CITY OF ROSEVILLE
TRADITION • PRIDE • PROGRESS

Environmental Utilities
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, California 95747-9704

April 26, 2005

Jim Durfee
Deputy Director
County of Placer: Department of Facility Services
11476 C Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Project - Process for Analyzing Urban Growth Areas (UGA's) Seeking Service from Regional Facilities--**REVISED**

Dear Jim:

Please disregard our letter of March 16, 2005 and replace it in its entirety with the following.

As part of our South Placer Wastewater Authority's (SPWA) *Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Project,* we have been receiving information regarding developments seeking services from regional trunk sewers and the two regional treatment plants. We appreciate the time and attention your staff and the landowners have invested in preparing information for our use as we evaluate the proposed contributions of wastewater and use of recycled water in these urban growth areas (UGA's). As you interface with UGA landowners, there is essential project information they will need to develop and provide to the Systems Evaluation Project Team:

Project Information List
For each UGA, we request that the required analyses and project information listed in Table 1 be submitted to enable our Systems Evaluation Project Team to prepare the proper engineering evaluations for regional trunk sewer, recycled water, and treatment facilities. This information list is not necessarily the same as the project information list required as part of the CEQA documentation.

CEQA Documentation
The County, as the local land use authority, will be the lead agency for CEQA for each UGA. SPWA will be a responsible agency under CEQA for purposes of financing regional wastewater infrastructure, such as: providing regional interceptor capacity, supplying recycled water from regional facilities, and providing expanded wastewater treatment facilities. It is our expectation that the County will rely on the 1996 Master Plan and Master Plan EIR as base documents for CEQA documentation, and will build on

916.774.5770 • Fax 916.774.5690 • TDD 916.774.5220 • www.roseville.ca.us

that documentation for each UGA CEQA document using information in the Systems Evaluation Project Report. Eventually, upon completion of the Systems Evaluation Project Report, each UGA CEQA document will reference the Systems Evaluation Project Report to support their CEQA Analyses.

The County must identify in the CEQA documentation issues that pertain to the construction and installation of wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure, and treated wastewater discharges that could result in or contribute to exceeding currently permitted wastewater capacity or discharge limits. Emphasis must be placed on cumulative impacts. Attachment A provides specific guidance on the preparation of the CEQA document.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Derrick Whitehead
Environmental Utilities Director

c. Art O'Brien/City of Roseville
Jerry Loscalzo/SPMUD
Fred Yeager/ Placer County Planning Director

Table 1: Project Information List for UGA's

CATEGORIES	REQUIRED ANALYSES AND PROJECT INFORMATION
Urban Growth Area Boundaries	▪ Boundary of Urban Growth Area ▪ Land Use in Urban Growth Area *(Acres by Land Use Type)* ▪ Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) to be Served ▪ Comparison of UGA proposed land uses and EDUs with land uses and EDUs in current SPWA Service Area
Analyses on Wastewater Flow and Characteristics	▪ Average Dry Weather Flow [a] ➢ To be Conveyed by the Collection System ➢ To be Treated at the Regional Treatment Facilities ▪ Peak Wet Weather Flow [a] ➢ To be Conveyed by the Collection System ➢ To be Treated at the Regional Treatment Facilities ▪ Flow Characteristics at Buildout for non-typical developments *(e.g. testing and laboratory facilities, manufacturing facilities, etc.)* ➢ Organic/Solids Loading Strength *(as compared to typical domestic strength)* ➢ Pre-Treatment Requirements ➢ Variable Flow Frequency/Duration *(e.g. batch large volume discharge, continuous 24/7 operations)*
New Wastewater Conveyance Infrastructure	▪ Location of Conveyance Routes ▪ Rights-of-Way ▪ Conveyance Pipeline Size, Length ▪ Pipeline Operations *(e.g. Gravity/Force Main)* ▪ Connection to Existing Conveyance System or to Regional Treatment Plant ▪ Pump Station ▪ Other Physical Features
New Infrastructure/ Flow Phasing	▪ Wastewater Flow Growth Rate *(e.g expected EDU absorption rate)* ▪ Infrastructure Phasing ▪ Buildout Year
Recycled Water Analyses	▪ Estimated Average Day (mgd) and Annual Demands (AFY) ▪ Sizing of Storage Facilities for Maximum Day & Peak Hour Demands [b] ▪ Distribution Infrastructures ➢ Location of Storage Facility and Distribution Routes ➢ Rights-of-Way ➢ Distribution Pipeline Size, Length ➢ Connection to Existing Distribution System [b] ➢ Pump Station ➢ Other Physical Features
Additional Approvals/Permits Affecting Project Development	List all other approvals/permits affecting project developments *(e.g. LAFCO approval, public right-of-way permits, etc.)*
Cumulative Impact Analyses	Discuss and present cumulative impact analyses for the proposed project Cumulative impact is defined as the impact that will be created by the proposed project for the regional wastewater (collection and treatment) and recycled water facilities when analyzed in addition to past, present, or foreseeable future development projects.

[a] Calculated based on proposed land use and EDUs generated by the new service area using collection system and treatment plant flow factors presented in the City of Roseville's *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan* (May 1996)

[b] Future recycled water system connection from UGAs will be required to have storage facilities to meet maximum day and peak hour demand The maximum recycled water volume allotment to the UGAs will equal the volume of wastewater received by the regional treatment facilities from the UGAs. Maximum day and peak hour demands currently used by the City of Roseville are found in *Recycled Water Distribution System Feasibility Study, April 2000*, and *Recycled Water Study for West Roseville Specific Plan Area May 21, 2003*

ATTACHMENT A

GUIDANCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND TECHNICAL ANALYSES

Background

The City of Roseville (City), the South Placer Municipal Utility District (District), and the County of Placer (County) entered into a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and formed the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) in October 2000. The SPWA was created for the purposes of, among other duties, funding and financing of Regional Wastewater Facilities. The SPWA and the Participants (City, District, and County) entered into a Funding Agreement and an Operations Agreement. The Funding Agreement established the revenue, debt service, and flow obligations among the Participants. The Operations Agreement recognized the City's role in owning, operating, and maintaining the Regional Wastewater Facilities.

The 1996 *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan EIR* (WWMP EIR) was certified by the City of Roseville in November 1996 and was considered by the SPWA in October 2000 as part of the formation of the JPA. The Master Plan identifies the wastewater service area and contains the assumptions used to identify and design for wastewater conveyance and treatment. Wastewater service within the current service area is based on a first come first serviced basis as outlined in the Funding Agreement.

The above agreements outline responsibilities and approval authorities among SPWA Participants that create specific CEQA compliance needs. The roles and CEQA responsibilities of each involved agency are described herein. The purpose of this document is to provide SPWA Participants and local agencies that prepare CEQA documents with the process and scoping guidance they will need to ensure adequate CEQA documentation is prepared for discretionary approvals required by the above-described agreements.

For the purpose of this guidance document, Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) are defined as areas located wholly or in part outside the current service area. Densification/Intensification projects (D/I Project) are defined as areas located within the current service area where proposed zone changes would result in an increase in wastewater generation compared to current assumptions.

Process for SPWA and Participant Involvement in UGA and/or D/I Projects

When local agencies with land use authority propose new UGAs or D/I Projects, it is appropriate for the local jurisdiction to consult with SPWA and Participant staff to ensure a comprehensive analysis of related wastewater impacts, including appropriate CEQA documentation. This effort should proceed in two phases and be based on the most recent available information as discussed below.

Phase 1: Early Consultation The first phase should involve early consultation between the landowner's engineers and SPWA and Participant staff. The goal of early consultation is to identify and agree upon the project's wastewater treatment and recycled water demands, parameters for cumulative flow analysis, and potential impacts to conveyance and treatment facilities. This effort should rely on the technical analyses contained in the *Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Flow Evaluation* (currently in progress). Once agreement is reached on project generated wastewater and recycled water demands, and related conveyance, treatment and storage requirements; system upgrades necessary to accommodate the project can be identified.

Phase 2: CEQA Documentation. Phase two of the consultation process focuses on CEQA documentation. During this phase, upgrades to the wastewater system identified during Phase 1 would be incorporated in the CEQA document prepared by the local agency with land use authority (i.e., the CEQA local Lead Agency). It is recommended that any new or modified Regional Wastewater Facilities identified during Phase 1, as needed to serve the UGA or D/I Project, be incorporated into CEQA document project description and identified as off-site improvements. The related CEQA analysis should address construction and operation of these facilities at a "project-level" so that no subsequent or supplemental CEQA review is required.

This phased process helps to ensure that CEQA documentation will be adequate for any and all discretionary actions as discussed in the following sections.

CEQA Responsibility and Approval Authority Among Local Agencies with Land Use Authority, the SPWA, and the Participants

As discussed above, the CEQA process for UGA and/or D/I Projects is initiated by the local jurisdiction with land use authority. This could include any of the following agencies that receive sewer service from the SPWA: Placer County, the City of Roseville, the City of Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. These agencies are collectively referred to as "local Lead Agencies."

Local Lead Agencies. Local Lead Agencies would be the first agency to take discretionary action relating to the approval of a proposed UGA and/or D/I project. As a result, they would serve as the **CEQA Lead Agency** and be responsible for preparation of the first tier CEQA document for the UGA or D/I project.

Local Lead Agencies should carefully follow the guidance provided herein to ensure the CEQA documentation for wastewater issues prepared by their agency will be adequate for all future related discretionary actions. To ensure proper coordination, distribution of the CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) and/or any early consultation materials initiated or distributed by the local Lead Agency in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (g), shall include the SPWA and SPWA Participants. This coordination will be extremely important to ensure the local Lead Agency CEQA document remains adequate

for future SPWA and Participant actions subject to CEQA. It will also be important to ensure that the most current cumulative wastewater flow scenario is used for related analyses (to be provided by the SPWA as discussed below).

Since the UGAs will generate wastewater flow and require recycled water supply, capital facilities (e.g. wastewater treatment plants) will need to be modified, expanded, or constructed to accommodate the UGAs and possibly D/I Projects. Impacts from new or modified capital facilities that are required to serve new UGAs or D/I projects, including any increased discharge of treated wastewater to the creeks, must be analyzed in the CEQA documentation prepared for the UGA or D/I Project.

The SPWA. The SPWA serves as a funding and financing authority for the construction of Regional Wastewater Facilities. In doing so, the SPWA acts as a **CEQA Responsible Agency**. As a Responsible Agency, the SPWA relies on the UGA or D/I Project CEQA documentation prepared by local Lead Agencies when taking discretionary actions related to funding or financing. The SPWA does not act as a Lead Agency.

In the capacity of a Responsible Agency, the SPWA will respond to CEQA notices for early consultation, including NOPs or other similar consultation requests, and provide comment as appropriate to ensure the local Lead Agency's CEQA document includes the proper scope and analysis for wastewater issues. This includes providing the local Lead Agency with the most current assumptions for wastewater cumulative analysis. The SPWA will similarly comment on draft CEQA documents as necessary to identify any inadequacies that could prevent the SPWA from fulfilling its statutory CEQA responsibilities when taking future funding or financing discretionary actions, or to consider modifications to the Funding and Operations Agreement as discussed below under Other Approvals for UGA Projects.

The City of Roseville. The City of Roseville owns and operates the Regional Wastewater Facilities on behalf of the Participants. In this capacity, the City maintains the necessary permits to process and discharge treated wastewater (i.e. NPDES permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board), and approves design and carries out construction of any new or expanded Regional Wastewater Facilities. This includes approvals such as construction documents, bid authorizations, and award of construction contracts. In this role, the City acts as a **CEQA Lead Agency**. However, when taking discretionary actions related to Regional Wastewater Facilities, the City relies on the UGA or D/I Project CEQA document prepared by the local Lead Agency. As such, the City of Roseville needs to review UGA and/or D/I project NOPs or other similar consultation requests issued by local Lead Agencies to ensure the CEQA document includes the appropriate scope and "project-level" analysis of Regional Wastewater Facilities. The City of Roseville will similarly comment on the draft CEQA document to ensure it can be found adequate for future discretionary construction and operation related approvals, and to consider modifications to the Funding and Operations Agreement as discussed below under Other Approvals for UGA Projects.

The City of Roseville relies on the SPWA, acting as a CEQA Responsible Agency, for related construction financing approvals.

Other SPWA and Participant Approvals needed for UGA Projects. For those UGAs located outside (in whole or in part) the current regional service area boundary, it is important to recognize that the service area boundary is only modified by agreement among the SPWA and Participants. It is therefore paramount that CEQA documentation for UGAs be adequate for both the SPWA and Participants so they can take their own discretionary actions relating to modification of the Funding and Operations Agreement to include land area outside the current service area or flows beyond those envisioned by the SPWA at its formation as documented in the *1996 Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan EIR*. As such, Participant agencies should also review UGA or D/I project NOPs, or other similar consultation requests issued by local Lead Agencies, to ensure the proposed scope and analysis for CEQA documents will be adequate for this future action. Participant agencies will similarly comment on the draft CEQA document to ensure it will be found adequate for this future discretionary action.

Guidance to Ensure Adequate CEQA Review by Local Lead Agencies

The following is intended to assist local Lead Agencies when determining the proper scope and analysis for CEQA documentation of UGA and D/I project wastewater issues.

Wastewater Issues of Concern. In general, the following conditions create CEQA issues of concern for the SPWA, the City of Roseville, or the Participants when fulfilling their future CEQA responsibilities related to their approval authorities as discussed above:

- The creation of conditions that may exceed the capacity of Regional Wastewater Facilities;
- The creation of conditions that may exceed the wastewater quantity analyzed or certified in the Wastewater Master Plan (WWMP) EIR;
- Installation of new Regional Wastewater Facilities;
- Expansion of existing Regional Wastewater Facilities, including conveyance and recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure;
- Modifications of approved SPWA service area boundaries; and,
- The creation of conditions that exceed permitted discharges from the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plants or exceed the ability to handle offsite disposal or reuse of biosolids.

The Scope of CEQA Analysis. In order for the CEQA document prepared for a UGA and/or D/I Project to be complete and therefore adequate for use by subsequent SPWA and Participant agencies as discussed above, it must contain project-level analyses of the following, at a minimum:

- Construction and Operation of new wastewater collection and conveyance facilities;
- Supply and Demand of Recycled Water and construction and operation of new recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure and facilities;

- Alteration of the quality and/or quantity of discharges from wastewater treatment facilities beyond discharge levels permitted under the current NPDES discharge permits, and production of biosolids needing offsite disposal and/or reuse in excess of current permitted capacity;
- Construction and operation of additional wastewater treatment facilities required to serve the proposed UGA or D/I Project (beyond those considered in current documents);
- Delineation of areas in each UGA that are outside the current service area boundary and documentation of wastewater flow and recycled water demands in quantities greater than what is included in the 1996 WW Master Plan EIR or reallocation of wastewater flow and recycled water demands as compared to those shown in the 1996 WW Master Plan EIR or more current documents;
- Inducing growth as a result of removing obstacles to growth;
- Potential cumulative effects associated with other past, present, or foreseeable future projects.
- Alternatives Analysis for each of the systems (wastewater collection, treatment, disposal and recycled water storage and distribution) listed above.

Customized Initial Study Checklist. To further assist local Lead Agencies with the identification and analysis of wastewater and recycled water CEQA issues that may not be specifically covered in the above bullets, a customized Initial Study checklist was developed (Table A-1). The checklist should be used as a tool to aid in the identification of issues that pertain to the construction and installation of wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure, recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure, and discharges that could result in, or contribute to, exceeding currently permitted wastewater treatment and disposal capacity.

Mitigation Measures for Significant Adverse Impacts. It is expected that CEQA documents prepared by local Lead Agencies will identify and provide project-level CEQA analysis for all Regional Wastewater Facilities necessary to implement the UGA or D/I Project. Local Lead Agency CEQA documents prepared for UGA and D/I Projects may not include mitigation that defers to a future date analysis of the construction and operation of required Regional Wastewater Facilities. Project-level analysis of these facilities is required in the local Lead Agency CEQA document in order to fulfill the other related SPWA and Participant CEQA actions as discussed in this guidance document.

Although no deferred wastewater mitigation should be included in local Lead Agency CEQA documents, it possible that mitigation may be required to ensure that required Regional Wastewater Facilities are permitted, constructed and operational prior to their need. Although the City of Roseville would serve as applicant for any required modification to Regional Water Quality Control Board waste discharge permits, the local Lead Agency would need to ensure through CEQA mitigation that building permits for related UGA and/or D/I Projects are withheld until all required permit modifications are secured and financing for Regional Wastewater Facilities has been approved by the

SPWA. As such, a mitigation measure similar to the following should be included in UGA and/or D/I Project CEQA documents as appropriate:

Prior to obtaining building permits that would cause total wastewater flows from the UGA to exceed the flow allocated in the Wastewater Master Plan EIR along with the flow in the most recent certified EIR, the applicant shall demonstrate that the treatment plant capacity will be expanded consistent with the UGA project and related wastewater analyses contained in the UGA EIR and supporting studies. This includes demonstrating that all necessary permits to discharge the treated flow are in effect. The applicant shall also demonstrate that the timing of the plant expansion will be adequate to serve the UGA without impeding other planned development. Further, the applicant shall implement all relevant mitigation measures identified in the Wastewater Master Plan EIR

TABLE A -1: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
1. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) 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 of siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Increase the currently allocated treated wastewater discharge documented in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan EIR, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, or increase or result in alteration of discharges from the regional wastewater treatment facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area wastewater conveyance and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure and facilities which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Exceed existing permitted wastewater treatment and discharge requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board or other applicable regulatory agency or exceeds the quantity of wastewater flow considered and documented in existing certified EIRs (e g WWMP EIR)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a determination by the local wastewater collection system provider (e g. City of Roseville, SPMUD, Placer County,or the regional wastewater conveyance, treatment, and disposal provider (SPWA) which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected wastewater flow over and above meeting the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) 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 effect?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Would the wastewater and/or recycled water portion of the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered utility facilities, need for new or physically altered utility 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:				

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Wastewater treatment and/or biosolids disposal/reuse?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wastewater conveyance?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Recycled water storage?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Recycled water distribution?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. AESTHETICS:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with existing agricultural use Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. AIR QUALITY:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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, including diesel emissions from temporary construction activities?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Results in changes to the wastewater and/or recycled water facilities that would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or US Fish & 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 & Game or US Fish & 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
7. CULTURAL RESOURCES:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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 a unique 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	☐
i Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42				
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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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, including materials used to treat wastewater and/or sanitize recycled water, 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 the 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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:				

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. MINERAL RESOURCES:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. NOISE:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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 ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Result in wastewater treatment system improvements that would remove an obstacle or facilitate unplanned population growth?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. PUBLIC SERVICES				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Would the wastewater and/or recycled water portion of 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
School?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other public facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
15. RECREATION:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC:				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Result in temporary increases in traffic congestion, circulation vehicle movement, emergency access, and/ or parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) 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 ration on roads, or congestions at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for the designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e g , sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g , bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issue	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
Would the construction and operation of the wastewater collection and treatment, and/or recycled water storage and distribution infrastructure portion of the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☐