the Proposed Project boundary and pose no threat to surface or groundwater or persons in the vicinity of the Project Area.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

N/A.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

N/A.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Construction and maintenance equipment will access Proposed Project sites via levee roads and will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Proposed Project sites are located primarily in rural areas that can be susceptible to wildfires. Construction and maintenance will occur at existing instream structures and there will be little additional exposure to wildfire as a result.

BMP HAZ-2—Potential Spills of Hazardous Materials: Development and implementation of a Hazardous Materials Management Plan that includes specific information describing: 1) how the District intends to safely transport and store fuels, oils, and conduct fueling and equipment maintenance operations; and 2) procedures requiring work crews to have on hand at all times adequate absorbent materials and containment booms to handle a spill equivalent to the largest container of fuels or oil in their possession in the event of a release of a hazardous material into water or onto land. The plan will contain, at a minimum, the following BMPs:

- Hazardous materials will not be drained onto the ground, into streams, or into drainage areas.
- All construction waste, including trash and litter, garbage, other solid waste, petroleum products, and other potentially hazardous materials, will be removed to a disposal facility authorized to accept such materials.
- Waters or soils contaminated with construction material will be disposed of in a suitable location to prevent discharge to surface waters.
- Vehicles will be inspected and maintained to reduce the potential for leaks or spills of oils, grease, or hydraulic fluids.
- Hazardous materials will not be stored at the Proposed Project site.
- No vehicles will be refueled at Proposed Project sites.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Would the proposed project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Or

b. Would the proposed project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Some ongoing CHCP activities have the potential to discharge sediments and pollutants into surface waters. These activities could include annual sediment removal and re-construction of the McGurk Earth Dam, which is typically conducted in conjunction with the installation of the flashboards at the Bellota Weir in the spring (on or about April 15) and flashboard dam removal in the fall (on or about October 15). The flashboard dam installation and removal process can take up to two weeks. However, these activities typically occur when the channels are already dry (either naturally or due to flow blockage by installation of uppermost flashboard dam or closure of slide gates) and no flow changes are necessary except as noted for the installation and removal of the Bellota Weir. Moreover, the duration of any of these activities, even when considered cumulatively, only occurs over the course of a period of less than a week in any given year.

However, since these activities typically occur when the channels are already dry (either naturally or due to flow blockage by installation of uppermost flashboard dam or closure of slide gates) and no flow changes are necessary except as noted for the installation and removal of the Bellota Weir, the potential effect of these activities, even when considered cumulatively, would be negligible. The implementation of the CHCP will

not significantly alter these ongoing effects. Moreover, implementation of BMP HYDRO-1 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

c. Would the proposed project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The Proposed Project would not alter the total quantity of water available to the District under either State law or the water supply contract with the Bureau of Reclamation. Only the contract allocation between SEWD and the Calaveras County Water District (CCWD) will change as CCWD builds up to full use of its 43.5% entitlement.

d. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Or

e. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Or

f. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The Proposed Project will not alter the stream course of any of the channels or tributaries that comprise the Project Area. The Proposed Project would not add any impervious land areas along the stream bank that could affect existing storm runoff volumes. The Proposed Project would not alter the current alignment of any of the river or slough channels. Nor will the Proposed Project activities alter the District's regulatory requirements relating to the continuance of the District's existing activities or alter the total amount of water use. Only the allocation between SEWD and CCWD will change as CCWD builds up to full use of its 43.5% entitlement.

While the timing and volumes of flow releases could be modified as a result of the CHCP, the changes in flow regime would not occur during the flood season so there would be no threat of the channel overtopping and altering

surface drainage patterns. The Proposed Project would not alter any existing dam inundation areas or require alteration of the existing emergency procedure plans. The runoff from local agricultural operations has been and will continue to be dominated by climatic conditions and will not be altered by the Proposed Project in any significant way.

g. Would the proposed project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The Proposed Project does not involve housing and will not affect the District's allocation of water for domestic or other purposes.

h. Would the proposed project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The Proposed Project will include the modification or replacement of existing diversion facilities within the 100-year flood hazard area. The improvements will be made in compliance with local and state requirements for flood impacts and should result in an incremental improvement to flow capacity.

i. Would the proposed project 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?

The covered activities will have no effect on the structural integrity or operation of the dam, levees, or other reclamation works. As described above, New Hogan Dam will continue to be operated in compliance with the Corps' flood space requirements.

j. Would the proposed project inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The Proposed Project will not contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

BMP HYDRO 1—Water Quality: While some Proposed Action activities could result in some discharge of sediments and pollutants into surface waters discharges, their effect on water quality would be minimized through the incorporation of several procedures imposed on the Proposed Project. Such conditions are those that would be prescribed in the general NPDES dewatering permit issued by the RWQCB, the general National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Construction Activities issued by the RWQCB, and the Areawide Urban Stormwater Runoff Permit for San Joaquin and Calaveras Counties issued by the RWQCB. Accordingly, standard procedures to minimize the potential disturbance to surface water should include the best management practices described below.

- All equipment maintenance shall be conducted at a SEWD maintenance yard designated for such purposes. This maintenance area shall include appropriate protection from soil contamination by using impervious barriers.
- All storage areas for oils, solvents, coolants, wastes, and other miscellaneous fluids used to operate the District's equipment should be covered and protected with secondary containment structures such as lined troughs in the event of leakage from drums, barrels, cans, or other primary structures.
- Disposal containers for oils, solvents, hydraulic fluids, coolants, and other filter and chemical wastes from maintenance activities should be located outside of the Project Area, within a designated maintenance facility. Disposal of these wastes shall be conducted in accordance with California Administrative Code Title 22 regulations.
- Grading activities will implement erosion and sediment control measures.
- SEWD will prepare a construction SWPPP and implement appropriate measures.

BMP HYDRO 2 — General Increased Turbidity: If applicable (i.e., there is flowing water during construction activities), SEWD will monitor turbidity levels upstream and downstream of the point of construction activities, as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region (RWQCB). Measurements would be taken up to four times daily when construction activities potentially have the greatest water quality impact. If turbidity increases exceeded 20 percent, actions will be implemented immediately to reduce and maintain turbidity below the 20 percent level. Actions could include use of suspended silt curtains, cessation of construction activities, or reduction of construction activities until turbidity standards are achieved.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - - Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IX. Land Use Planning

Impacts

a. Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?

The Proposed Project is located within Lower Calaveras River, the Mormon Slough and its tributaries. Property surrounding the Proposed Project includes agricultural, urban commercial, highway and residential uses. The Proposed Project is confined to the existing creek channel and banks. The Proposed Project would not create any new division of any local community. Therefore, the proposed improvements would not result in any new divisions to any of the established communities located along the Lower Calaveras River, Mormon Slough or its tributaries. Mitigation is not warranted to avoid community division.

b. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The Proposed Project would retain the existing alignment of the lower Calaveras Creek and the Mormon Slough. As such, the Proposed Project—which is confined to the bankfull channel and adjacent riparian zone—would not result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of the area. Nor would it be affected by or have an effect on present or planned land use of the area. Mitigation is not warranted to achieve consistency with Plan Consistency with Local Agency Plans.

c. Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The relevant plans are the District's Long Range Organizational Plan, which contain watershed-related goals which include "restoring, protecting, and enhancing water quality and associated aquatic resources and water supplies within the Calaveras River." The CHCP will help attain these goals. Mitigation is not warranted to achieve consistency with SEWD Long Range Organizational Plans.

X. **MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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. Mineral Resources

Impacts

a. Would the proposed project 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?

Or

b. Would the proposed project 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?

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of concrete aggregate, sand or gravel – products currently mined in the area by Teichert Aggregates. Nor would it result in changes to any designated mining areas on any local general plans. The District does not have contracts with parties for in-stream mineral rights (e.g., sand and gravel mining permits) that would be affected by or could affect any of the activities identified in the CHCP.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XI. Noise

Impacts and Mitigation

a. Would the proposed project result in 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?

Or

b. Would the proposed project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Or

c. Would the proposed project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The Proposed Project would not generate additional vehicle trips, add to or alter the existing roadway infrastructure, or change the distance between the Proposed Project and noise-sensitive land uses such as residences. Therefore, no significant long-term traffic noise impact would occur upon the completion of any of the Proposed Project activities.

A temporary increase in noise is expected to be generated by equipment, vehicles, and personnel during construction activities, however, this impact would be temporary in nature and would be limited to typical construction equipment (e.g., backhoe, bulldozer, grader, loader, scraper, truck) noise levels which range from 80-89 dBA 50 feet from source (FTA 2006). Based on basic sound level drop-off rate of 6.0 dBA per doubling of distance, noise levels at 300 feet would range from 65-74 dBA. Construction at sites within San Joaquin County would only be conducted from Mondays - Saturdays between 6:00 AM and 9:00 PM, and noise associated with temporary construction activities during this timeframe is specifically exempt from San Joaquin County noise standards (Title 9, Section 9-1025.9 of the San Joaquin County Code). Construction at sites within Calaveras County would only be conducted from Mondays- Saturdays between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM, and noise associated with temporary construction activities during this timeframe is specifically exempt from Calaveras County noise standards (Title 9, Chapter 9.02.060 Exemption E of the Calaveras County Code). Therefore, no short-term traffic noise impact would occur.

d. Would the proposed project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The covered activities will not alter long-term operations in a way that will alter current noise levels. Future covered activities will include new diversion facilities that will be located far from population centers and will be largely noiseless.

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?

N/A.

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?

N/A.

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

XII. Population and Housing

Impacts

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The Proposed Project is proposed to satisfy regulatory requirements relating to the continuance of the District's existing activities, which include the ongoing provision of water to over 300,000 residential and business customers. The quantity of the District's current water diversion and water rights pertaining to diversions will remain unchanged.

The Proposed Project neither limits nor induces population growth. Mitigation is not warranted for any effect to population growth.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The CHCP would not result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of the area or result in the displacement of any existing population or housing. Mitigation is not warranted for any effect to housing.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

N/A.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XIII. Public Services.

Impacts

a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?

While the Project Area is subject to flood inundation and fire hazard, the Proposed Project would not introduce any new activity that would affect public health, induce new hazards, or add demand or affect response time of any public health provider. Mitigation is not warranted for any effect on flooding or fire.

The Proposed Project activities would not affect any service ratios relative to schools, parks or other public facilities. Mitigation is not warranted for any effect on public services.

XIV. RECREATION –	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XIV. Recreation

Impacts and Mitigation

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?

The Project Area includes recreational activities that are directly water dependent (e.g., fishing) and indirectly water dependent (e.g., visual setting the river channel provides for trail activities) and may be affected by activities that would alter the timing or quantity of water releases. New Hogan Reservoir water impoundment and non-flood control operations affect flow releases from approximately May to October. However, the principal long-term effect of the CHCP will be to increase river flows somewhat during the dry period, enhancing the environmental setting. Any marginal decrease in flows during the wet season would likely be unnoticed. In addition, the level of recreational activity in the Project Area is minor. There is no designated public recreation area within the Project Area except the area directly below New Hogan Dam, which is managed as part of the larger New Hogan Reservoir Recreation Area. No Mitigation is warranted.

In the short-term, covered activities including artificial instream structures and SEWD small instream dam operations and SEWD channel maintenance (for instream structures) and construction and maintenance of new diversions could temporarily render levees impassible for trail use for short periods of time, interfering with recreational trail use. However, with the exception of Reach 1, existing trail use is an unsanctioned activity. Fishing activities within the Project Area may also be temporarily impacted on a periodic basis by construction of fish passage improvements such as fish ladders or other structural improvements. However, fishing could still occur up- or downstream of the construction and would likely be enhanced in the long-term by increased dry-season flow releases. Implementation of BMP REC-1 will reduce impacts from trail closure to Less Than Significant level.

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?

The Proposed Project will involve no modification of a recreational facility.

BMP REC-1—Trail Closure: While trail use is primarily informal and unsanctioned, adequate signage indicating schedule of activities requiring closure of recreational trails will reduce temporary conflicts between recreational users and work crews conducting maintenance and construction activities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XV. Transportation

Impacts and Mitigation

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

Or

b. Would the proposed project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

The Proposed Project is proposed to satisfy regulatory requirements relating to the continuance of the District's existing water supply activities. The Proposed Project will neither limit nor induce changes in relation to any transportation policies, plans, or the existing transportation infrastructure, including traffic load and capacity.

Proposed Project sites are generally located in rural areas. General transportation patterns in these areas are typical of lightly populated rural communities. Roads are used by residents, recreationists, and commercial trucks. A temporary increase in the number of trucks (used to transport gravel and rock material from landscape facilities to construction sites) is expected and could result in delays on the local roadway system. However, this increase would be minimal and would occur for a short duration (i.e., three to four weeks annually).

Implementation of BMP TRANS-1 would result in a Less than Significant Adverse Effect.

c. Would the proposed project 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?

The Proposed Project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d. Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The Proposed Project will result in no modifications to roadways or changes in land use.

***e. Would the proposed project r*esult in inadequate emergency access?**

The Proposed Project may reduce physical access to levee trails during construction, but not to the extent of preventing access by emergency vehicles.

***f. Would the proposed project r*esult in inadequate parking capacity?**

The Proposed Project will have no effect on parking.

g. ***Would the proposed project c*****onflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

The Proposed Project involves activities within and immediately along a river that does not serve as a transportation corridor nor borders one.

BMP TRANS-1-Construction Vehicle Traffic: Preparation of a haul route access plan will minimize potential conflicts between construction activities and general traffic and will reduce these short-term impacts to a less than significant level.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

Impacts

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Or

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?

Or

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?

Or

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Or

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?

By its nature, the conservation strategies proposed in the CHCP will not place significant demands on utilities, such as:

- Electric, phone, sewage treatment services, etc.

- Public services (e.g., fire, police, school, parks, or other public facilities or agencies support)
- Landfill capacity
- Storm drainage services.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?

Or

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Some solid waste (e.g., concrete, dirt/fill, rocks) may be generated during excavation at Proposed Project sites. The District will design and implement a Construction-Demolition Recycling Plan to comply with the City of Stockton's Construction and Demolition (C&D) Recycling Program which requires recycling of at least 50% of the materials generated by a Proposed Project. This C&D Recycling Program is designed to be in compliance with the State of California's requirement that all cities divert 50% of their waste materials from landfills (AB 939). Compliance with this permit will reduce the amount of solid waste that will be disposed in a landfill.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Impacts

a. ***Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

The Proposed Project is intended to benefit the environment through the construction of, for example, fish passage improvements and new diversions in order to reduce potential "incidental take" of listed fish. Although long-term effects are beneficial, there is a potential to temporarily impact several resources (e.g., biological resources, water quality, air quality). Implementation of BMPs for Checklist Sections III-VIII, XIV, and XV will minimize impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

b. ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

The Proposed Project will not have considerable cumulative impacts. This checklist discusses the potential impacts as a result of the Proposed Project.

c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The Proposed Project will not have considerable impacts on human beings. This checklist discusses the potential impacts as a result of the Proposed Project.