

SECTION 6: EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section is based on the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) prepared for the project and included in this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as Appendix A, Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, as well as additional information added after the preparation of the IS/NOP that supports the less than significant and no impact findings. In addition, a qualitative evaluation of energy consumption associated with the construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project is provided at the end of this section. Energy consumption was added in this section because the project's potential impact on energy resources was found to be less than significant. The IS/NOP was prepared to identify the potentially significant effects of the project and was circulated for public review between November 13, 2012 and December 13, 2012. Additionally, in the course of evaluating the project's potential impacts and preparing the Draft EIR, certain effects relating to certain subjects or topical areas within those particular subjects were found either to be less than significant or to have no impact. Therefore, these subjects were not discussed in detail in this Draft EIR. This section provides a brief discussion of the reasons for the less than significant and no impacts determinations, which are based on the detailed analysis conducted during preparation of the IS/NOP.

6.1 - Aesthetics

6.1.1 - Scenic Vista

The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

According to both the City of Beaumont General Plan and the County of Riverside Pass Area Plan, scenic resources in the project vicinity include ridgelines, rural and undeveloped areas, the "Badlands" area, the deodar cedar trees (*Cedrus deodara*) along Beaumont Avenue, and the San Bernardino and San Jacinto Mountains. The pipeline would be located underground and would not affect views either of or from any of these scenic resources. The recharge facility would have raised embankments along its perimeter that would extend approximately 9.5 feet above the existing surrounding grade. At this limited height, the embankments would not impact views of the adjacent deodar cedar trees along Beaumont Avenue or undeveloped areas. Additionally, the service connection facility would include an approximately 10-foot by 12-foot building. Based on the height and size of this structure, visual line-of-sight from adjacent areas would not be affected as a result of the structure. Therefore, impacts associated with scenic vistas would be less than significant.

6.1.2 - Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway

The project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway.

The project would not be located within the viewshed of an Officially Designated or Eligible State Scenic Highway. The nearest such highways to the project are State Route (SR) 243, from SR-74 to

the City of Banning, and Interstate (I) 10 throughout the greater Beaumont area. The closest portions of these highway segments occur approximately 5.75 miles southeast of the project and roughly 1.5 mile southwest of the project, respectively. Views of the project from these portions of highway would be interrupted by both natural variation in topography and elements of the built environment, and as a result, no visual line-of-sight would occur between either of these highway segments and the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with State Scenic Highways would occur.

6.1.3 - Visual Character

The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

During construction of the project, construction equipment and materials could be stored at one of four staging areas. Although storage of this equipment and materials could potentially affect the viewshed of the surrounding land uses, the storage would be temporary and cease upon completion of construction activities. Additionally, the project area could be characterized as undergoing steady change over the past decade, with several completed residential, commercial, institutional, and municipal projects having occurred in the project vicinity. Moreover, the future development of land in the project area that is currently vacant but is planned for eventual development would continue to provide views of construction equipment and materials. As a result, the presence of construction equipment and materials is and would continue to be a relatively familiar occurrence in the project vicinity, and thus, the presence of these construction elements and the use of the staging areas would not substantially degrade the existing character or quality of the project sites or surrounding area. Therefore, short-term impacts associated with the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

The pipeline would be located underground and would not be visible from the surrounding area. The recharge facility would have raised embankments along its perimeter that would extend approximately 9.5 feet above the existing surrounding grade. Residential uses located east of Beaumont Avenue and north and south of Cougar Way have block walls ranging from four to six feet in height and building facades ranging 15 to 20 feet in height. Because of the presence of these existing walls and facades, the addition of the embankments along the western side of Beaumont Avenue would only be visible at certain limited vantage points and would not substantially degrade the existing character or quality of the project sites or surrounding area. Additionally, the service connection facility would include an approximately 10-foot by 12-foot building. Based on the height and size of this structure, the improvements on the service facility site would be smaller than the existing residential buildings located along Orchard Street. Moreover, because of their scale, the improvements on the service connection site would not serve as a prominent feature in the project area or otherwise be obtrusive. Therefore, long-term impacts associated with the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

6.1.4 - Light or Glare

The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Limited nighttime lighting would be provided at the recharge facility and service connection facility for safety and security purposes. Although the specific type of lighting that will be used at the project facilities would not be finalized until the preparation of final development drawings, all lighting fixtures would use low wattage light bulbs with hoods. All lighting would be directed towards the ground and similar to the existing exterior residential and school nighttime lighting used in the project area. Therefore, impacts associated with lighting would be less than significant.

The project facilities would not include any components with vertical reflective surfaces that could potentially create glare that could affect surrounding land uses. Although the water contained within the basins could produce glare, the water level within the basins would be lower than the adjacent berms, and as a result, ground-level receptors in the project area would be affected by glare produced by the water. Therefore, impacts associated with glare would be less than significant.

6.2 - Agriculture and Forestry Resources

6.2.1 - Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use

The project would not 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.

The recharge facility site, the service connection site, and the offsite triangular parcel have likely supported historical farming and other agricultural operations. However, under the existing conditions, none of the project sites support agricultural activities. Regardless, according to the California Department of Conservation: Division of Land Resource Protection, the recharge facility site, the service connection site, and the offsite triangular parcel are identified as Farmland of Local Importance. Currently, 229,877 acres of Farmland of Local Importance occurs in Riverside County. The approximately 50.9 acres of Farmland of Local Importance that constitute the project sites comprise roughly 0.02 percent of the County's total Farmland of Local Importance. As a result, the loss of Farmland of Local Importance due to the project represents a nominal amount of the total amount of Farmland of Local Importance found in the County. No other Farmland, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, is located on, adjacent to, or within one mile of the project. Therefore, impacts associated with the conversion of Farmland would be less than significant.

6.2.2 - Conflict with Existing Zoning or Williamson Act Contract

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

According to the City of Beaumont and the County of Riverside Zoning Maps, neither the project sites nor any adjacent lands are zoned for agricultural use. Additionally, in accordance with Sections 53091(d) and 53091(e) of the California Government Code, as a municipal water storage/recharge facility, the project would be exempt from the zoning ordinances of a county or city, including the provisions contained in the City of Beaumont and County of Riverside Zoning Ordinances. As a result, the project would not conflict with zoning in the City of Beaumont or the County of Riverside, including existing agricultural zoning. Therefore, no impacts associated with agricultural zoning would occur.

Per the California Department of Conservation: Division of Land Resource Protection, the recharge facility site, the service connection site, and the offsite triangular parcel not located on, adjacent to, or within 0.6 mile of the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with Williamson Act contracts would occur.

6.2.3 - Conflict with Zoning or Rezoning of Forest Land or Timberland

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).

According to the City of Beaumont and County of Riverside Zoning Maps, neither the project sites nor any adjacent lands are zoned for forestland, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production. The nearest forested lands to the project is the San Bernardino National Forest, whose boundary is located approximately 2.0 miles northeast of the project. Based on this distance, the project would not conflict with these forested lands. Therefore, no impacts associated with forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production zoning would occur.

6.2.4 - Loss or Conversion of Forest Land

The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Neither the project sites nor any adjacent lands are zoned for forestland, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production. The nearest forested lands to the project is the San Bernardino National Forest, whose boundary is located approximately 2.0 miles northeast of the project. Based on this distance, the project would not conflict with these forested lands. Therefore, no impacts associated with the loss or conversion of forestland would occur.

6.2.5 - Conversion to Non-Agricultural or Non-Forest Use

The project would not involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use of conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Currently, 229,877 acres of Farmland of Local Importance occurs in Riverside County. The project would result in the conversion of 50.9 of these acres, compromising roughly 0.02 percent of the County's total Farmland of Local Importance. As a result, the loss of Farmland of Local Importance due to the project represents a nominal amount of the total amount of Farmland of Local Importance found in the County. No other Farmland, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, is located on, adjacent to, or within one mile of the project. Therefore, impacts associated with the conversion of Farmland would be less than significant. Additionally, the project would not introduce any use or activity that would be incompatible with agricultural production. Therefore, no impacts associated with the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use would occur.

Based on the approximately two miles between the project and the nearest forested land, the project would not affect forestland or result in the conversion of such lands. Therefore, no impacts associated with conversion of forestland to non-forest use would occur.

6.3 - Air Quality

All environmental issues concerning Air Quality are addressed in Section 3.1, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR.

6.4 - Biological Resources

6.4.1 - Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources

The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

No Impact. Beaumont Avenue, from Cherry Valley Boulevard south to Oak Valley Parkway, is currently lined with mature street trees, consisting of deodar cedar. Both the Beaumont Municipal Code and the County of Riverside General Plan Open Space Element contain provisions regarding tree preservation, maintenance, removal, and relocation. Additionally, the Noble Creek Vistas Specific Plan, which encompasses the recharge facility site, establishes various provisions related to the protection of the deodar cedar trees, including setback and buffer requirements for areas west of Beaumont Avenue. Although SGWPA is not bound by the provisions contained in the Noble Creek Specific Plan per Sections 53091(d) and 53091(e) of the California Government Code, the following design features included in the Specific Plan would still be incorporated as part of the project:

- A 40-foot landscape buffer from the western edge of the Beaumont Avenue right-of-way into the proposed recharge facility site.

Effects Found Not To Be Significant

- A 25-foot permeable surface around each deodar cedar tree (except where the distance between tree and existing road is less than 25 feet).

While not bound to the aforementioned tree preservation provisions per Sections 53091(d) and 53091(e) of the California Government Code, the project would include the placing of the pipeline towards the centerline of Beaumont Avenue to reduce potential effects on the deodar cedar trees and their root systems. This, along with incorporation of the above design features, would further reduce potential impacts to the deodar cedar trees along Beaumont Avenue. Because the SGPWA is not bound by the provisions contained in the City's Municipal Code and the County's General Plan, the project would not conflict with either the City's tree preservation provisions or the County's tree preservation policy. Therefore, no impacts associated with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

6.5 - Cultural Resources

All environmental issues concerning Cultural Resources are addressed in Section 3.3, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR.

6.6 - Geology and Soils

6.6.1 - Earthquakes

The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

- iv) **Landslides.**
-

The recharge facility would include earthen berms and embankments. However, all slopes created as part of the recharge facility would be engineered to ensure structural integrity and to prevent instability, reducing the potential for landslide. The pipeline, service connection site, and offsite triangular parcel are relatively flat; any improvements related to the project would not alter this flat topography. As a result, landslide activity is not anticipated following implementation of the project. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides would be less than significant.

6.6.2 - Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss

The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The pipeline would be located underground and would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The recharge facility would alter the existing, relatively flat topography by creating five basins, each separated by earthen berms, as well as raised earthen embankments along the facility's perimeter. These slopes would be engineered to ensure structural integrity and to prevent instability, reducing the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil during storm events. To prevent the basins from overflowing during larger than normal storm events, some of the water within the

basins may be directed via pipes to an existing storm drain located immediately southwest of the recharge facility site. However, the amount of basin water that could potentially be directed to this existing storm drain during storm events would be less than the amount of stormwater that is currently directed to this storm drain during storm events.

Additionally, the service connection site consists of a relatively flat, undeveloped parcel predominantly covered by bare earth. When left unprotected from the elements, bare earth can be susceptible to the effects of soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Construction of the service connection facility would remove a portion of this bare earth and replace it with a 10-foot by 12-foot building, which would not be susceptible to the impacts of soil erosion and the loss of topsoil.

Moreover, if the offsite triangular parcel would be used for depositing soils, all deposits would be distributed evenly throughout the site so that existing topography would not be substantially altered. By maintaining the existing topography, drainage characteristics would remain similar to the existing conditions, and as a result, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur.

6.6.3 - Expansive Soil

The project would not 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.

At the time of preparing the Initial Study, it was unknown if the sites of the proposed facilities had expansive soils. Due to the nature of the proposed project (i.e., construction of a recharge facility, pipeline, and service connection facility), the presence of expansive soil was found to not result in substantial risks to life or property. Furthermore, as the detailed design is prepared for the proposed facilities, the soil characteristics would be taken into account. Therefore, the proposed facilities would not have a potential to create a substantial risk to life or property.

The evaluation within the 2013 Geotechnical Investigation Report supported the above conclusion that the proposed facilities would result in less than significant impacts would occur from expansive soils. The report identified that based on visual classification and sieve analysis, soils on the project sites have very low expansion potential. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soils would be less than significant.

6.6.4 - Wastewater Disposal Systems

The project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

The project does not include/require any wastewater disposal system. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

6.7 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions

All environmental issues concerning greenhouse gas emissions are addressed in Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR.

6.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

6.8.1 - Routine Use

The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

During construction of the project, hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be routinely handled, transported, used, and disposed of at the project sites. These hazardous materials would include gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and other petroleum-based products used to operate and maintain construction equipment and vehicles. This handling, transporting, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be a temporary activity and coincide with short-term construction activities. Any handling of hazardous materials would be limited in both quantity and concentrations. Hazardous materials associated with operation and maintenance of construction equipment and vehicles may be stored on the project sites, although only the amounts needed are expected to be stored onsite; excessive amounts are not expected to be stored onsite. Removal and disposal of hazardous materials from the project sites would be conducted by a permitted and licensed service provider. Any handling, transporting, use, or disposal would comply with applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (the Certified Unified Program Agency [CUPA] for Riverside County). Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with hazardous materials would be less than significant.

During the operation phase of the project, hazardous or potentially hazardous materials may be handled, transported, used, and disposed of at the project sites. Because of the nature of the project, these materials could vary, but would generally be limited to fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and similar materials used at the recharge facility site and the service connection site. These types of materials are common and represent a low risk to people and the environment when used as intended. Therefore, long-term operation impacts associated with hazardous materials would be less than significant.

6.8.2 - Public Airports

The project is not located within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

The nearest public airport to the project would be Banning Municipal Airport, which is located approximately seven miles southeast of the project sites in the City of Banning. According to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission's Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project sites occur outside of any designated Compatibility Contour. The project would not include any improvements that would occur at heights that could potentially interfere with air traffic. The tallest improvements introduced to the project area as part of the project would be the service connection facility building, which would be less than 10 feet in height, and the recharge facility embankments, which would extend less than eight feet above the existing surrounding grade. Both of these improvements would occur well below any flight path. Any overhead air traffic would be coincidental and would occur at elevations that would not pose a safety hazard for people on or adjacent to the project sites. Therefore, no impacts associated with safety hazards from public airports would occur.

6.8.3 - Private Airstrips

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

No private airstrips are located within a 20-mile radius of the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with safety hazards from private airstrips would occur.

6.8.4 - Emergency Plans

The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Construction of the recharge facility and the service connection facility would occur off the public street system and would not interfere with emergency response or an emergency evacuation plan.

Construction of the pipeline could result in the temporary closure of one traffic lane along the existing two-lane Beaumont Avenue and two-lane Orchard Street in the area undergoing construction. This lane closure could occur as excavation, placement, and backfilling activities occur. In areas where jack and bore activities are planned, such as at the Mountain View Channel and Noble Creek, one lane could also be closed. Because both Beaumont Avenue and Orchard Street have unpaved dirt shoulders, there would be an opportunity for emergency vehicles to pass traffic in the vicinity of the lane closure.

Operation of the project would not impact circulation on the local street system, and as a result, would not affect emergency response or an emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts associated with interfering with emergency response or an emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

6.8.5 - Wildland Fires

The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The project would be located within an increasingly developed area outside of a wildland-urban interface. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, none of the project sites are located within areas deemed highly susceptibility to wildland fire. Therefore, impacts associated with wildland fires would be less than significant.

6.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality

6.9.1 - Water Quality Standards and Requirements

The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

During construction of the project, earthmoving activities could potentially introduce sediments into stormwater runoff during storm events. As established by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), a project that would disturb more than one acre of area would be required to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities. In addition to the General Construction Permit, the project would also be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs), as well as other BMPs designed to maintain water quality during construction activities.

During the operation phase of the project, the amount of stormwater runoff produced on the project site would not increase over the existing quantity. The recharge facility has been designed to contain stormwater runoff to the site. The perimeter of the basins would consist of unlined earthen slopes, which would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff generated from the recharge facility site. Maintenance roads provided along the perimeter of these earthen slopes would have a slight grade that would allow stormwater runoff to drain into the basins. Stormwater runoff would also flow from the top of the earthen slopes toward the project boundary, similar to under existing conditions. Because at least some of the stormwater runoff would be captured by the basins, this flow would be less than under existing conditions.

The basins would require periodic maintenance by heavy-construction equipment. To reduce the potential for construction equipment to transfer sediments from the recharge facility site into local streets, a steel grate would be provided at the entrance of the basin and BMPs would be incorporated in accordance with the requirements of the County of Riverside and City of Beaumont.

Additionally, since raw SWP water would be used to recharge the groundwater basin, the potential effects related to turbidity must be evaluated. Turbidity impacts certain portions of the SWP and has the potential to affect recharge projects, since sediment loads can reduce recharge rates. However,

the turbidity of the SWP water in the East Branch Extension, which is located downstream of Lake Silverwood, is much less than in the SWP Aqueduct, and is not expected to cause clogging problems. Moreover, recharge projects have a potential to pollute groundwater basins, if the imported water is high in TDS, nitrates, or other pollutants. However, the introduction of imported SWP water into the groundwater basin should not pose a water quality problem, as SWP water is low in TDS and other constituents of concern. The average TDS of water measured at Devil Canyon Afterbay near San Bernardino is about 250 mg/l over a 14-year period from 1990 to 2003, ranging from about 175 to 380 mg/l. This average is lower than that of the extracted groundwater in the project vicinity. Other constituents, such as nitrates, are well within Basin Plan objectives and drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCL) standards. Therefore, short-term construction and long-term operation impacts associated with stormwater and groundwater quality would be less than significant.

6.9.2 - Groundwater Supplies and Recharge

The project would not 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 purpose of the project is to facilitate groundwater recharge. The project would have a beneficial effect on groundwater supplies. Therefore, no adverse impacts associated with groundwater supplies or recharge would occur.

6.9.3 - Drainage Pattern: Erosion or Siltation

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the 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.

The proposed pipeline would be located underground and would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area. However, development of the recharge facility would alter the relatively flat topography currently found on the site, which could potentially alter the current drainage pattern of the area. Under the existing conditions, the majority of onsite stormwater runoff flows to the southwest, although some runoff flows from the northwestern portion of the recharge facility site into Noble Creek. Following construction of the recharge facility, much of the onsite stormwater runoff would be contained within the basins, while runoff flowing from the perimeter of the earthen slopes to the project boundary would be conveyed to an existing storm drain located southwest of the site. The amount of stormwater runoff directed to this existing storm drain would be less than under the existing conditions, and the quantity of runoff that would flow from the perimeter of the northernmost basin into Noble Creek would be less than under current conditions as well. With this decrease in stormwater runoff flows from the recharge facility site, there would be a subsequent decrease in erosion and siltation from the site.

Additionally, the service connection site consists of a relatively flat, undeveloped parcel predominantly covered by bare earth. When left unprotected from the elements, bare earth can be

Effects Found Not To Be Significant

susceptible to the effects of erosion and siltation. Construction of the service connection facility would remove a portion of this bare earth and replace it with a 10-foot by 12-foot building, which would not be susceptible to the impacts of erosion and siltation.

Moreover, if the offsite triangular parcel would be used for depositing soils, all deposits would be distributed evenly throughout the site so that existing topography would not be substantially altered. By maintaining the existing topography, drainage characteristics would remain similar to the existing conditions, and as a result, substantial erosion or siltation would not occur. Therefore, impacts associated with altering the existing drainage pattern would be less than significant.

6.9.4 - Drainage Pattern: Flooding

The project would not 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.

The pipeline would be located underground and would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area. Additionally, although development of the aboveground project facilities would introduce basins, embankments, buildings, and other improvements that would alter the existing topography and could potentially alter the current drainage pattern of the project sites, the project would not increase stormwater runoff flows from the sites when compared to existing conditions. However, the basin would be uncovered, and as a result, could potentially be susceptible to overflow conditions, although unlikely, if filled beyond capacity, either by SWP water or precipitation from storm events, or a combination of both.

Flooding is the covering of land that is not normally covered with water. The filling of the basins with SWP water would not be considered flooding because, under normal circumstances, the basins would typically be covered with water. The recharge facility would be designed to direct water to a specific basin with the capacity to receive water, and as a result, overflow conditions would not occur. As such, even though the recharge facility would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, on- or off-site flooding would not occur.

Moreover, construction of the service connection facility would remove a small portion of the undeveloped 3.5-acre site and replace it with a 10-foot by 12-foot building. The footprint of this structure would represent only a nominal percentage of the overall service connection site and would not be large enough to substantially alter the current drainage pattern of the site.

Furthermore, if the offsite triangular parcel would be used for depositing soils, all deposits would be distributed evenly throughout the site so that existing topography would not be substantially altered. By maintaining the existing topography, drainage characteristics would remain similar to the existing conditions, and as a result, substantial flooding impacts would not occur. Therefore, impacts associated with altering the existing drainage pattern would be less than significant.

6.9.5 - Runoff Water and Drainage Systems

The project would not 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 pipeline would be located underground and would not create or contribute runoff water. Additionally, much of the onsite stormwater runoff would be contained within the basins, while runoff flowing from the perimeter of the earthen slopes to the project boundary would be conveyed to an existing 36-inch storm drain located southwest of the site. During large storm events, a portion the southwesternmost basin may be drained so that stormwater runoff entering the basins would not result in an overflow condition. The amount of stormwater runoff and basin water anticipated that would be conveyed to the existing storm drain would be less than the amount of stormwater that is currently collected by the storm drain.

The design capacity of a 36-inch storm drain is approximately 57.6 cubic feet per second (cfs). Generally, a pervious property such as the recharge facility site will yield a stormwater runoff flow of approximately one cfs per acre for a 100-year storm event. As a result, under the worst-case scenario, the 44-acre recharge facility site would yield a stormwater runoff flow of roughly 44 cfs, which could be accommodated by the existing storm drain. Since the recharge facility would reduce the amount of land that could contribute onsite stormwater runoff because the basins would retain precipitation falling on the majority of the site, the amount of runoff from the site would be less than under existing conditions. As such, the recharge facility would not result in an exceedance of the existing storm drain, and would not increase the amount of stormwater runoff that could potentially convey pollutants offsite.

Moreover, development of the project would not alter the drainage pattern of either the service connection site or the offsite triangular parcel to the extent that a substantial increase in onsite stormwater runoff would occur, exceeding the capacity of existing or planned storm drains that currently serve these sites. Therefore, impacts associated with the exceedance of stormwater drainage systems would be less than significant.

6.9.6 - Water Quality

The project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

During construction of the project, earthmoving activities could potentially introduce sediments into stormwater runoff during storm events. As established by the SWRCB, a project that would disturb more than one acre of area would be required to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities. In addition to the General Construction Permit, the project would also be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP would include erosion and sediment control best management practices BMPs, as well as other BMPs designed to maintain water quality during construction activities.

During the operation phase of the project, the amount of stormwater runoff produced on the project site would not increase over the existing quantity. The recharge facility has been designed to contain stormwater runoff to the site. The perimeter of the basins would consist of unlined earthen slopes, which would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff generated from the recharge facility site. Maintenance roads provided along the perimeter of these earthen slopes would have a slight grade that would allow stormwater runoff to drain into the basins. Stormwater runoff would also flow from the top of the earthen slopes toward the project boundary, similar to under existing conditions. Because at least some of the stormwater runoff would be captured by the basins, this flow would be less than under existing conditions.

However, as with all groundwater recharge operations, there would be a possibility for groundwater mounding to occur below the recharge facility, which could potentially degrade shallow subsurface aquifers and surface water features should the deeper groundwater table contain constituents that are conveyed upwards as a result of the mounding.

Generally, groundwater mounding is an outward and upward expansion of the free groundwater table caused by shallow re-injection, percolation below an impoundment, or other surface recharge process. Groundwater mounding can potentially alter groundwater flow rates and direction, reduce the integrity of soils supporting foundations and basements, and convey constituents suspended in deeper aquifers upwards. The shape and height of the groundwater mound depend on many factors, including the distance between the surface recharge body and the groundwater table, the size and depth of the surface water body, the infiltration rate of the subsurface soils, the flow pattern of the groundwater, and the specific features and characteristics of the subsurface geology and aquifers.

The SGPWA considered groundwater mounding when evaluating potential locations for the recharge facility. Depth to groundwater was an important factor that contributed to the SGPWA choosing the recharge facility site as the appropriate location for the recharge facility, as the distance between the floor of the facility and the groundwater table below would be great enough to support groundwater recharge while also preventing impacts from groundwater mounding. Depth to groundwater is important because this distance affects the recharge performance of the facility, and serves as a measure of the available storage capacity below the facility. Generally, the rate of groundwater recharge is independent of the depth to groundwater as long as the groundwater table does not rise to the floor of the recharge facility. Accordingly, a site having a comparatively large depth to groundwater would typically be favored over a location where the groundwater table is shallower, since there would be greater opportunity for groundwater mounding without the mound impeding on the floor of the recharge basin.

Depth to groundwater also serves as a measure of the available storage capacity below a recharge facility. Again, a site having a greater depth to groundwater would generally be favored over a location where the groundwater table is shallower, as a greater depth represents a greater capacity for

groundwater storage. According to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), depth to groundwater below the recharge facility site is estimated between 400 and 500 feet below the ground surface. Even with other groundwater recharge efforts occurring in the project vicinity, at these depths, it is highly unlikely that a groundwater mound would come into contact with a surface recharge body or otherwise interfere with groundwater recharge. Additionally, the USGS estimates that artificial recharge in the San Gorgonio Pass area may take decades to reach the groundwater table because of the thickness of the unsaturated zone in most of the San Gorgonio Pass area being between 150 and 465 feet. At these thicknesses, the elevation of the groundwater table would not substantially rise in the near future, and may potentially take numerous years before a noticeable change in elevation is detected. Because of this, any groundwater mounding occurring atop the groundwater table would not be substantially elevated over the next decades due to an overall rise in aquifer elevation.

Intervening, low permeability layers could possibly impede movement of water from the recharge facility to the groundwater table, and potentially contribute towards groundwater mounding. Sediments within the project vicinity are stratified, with intermittent layers of clay separating layers of silt, sand, and gravel. While the degree of stratification is specific to the particular site, individual layers do not persist over large areas in the project vicinity. This absence of laterally persistent clays over broad areas of the Beaumont Basin means that percolating water would be allowed to move relatively freely below the recharge facility.

In the highly unlikely event that groundwater mounding occurs at shallow depths, the USGS has determined that groundwater quality in the San Gorgonio Pass area is good, as indicated by samples collected for a previous study. Thus, should the groundwater table ever reach an elevation where it could potentially affect surface or shallow subsurface waters, water quality would not be substantially impacted.

Therefore, impacts associated with groundwater mounding and its effects on water quality would be less than significant.

6.9.7 - Housing Placement: Flood Hazard Area

The project would not 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 project would not include residential uses. Therefore, no impacts associated with placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would occur.

6.9.8 - Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

The project would not be subject to or create inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Because of the geographical and topographical characteristics of the project sites, including the relatively flat terrain found on and adjacent to the site and the lack of coastline or large water body in

the project vicinity, the project would not be susceptible to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impacts associated with seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would occur.

6.10 - Land Use and Planning

6.10.1 - Divide Established Community

The project would not physically divide an established community.

The pipeline would be located underground and would not include any aboveground improvements that could potentially divide any surrounding established community. Additionally, the recharge facility and service connection site would be constructed upon vacant, undeveloped parcels that are not currently being used to connect an existing community. Therefore, no impacts associated with division of an established community would occur.

6.10.2 - Conflict with Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The project would not 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.

According to California Government Code Section 53091(d) and 53091 (e), as a municipal water storage/recharge facility, the project would be exempt from the land use policies and zoning ordinances of a county or city, including the provisions contained in the City of Beaumont General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as well as the County of Riverside General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Per California Government Code Section 53091(d):

Building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.

Additionally, California Government Code Section 53091(e) establishes that:

Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, or for the production or generation of electrical energy, facilities that are subject to Section 12808.5 of the Public Utilities Code, or electrical substations in an electrical transmission system that receives electricity at less than 100,000 volts. Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall apply to the location or construction of facilities for the storage or transmission of electrical energy by a local agency, if the zoning ordinances make provision for those facilities.

In accordance with Sections 53091(d) and 53091(e) of the California Government Code, the proposed recharge facility, pipeline, and service connection facility, and offsite triangular parcel are exempt

from the provisions of the City of Beaumont and County of Riverside's Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, no impact associated with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project would occur.

6.11 - Mineral Resources

6.11.1 - Loss of Known Mineral Resource

The project would not 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.

The project area is located within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3, as designated by the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB), which is defined as an area where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, although the significance of the deposit is undetermined. According to the City of Beaumont General Plan, although there are potential aggregate resources located in the western portion of the City of Beaumont, there are currently no significant mineral extraction operations in the City. Additionally, none of the project sites are located in an area of potential aggregate resources, none of these locations occur within the Mineral Resource Overlay (MRO) zone as identified on the City's Zoning Map. Therefore, less than significant impacts associated with the availability of a known mineral resource would occur.

6.11.2 - Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site

The project would not 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.

None of the project sites are located in an area of potential aggregate resources and there are currently no significant mineral extraction operations in the project vicinity. Therefore, less than significant impacts associated with the availability of a locally-important mineral resource would occur.

6.12 - Noise

6.12.1 - Public Airport Noise Levels

The project is not located within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

The nearest public airport to the project would be Banning Municipal Airport, which is located approximately seven miles southeast of the project sites in the City of Banning. According to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission's Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project sites occur outside of any designated Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) Compatibility Contour. Therefore, no impacts associated with public airport noise would occur.

6.12.2 - Private Airstrip Noise Levels

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

No private airstrips are located within a 20-mile radius of the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with private airstrip noise would occur.

6.13 - Population and Housing

6.13.1 - Housing Displacement / Replacement Housing

The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

In the existing conditions, no residential uses located on any of the project sites. Therefore, no impacts associated with the displacement of existing housing would occur.

6.13.2 - Population Displacement / Replacement Housing

The project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

None of the project sites currently contain residential uses, and as a result, no people presently reside on any of the sites. As such, no people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with the displacement of people would occur.

6.14 - Public Services

6.14.1 - Fire Protection

The project would not 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 fire protection.

The project would not include improvements that would increase calls for service to the project sites or otherwise increase the need for increased RCFD facilities. The project does not involve the development of land uses that typically increase the need for fire protection and emergency medical services, including residential and commercial uses. No people would be residing or employed full-time on the project sites, which would reduce the need for increase RCFD services to the sites.

Additionally, the project would develop two vacant, undeveloped parcels, removing ruderal brush and scattered debris in the process, reducing the opportunity for wildland fire and the need for RCFD services to the sites. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, RCFD facilities would be less than significant.

6.14.2 - Police Protection

The project would not 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 police protection.

The project would not include improvements that would increase calls for service to the project sites or otherwise increase the need for increased BPD facilities. The project does not involve the development of land uses that typically increase the need for police protection service, including residential and commercial uses. No people would be residing or employed full-time on the project sites, which would reduce the need for increase BPD service to the sites.

Additionally, the recharge facility site consists of a vacant, undeveloped parcel that is currently accessible to unauthorized users. The project would include construction of a fence/wall around the recharge facility, which would limit access to the facility while also reducing the calls for service regarding trespassing and other similar to the site. Moreover, nighttime security lighting would be provided at the recharge facility and service connection facility, which would illuminate that facilities and deter unauthorized users from trespassing on the sites. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, BPD facilities would be less than significant.

6.14.3 - Schools

The project would not 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 schools.

The project does not involve the development of land uses such as residential uses that typically generate students, resulting in the need for new or expanded school facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, BUSD facilities would occur.

6.14.4 - Parks

The project would not 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 parks.

The project does not involve the development of land uses that typically increase park patronage, resulting in the need for new or expanded park facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, park facilities would occur.

6.14.5 - Other Public Facilities

The project would not 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 other public facilities.

The project does not involve the development of land uses that typically increase the usage of libraries, community centers, and other public facilities, resulting in the need for new or expanded public facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, public facilities would occur.

6.15 - Recreation

6.15.1 - Increase Use of Parks

The project would not 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 does not involve the development of land uses that typically increase patronage at park and recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with the increased usage of existing parks or other recreational facilities would occur.

6.15.2 - Recreational Facilities Physical Effect on Environment

The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

The project does not involve the development of land uses that typically create a demand for recreational facilities. As a result, the project would not include recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with recreational facilities would occur.

6.16 - Transportation and Traffic

6.16.1 - Air Traffic Patterns

The project would not 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 nearest public airport to the project would be Banning Municipal Airport, which is located approximately seven miles southeast of the project sites in the City of Banning. Additionally, no private airstrips occur within a 20-mile radius of the project. According to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission's Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project sites occur outside of any designated Compatibility Contour. The project would not include any improvements that would occur at heights that could potentially interfere with air traffic. Therefore, no impacts associated with air traffic patterns would occur.

6.16.2 - Hazards

The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The project does not include any roadway improvements that involve hazardous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Additionally, the project would not introduce incompatible uses to the project area. Therefore, no impacts associated with hazardous design features or incompatible uses would occur.

6.16.3 - Emergency Access

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Construction of the project would not interfere with the emergency access to the project sites and within the project area. All equipment and materials related to construction of project facilities would be stored in designated staging areas. These staging would be physically separated from vehicular traffic, and as a result, would not impede emergency access.

Additionally, construction of the pipeline would result in the temporary closure of traffic lanes along the existing two-lane Beaumont Avenue and two-lane Orchard Street in the area undergoing construction. These lane closures would occur as excavation, placement, and backfilling activities occur. In areas where jack and bore activities are planned, such as at the Mountain View Channel and Noble Creek, lanes would also be closed. Because both Beaumont Avenue and Orchard Street have unpaved dirt shoulders, there would be an opportunity for emergency vehicles to pass traffic in the vicinity of the lane closure. Moreover, unlike typical motorists, emergency vehicles would be allowed to make left or u-turns at locations and intersections under construction.

Operation of the project would not impact circulation on the local street system, and as a result, would not affect emergency access within the project area. The recharge facility site and service connections facility site would be accessible via driveways from Cougar Way and Orchard Street, respectively. Therefore, impacts associated with emergency access would be less than significant.

6.16.4 - Conflict with Alternative Transportation

The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Construction of the pipeline would require temporary southbound lane closures of individual segments of Beaumont Avenue (e.g., Brookside Avenue to Cherry Valley Boulevard, Cherry Valley Boulevard to Vineland Street) for approximately one to two weeks at a time. Closure of these roadway segments would affect the existing Class II bike lane located along the southbound lane of Beaumont Avenue, as well as the existing multipurpose trail located along the western edge of Beaumont Avenue. During these closures, signage would be used to inform bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians of the closure and to direct users to alternative routes. For example, users needing to

traverse Beaumont Avenue could be directed to Noble Street. As the nearest north/south trending roadway, Noble Street would provide users with a continuous connection between Brookside Avenue and Orchard Street, while not adding substantial time to their commute.

Additionally, pipeline construction would occur during the summer months when Beaumont High School, Mountain View Middle School, and other nearby schools are closed for summer recess, which would reduce the number of commuters using the bike lane and multipurpose trail. Moreover, while Pass Transit bus service along Beaumont Avenue would be affected by the temporary lane closures, bus service could still use Beaumont Avenue as a bus route during construction of the pipeline. In the immediate vicinity of the proposed pipeline construction along Beaumont Avenue, Pass Transit bus stops are located along Cherry Valley Boulevard and Cougar Way. Although adjacent to Beaumont Avenue, these bus stops would not be directly impacted by the lane closures.

Operation of the project would not affect existing portions of pedestrian, bicycle, equestrian, and multipurpose facilities that are located in the project area because neither the recharge facility site nor the service connection facility contain transit, bicycle, or pedestrian uses. The pipeline would be located underground, and as a result, would not affect transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, short-term construction and long-term operation impacts associated with the transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

6.17 - Utilities and Service Systems

6.17.1 - Wastewater Treatment

The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The project would not include activities that would create the need for additional levels of wastewater treatment. As a result, implementation of the project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements established by the San Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, no impacts associated with exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements would occur.

6.17.2 - Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The project would not 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.

Although the project includes a groundwater recharge facilities, implementation of the project would not create the need for additional water facilities, as well as any wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, water or wastewater treatment facilities would occur.

6.17.3 - Stormwater Drainage Facilities

The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The project would include installation of stormwater drainage facilities at the recharge facility site that would connect to the existing 36-inch storm drain located southwest of the site. Much of the stormwater runoff flowing from the perimeter of the earthen slopes of the recharge facility to the project boundary would be conveyed to this storm drain. During large storm events, a portion the southwesternmost basin may be drained so that stormwater runoff entering the basins would not result in an overflow condition. The amount of stormwater runoff and basin water anticipated that would be conveyed to the existing storm drain would be less than the amount of stormwater that is currently collected by the storm drain.

The design capacity of a 36-inch storm drain is approximately 57.6 cubic feet per second (cfs). Generally, a pervious property such as the recharge facility site will yield a stormwater runoff flow of approximately one cfs per acre for a 100-year storm event. As a result, under the worst-case scenario, the 44-acre recharge facility site would yield a stormwater runoff flow of roughly 44 cfs, which could be accommodated by the existing storm drain. Since the recharge facility would reduce the amount of land that could contribute onsite stormwater runoff because the basins would retain precipitation falling on the majority of the site, the amount of runoff from the site would be less than under existing conditions. As such, the recharge facility would not result in an exceedance of the existing storm drain an expansion of this existing drainage facility would not be required. Therefore, no impacts associate with the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, stormwater drainage facilities would occur.

6.17.4 - Water Supplies

The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements are needed.

In part, the project would convey raw, imported water from the East Branch Extension of the SWP to the SGPWA service area to facilitate groundwater recharge of the currently overdrawn groundwater table. This groundwater would be available to regional water purveyors who hold the right to withdraw water from the local groundwater supply. In and of itself, however, the project would not create the need for additional water supplies. Therefore, no impacts associated with water supplies would occur.

6.17.5 - Wastewater Treatment Capacity

The project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

The project would not include activities that would create the need for additional levels of wastewater treatment. Implementation of the project would not create the need for wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with wastewater treatment capacity would occur.

6.17.6 - Landfill Capacity

The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

Construction of the project could potentially generate solid waste that would be required to be disposed of at a landfill. However, the majority of the excess soils related to grading and excavation of the pipeline and other project facilities would be deposited at one of three designated spoils sites: the recharge facility site, the offsite triangular parcel, and the service connection site. The operational phase of the project is expected to create only a nominal amount of solid waste during maintenance of the project facilities. Therefore, impacts associated with landfill capacity would be less than significant.

6.17.7 - Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations and Statutes

The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

All collection, transportation, and disposal of any solid waste generated by the project would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. Prior to entering into a landfill facility, solid waste collection service providers, include those that would serve the project sites, would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts associated with solid waste statutes and regulations would occur.

6.18 - Energy

6.18.1 - Energy Consumption

The project would not consume energy resources in a wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary manner, and would result in a less than significant impact on energy resources.

The proposed project would use energy resources such as electricity, natural gas, and petroleum products (gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and asphalt) during the construction and potentially the operational phases.

Based on construction trips and construction equipment hours obtained in Appendix B, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the total on-road vehicle miles for workers and haul trucks for the proposed project is approximately 54,500 miles. Based on a general estimate of 10

miles per gallon of fuel, the on-road fuel consumption during project construction activities would be approximately 5,450 gallons of fuel. Also based on information from Appendix B, the total number of construction equipment hours is estimated to be 7,200 hours. Based on a general construction equipment fuel consumption of 9 gallons per hour, the total amount of fuel that would be consumed by construction equipment is estimated to be approximately 64,800 gallons of fuel. Therefore, the total amount of fuel that would be consumed by on-road vehicles (worker vehicles and haul trucks) and construction equipment is estimated to be approximately 70,250 gallons of fuel. There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the State. Therefore, it is expected that construction fuel consumption associated with the proposed project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than at other construction sites in the region.

During the operation of the proposed project, a nominal amount of fuel is expected to be used. Gasoline fuel is expected to be used by maintenance vehicles as well as the annual cleaning of the basins. Based on estimates provided in Appendix B of this Draft EIR, on-road vehicle miles for workers and haul trucks is estimated to be approximately 4,000 miles per year. Based on a general estimate of 10 miles per gallon, the on-road fuel consumption during project operational activities would be approximately 400 gallons of fuel. Also based on estimates in Appendix B, the total number of construction vehicle hours during the cleaning of the recharge basins is approximately 50 hours. Based on a general construction equipment hours of 9 gallons per hour, the total amount of fuel that would be consumed by construction equipment is estimated to be approximately 450 gallons of fuel. Therefore, the total amount of fuel that would be consumed by on-road vehicles (workers vehicles and haul trucks) and construction equipment is estimated to be approximately 850 gallons of fuel per year.

The proposed project will also include the use of electricity for an onsite pump associated with an onsite irrigation well. Based on data from Appendix B of this Draft EIR, the pump will run approximately 624 hours per year and use approximately 9,300 kilowatt hours per year. There are no additional pumps associated with the proposed pipeline because the pipeline has been designed with a down gradient from the service connection site to the proposed recharge facility. The service connection site will include security lighting on the service connection structure; however, the amount of electricity that will be used is considered nominal.

Based on the operational characteristics of the proposed project, fuel and electrical consumption associated with the proposed project would not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact on energy resources.

