

ANTELOPE VALLEY-EAST KERN WATER AGENCY
6500 West Avenue N, Palmdale CA 93551-2855
Phone: 661-943-3201; Fax 661-943-3204
www.avek.org

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

To: Los Angeles County Clerk
 ATTN: Environmental Filing
 12400 Imperial Highway, Suite 2001
 Norwalk, CA 90650

 Kern County Clerk
 1115 Truxton Avenue
 Bakersfield, CA 93301-4339

 Governor's Office of Planning and Research
 1400 Tenth Street, Room 1311
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Project Title: Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency WSSP-2 Groundwater Recharge Project

Location: Proposed Project facilities would be located in the south-central Antelope Valley in Los Angeles and Kern counties within the area bounded on the north by Gaskell Road, on the south by West Avenue C, on the west by 155th Street West and on the east by 80th Street West.

Project Description: The Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) proposes to construct and operate a groundwater recharge and recovery program, with recharge facilities located on approximately 1500 acres of land it owns in Los Angeles County in the area bounded by:

- On the West: 155th Street West
- On the East: 130th Street West
- On the North: West Gaskell Road
- On the South: West Avenue C

Proposed Project recharge lands are located within Sections 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Township 8 North, Range 14 West. Historically, these lands have been irrigated for row crops and alfalfa by the farming entity of Ritter-Godde or by lessees. Other facilities will be located along Los Angeles and Kern County roads and on AVEK-owned lands at the intersection of Gaskell Road and 80th Street West.

The Proposed Project will consist of recharge areas with wells and pipelines to recover water. AVEK's State Water Project supplies will be delivered from the California Aqueduct to the site via gravity flow using AVEK's existing West Feeder pipeline, which runs north-south through the property along 140th Street West. Delivery of the water to the recharge areas will be by permanent below ground pipelines. Delivered supplies will be spread across the surface of the land, will percolate into the soil, and stored. When needed, the stored water will be extracted using pumps, delivered to the West Feeder via internal buried pipelines, and then delivered to AVEK customers north and east of the recharge area via the West

Feeder pipeline. The Proposed project also provides for recovered raw water to be delivered via a buried pipeline to a storage, treatment and pumping facility in the vicinity of the intersection of Gaskell Road and 80th Street West.

It is anticipated that during the project irrigated agricultural operations would continue on the property. Farming will be irrigated agriculture or fallowed land. Farming anticipated will include row crops and alfalfa or other hay and grain crops. Recharge would generally be accomplished from November through February, when AVEK has the greatest capacity in the California Aqueduct and its other facilities to convey water to recharge. Farming is anticipated and would continue to be row crops and alfalfa. It will not be the goal to farm and recharge in the same area in the same time period since over irrigation for the purpose of recharge would not be compatible with the farming operation. Also, this would minimize conflicts between any agricultural chemicals and fertilizers that are used being a part of the recharged water supply. Recharge areas are located within an area of sparse development, with several county-designated significant ecological areas to the south and west of the Proposed Project. Current land use is agricultural. There are no urban/suburban developments in or near the recharge area. Land use at the site of the storage, treatment, and pumping facility at the southwest corner of Gaskell Road and 80th Street West is agricultural and there is rural residential housing along the east side of 80th Street West.

Comment Period

The public is invited to review the Draft MND and provide AVEK with written comments. Copies of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and its supporting Initial Study are available for review at AVEK headquarters at:

6500 West Avenue N
Palmdale, CA 93551-2855
661-943-3201

The MND is also available at www.avek.org.

The review period for the Draft MND begins on July 3, 2008 and ends on August 2, 2008 at 5:00 PM. Copies of the Draft MND and supporting documents can be viewed at the AVEK headquarters (address above) and at:

Palmdale City Library
700 East Palmdale Boulevard
Palmdale, Ca 93309

Rosamond Public Library
3611 West Rosamond Boulevard
Rosamond, CA 93560

Lancaster Regional Library
601 West Lancaster Boulevard
Lancaster, CA 93534

AVEK's office hours are Monday-Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Copies of the Draft MND and Initial Study are available as pdf files in Compact Disk (CD) form at AVEK's headquarters. If you plan to view the Draft MND and supporting documents at the AVEK headquarters, please call 661-943-3201 in advance to ensure staff availability.

Written comments must be received by 5:00 PM of the last day of the comment period and addressed to:

Mr. Tom Barnes
Resources Manager
Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency
6500 West Avenue N
Palmdale, CA 93551-2855
RE: AVEK WSSP-2 Groundwater Recharge Project

Following receipt of any comments, the Board of Directors of the Antelope Valley East-Kern Water Agency will consider adoption of the MND at a regularly scheduled meeting to be announced at a future date. The meeting will be posted on the AVEK Board Meeting Agenda, which may be viewed at AVEK headquarters and/or on line at www.avek.org.

Original signed by: Michael Flood, Agency Engineer

Signed: _____ Date: 6/30/2008
Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency

Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form

1.	Project title: <u>Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency WSSP-2 Groundwater Recharge Project</u>		
2.	Lead agency name and address: <u>Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency</u> <u>6500 West Avenue N</u> <u>Palmdale, CA 93551-2855</u>		
3.	Contact person and phone number: <u>Mr. Tom Barnes, Resources Manager</u> <u>661-943-3201</u>		
4.	<p>Project location: The project involves recharge areas and pipelines in the unincorporated portions of Los Angeles and Kern Counties west of Lancaster, CA, within a general area bounded by West Avenue C on the south, Gaskell Road on the north, 155th Street West on the west and 80th Street West on the east. These boundaries are defined by (approximately):</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">On the south: Latitude 34^o 47' 19.21" N On the north: Latitude 34^o 50' 03.72" North On the west: Longitude 118^o 24' 18.57" West On the east: Longitude 118^o 16' 20.58" West</p> <p>There may be wells constructed within and immediately adjacent to these areas.</p>		
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: <u>Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency</u> <u>6500 West Avenue N</u> <u>Palmdale, CA 93551-2855</u>		
6.	General plan designation: In Kern County: Within Willow Springs Specific Plan; In Los Angeles County: Non-urban uses	7.	Zoning: In Kern County: Map Code 5.6 (rural residential; In Los Angeles County: rural residential._
8.	<p>Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)</p> <p>The Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) proposes to construct and operate a groundwater recharge program, with recharge facilities located on approximately 1500 acres of land it owns in Los Angeles County in the area bounded by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the West: 155th Street West • On the East: 130th Street West • On the North: West Gaskell Road • On the South: West Avenue C <p>Proposed Project lands (Maps 1 and 2 and Figures 1 and 2 of the Initial Study, attached) are located within Sections 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Township 8 North, Range 14 West. Historically, these lands have been irrigated for row crops and alfalfa by Ritter-Godde Farms or by lessees. The Proposed Project (Figures 1 and 2 of the attached Initial Study) will consist of recharge areas with wells and pipelines to recover water. AVEK's State Water Project supplies will be delivered from the California Aqueduct to the site via gravity flow using AVEK's existing West Feeder pipeline, which runs north-south through the property along 140th Street West. Delivery of the water to the recharge areas will be by permanent below ground pipelines. Delivered supplies will be spread across the surface of the land, will percolate into the soil, and stored. When needed, the</p>		

	<p>stored water will be extracted using pumps, delivered to the West Feeder via internal buried pipelines, and then delivered to AVEK customers north and east of the recharge area via the West Feeder pipeline. The Proposed project also provides for recovered raw water to be delivered via a buried pipeline to a storage, treatment and pumping facility in the vicinity of the intersection of Gaskell Road and 80th Street West.</p> <p>It is anticipated that during the project irrigated agricultural operations would continue on the property that is not in use for recharge. Farming will be irrigated agriculture or fallowed land. Farming anticipated will include row crops and alfalfa or other hay and grain crops. Recharge would generally be accomplished from November through February, when AVEK has the greatest capacity in the California Aqueduct and its other facilities to convey water to recharge. Farming is anticipated and would continue to be row crops and alfalfa. It will not be the goal to farm and recharge in the same area in the same time period since over irrigation for the purpose of recharge would not be compatible with the farming operation. Also, this would minimize conflicts between any agricultural chemicals and fertilizers that are used being a part of the recharged water supply.</p>
9.	<p>Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: Recharge areas are located in a sparsely developed area, with several county-designated significant ecological areas to the south and west of the Proposed Project. Current land use is agricultural. There are no urban/suburban developments in or near the recharge area. Land use at the site of the storage, treatment, and pumping facility at the southwest corner of Gaskell Road and 80th Street West is agricultural and there is rural residential housing along the east side of 80th Street West.</p>
10.	<p>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) *Kern County encroachment permit for any work in the public right of way *Los Angeles County encroachment permit for any work in the public right of way *California Department of Public Health Public Water System Permit for wells and water treatment facilities *Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan *California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Permit</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY MICHAEL FLOOD, AGENCY ENGINEER

Signature

6/30/2008

Date

Michael Flood, Agency Engineer, Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency

Printed Name

_____ For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

CEQA CHECKLIST

See the corresponding sections of the attached Initial Study for detailed analysis and details of mitigation measures.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? With mitigation measures A-1 an A-2, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Temporary berms, if any are needed at the recharge are, will be not higher than about 18-36 inches. Above ground facilities will not be inconsistent with facilities existing in the area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? No features of the project would substantially damage scenic resources. No damage to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings will occur. The site is not near a state scenic highway. This impact would be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? With mitigation measures A-1 through A-3, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Buildings will be screened with vegetation in a manner common in the neighborhood and designed to be consistent with the existing visual character.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? With mitigation A-4 the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area. Buildings will not need substantial lighting at night. The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Any lighting installed will be directed away from existing residences.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? The project does affect the net land available for farming under current practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? The project does affect the net land available for farming under current practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? The project does affect the net land available for farming under current practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? With mitigation Air-1 through Air-3, the project would reduce fugitive dust emissions and alter the timing of water imports, and may thus reduce regional use of fossil fuels. This will enhance implementation of air quality plans. Project emissions are below the established levels of significance for the AVAQMD and KCAPCD.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? Even without mitigation, all project emissions are below the established levels of significance for the AVAQMD and KCAPCD.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>precursors)? With mitigation measures Air-1 through Air-3 and taking into account (a) the very low emissions during on-going project operations and (b) the potential effects of the project on use of fossil fuels to power the delivery of SWP supplies and provide power for well use, the project will not contribute substantially to the cumulative increase in emissions associated with past, present, and future development.</p>				
<p>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? With mitigation Air-1 and Air-2, the project construction and operation will not create substantial concentrations of pollutants. The project impacts are both temporary and less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? The project will not emit objectionable odors.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? The project will not modify wildlife habitat. Mitigations BIO-1 through BIO-3 will avoid and minimize potential for direct impacts to special status species.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? The project will not be located on riparian or other sensitive habitats.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? No wetlands exist on the proposed project lands.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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? With mitigation BIO-3 (animal movement), temporary movement constraints during construction will be avoided.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? The project does not violate any local policies or ordinances related to preservation.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? The project occurs in the general area of the West Mojave Plan but does not affect any wildlife habitat or species addressed by this plan. No conflict will occur.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? With mitigation measure CR-1, the project will avoid the only known site with potential for significance.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? With mitigation measure CR-1, the project will avoid the only known site with potential for significance</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? No paleontological resources were identified during cultural survey. No impacts are anticipated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? With mitigations CR-3 and CR-4, the potential of the project to adversely impact buried human remains will be mitigated to a level of less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. With mitigation measures GEO-2 to GEO-4, the proposed project will avoid impacts associated with fault rupture.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? With mitigation measures GEO-2 to GEO-4, the proposed project will avoid impacts associated with fault rupture.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? With mitigation measure GEO-5, the project will avoid significant impacts associated with ground failure or liquefaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides? There no potential landslide areas in the vicinity of the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? With mitigation measure GEO-1 and Air-1 (fugitive dust), the project will avoid substantial erosion and loss of topsoil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? The project is not located on unstable land. With mitigation measure GEO-5 the project will not cause a soil to become unstable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? The project is not located on an expansive soil type.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? Septic systems are not an aspect of the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? With mitigation HAZ-1, hazardous materials management will reduce the potential for project effects to less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? With mitigation HAZ-1, hazardous materials management will reduce the potential for project effects to less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? There are no schools within 0.25 miles of project areas where hazardous materials may be handled.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? In addition to design and operation measures that will inherently reduce impacts associated with bird use or aircraft flight areas, mitigation measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-6 will further reduce potential impacts and their safety implications to a level of less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? In addition to design and operation measures that will inherently reduce impacts associated with bird use or aircraft flight areas, mitigation</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-6 will further reduce potential impacts and their safety implications to a level of less than significant.				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? The project has no mechanism by which it might affect implementation of emergency responses or evacuation plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? The project has no mechanism by which it would affect wildland fires.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Generate vectors (flies, mosquitoes, rodents, etc.) or have a component that includes agricultural waste. Specifically, exceed the following qualitative threshold: (a) occur as immature stages and adults in numbers considerably in excess of those found in the surrounding environment; (b) are associated with design, layout, and management of project operations; (c) disseminate widely from the property; and (d) cause detrimental effects on the public health or well being of the majority of the surrounding population. The proposed project could, particularly during operations in fall and early spring, result in increases in mosquito populations. Proposed Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 will reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Dust control measures implemented under Air Quality will minimize fugitive dust and potential for spread of Valley Fever to less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? The water quality analysis indicates that SWP supplies will not degrade indigenous water quality to the extent that a net degradation will occur or that any beneficial use of water would be affected. Water recharged and recovered will meet drinking water standards. Provisions of the SWPPP and Spill Prevention Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
and Countermeasures Plan (mitigation measure HWQ-4) will reduce the potential for construction related waste discharge.				
<p>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? The Proposed Project would increase groundwater supplies and local groundwater levels. Implementation of monitoring and best management practices (mitigation measure HWQ-6) will ensure that local wells owners are not adversely affected. With these mitigations in place, no significant impacts are anticipated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? The atypical design of the recharge areas will preclude substantial alteration of drainage patterns. Mitigation measures HWQ 1 through HWQ 3, and HWQ-5 will further ensure this. With mitigation, no significant impacts to drainage are anticipated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? The atypical design of the recharge areas will preclude substantial alteration of drainage patterns. Mitigation measures HWQ 1 through HWQ 3, and HWQ-5 will further ensure this. With mitigation, no significant impacts to drainage are anticipated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
polluted runoff? Provisions of the SWPPP and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan (mitigation measure HWQ-4) will reduce the potential for construction related waste discharge. With these mitigations in place, no significant impacts are anticipated.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Per mitigation measure HWQ-7, AVEK will comply with all regulations of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation regarding the use of herbicides and pesticides in areas designated for groundwater recharge. On-going project operations will be conducted under California Department of Pesticide regulation, which precludes use of pesticides known to contaminate water. Groundwater levels are deep and soils are “moderately” constrained for septic systems, requiring extended leach lines in many instances. Potential for conflict between recharge and septic tank discharge is low. No significant impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? The project will not place housing in the 100-year floodplain.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? With mitigation HWQ-5, the effects of placing several water tanks in an area where there may be shallow sheet flood flows will not result in impeding or re-directing flood flows.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? The project does not involve creation or operation of dams or levees. Temporary recharge berms will not contain substantial quantities of water. With mitigation measures HWQ 1, HWQ 2, and HWQ 5, the project will not cause or exacerbate flooding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? The project has no mechanism for affecting these phenomena.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Physically divide an established community? The Project would be located in a rural area, surrounded by active agricultural lands and undeveloped lands, and would not physically divide an established community. Even if a community were to develop in the vicinity of the proposed project in the future, the discontinuous nature of the parcels in use would preclude physical division of the resulting community. Project construction and operation would not restrict movement through or around the area because the Project does not include construction of new roads, bridges, or other common physical barriers to movement through the area. No significant impacts are anticipated.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? The Proposed Project is not in substantial conflict with planning in either Los Angeles or Kern counties. The siting of a needed public facility within the Willow Springs Specific Plan area would reduce the area available for low-density housing by 2 to 5 acres, which would not substantially affect the implementation of the General Plan. The Proposed Project would also not affect Edwards AFB low-level flight operations. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? The project occurs in the general area of the West Mojave Plan but does not affect any wildlife habitat or species addressed by this plan. No conflict will occur.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>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? The project area does not contain mineral resources of commercial value. Thus it would not result in impacts that would be considered significant under CEQA.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? The project area does not contain mineral resources of commercial value. Thus it would not result in impacts that would be considered significant under CEQA.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
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? The project may cause temporary significant adverse noise impacts to residents living in the vicinity of construction activities. Proposed mitigation measure Noise-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? The Proposed Project will not involve the use of equipment that generated substantial groundborne vibration or noise. No significant impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Mitigation measure Noise-2 will eliminate any permanent increase in ambient noise by enclosing any facility with potential to generate substantial noise (such as wells and pumps) in noise reducing structures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Mitigation measures Noise-1 will minimize any increase in ambient noise by providing for noise management to be implemented. Impacts will be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The project is not within an air port land use plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The project will not have airport-related noise impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? Based on consideration of the nature of the project and the historic and present relationship between such projects and growth, the proposed project would not induce growth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? The project does not displace housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? The project does not displace people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial unbalanced or disproportional distribution of impacts of any type on a disadvantaged demographic, such as concentration of toxic emissions in an area of low income families versus high income families. The project does not result in distribution of impacts to a disadvantaged demographic. Impacts are distributed among counties and in areas with and without housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection? No significant impacts are anticipated because the project has no mechanism by which demand for public services would be altered substantially.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection? No significant impacts are anticipated because the project has no mechanism by which demand for public services would be altered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantially.				
Schools? No significant impacts are anticipated because the project has no mechanism by which demand for public services would be altered substantially.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks? No significant impacts are anticipated because the project has no mechanism by which demand for public services would be altered substantially.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities? No significant impacts are anticipated because the project has no mechanism by which demand for public services would be altered substantially.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. RECREATION				
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? There is no mechanism by which the project alternatives would increase recreational use of existing facilities. No impact.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? The project does not include new recreation facilities. No impact.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially reduce recreational opportunities or substantially degrade recreational experiences. There is no mechanism by which the project alternatives would reduce recreational opportunities or degrade recreation. No impact.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? Under the worst-case scenario involving simultaneous of all wells, pipelines, and other facilities, the project would not add traffic volumes to local roads that would	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
exceed result in a change in level of service. Because construction will likely be phased over several years, traffic volumes are likely to be lower than this worst case and no impact to traffic is anticipated.				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? Under the worst-case scenario involving simultaneous of all wells, pipelines, and other facilities, the project would not add traffic volumes to local roads that would exceed result in a change in level of service. Because construction will likely be phased over several years, traffic volumes are likely to be lower than this worst case and no impact to traffic is anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? The Project does not propose the alteration of any air traffic patterns, nor does it include the construction of any structures or design features that are considered a direct hazard to air navigation. There would be no impact. Potential bird air strike hazards are addressed in Hazard and Hazardous Materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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 propose any changes to existing roads that would constitute a traffic hazard. Heavy equipment traffic, however, could create conditions that would be incompatible with general purpose traffic in the area. With proposed mitigation measures TR-1 and TR-2, this potential impact would be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? During the construction phase of the Project, slow-moving traffic in the area could affect emergency response times on roads in the Project vicinity. Additionally, temporary road closures or detours would be required where proposed pipeline alignments cross roadways. This potential impact would be significant. Mitigation Measure TR-2 and TR-4 address this issue, and no significant impacts to emergency access would	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
occur.				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? The Project would require parking for less than 10 to 15 employees during operations. Per measure TR-3, parking would be provided at inline storage, pumping, and water treatment stations. During construction, existing off-road parking areas would be adequate; equipment staging areas and commuter parking areas would be located on private property and would not encroach on roadways. Impacts would be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? There are no pedestrian walkways, bikeways, or roads designated as bike routes that could be potentially affected by project construction or on-going operation. Additionally, while plans for the area support the expansion of alternative transportation, the area is sparsely populated, and alternative means of transportation have not developed in the Project vicinity. The Project would also not preclude the expansion of alternative transportation in the area at some future date. No impact is anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? The project does not generate wastewater.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? The project does not generate wastewater.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? The project does not generate new storm water drainage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
entitlements needed? The project does not require water supplies.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? The project does not generate wastewater.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? The project does not generate substantial solid waste and is served by a regional landfill.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? The project does not generate substantial solid waste and is served by a regional landfill.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? The project will not contribute to the cumulative loss of habitat or its fragmentation. The project will avoid and minimize impacts to known cultural sites that may be considered significant by avoiding project activities on these areas. The proposed project will fully comply with all laws, regulations, and policies regarding treatment of buried cultural resources. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? No significant "cumulatively considerable" impacts are anticipated, primarily as a result of the project's provisions for avoidance of impacts and its innovative design that substantially reduces impacts to agriculture, air quality, energy use, and land use.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? The project incorporates measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts in categories directly or indirectly affecting human beings. Mitigations for air quality, land use, hydrology and water quality, mosquito management, hazard management, and traffic-related management will effectively reduce any impacts to a level of less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

| [CERES](#) | [CEQA Home](#) | [CEQA Guidelines](#) | [Environmental Law](#) | [Wetlands](#) | [LUPIN](#) |

This file last modified on: Tuesday, February 6, 2001.

Document URL: http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/Appendix_G.html

Copyright © 1998-2003 California Resources Agency. All rights reserved.