Appendix B WSIP Initial Study Checklist

APPENDIX B

SFPUC Water System Improvement Program Initial Study Checklist – File No. 2005.0159E

A. Project Description

See Chapter 3 of this PEIR for Background and Description of the proposed Water System Improvement Program (WSIP or proposed program).

B. Project Setting

See Chapters 2 and 3 for description of the existing regional water system and regional location of proposed program.

C. Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans

	Applicable	Not Applicable
Discuss any variances, special authorizations, or changes proposed to the Planning Code or Zoning Map, if applicable.		\boxtimes
Discuss any conflicts with any adopted plans and goals of the City or Region, if applicable.	\boxtimes	
Discuss any approvals and/or permits from City departments other than the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection, or from Regional, State, or Federal Agencies.		

The program does not propose any variances, special authorizations or changes to the Planning Code or Zoning Map. See Chapter 4, Section 4.2, Plans and Policies, for discussion of plans and policies applicable to WSIP facility improvement projects. See Chapter 5, Section 5.2, Plans and Policies, for discussion of plans and policies applicable to WSIP water supply and system operations. See Chapter 3, Section 3.12, Required Actions and Approvals, for discussion of approvals applicable to the proposed program.

D. Summary of Environmental Effects

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

\boxtimes	Land Use	\boxtimes	Air Quality	\square	Geology and Soils
\boxtimes	Aesthetics		Wind and Shadow	\boxtimes	Hydrology and Water Quality
\boxtimes	Population and Housing	\boxtimes	Recreation	\boxtimes	Hazards/Hazardous Materials
\boxtimes	Cultural Resources	\boxtimes	Utilities and Service Systems	\boxtimes	Mineral/Energy Resources
\boxtimes	Transportation and Circulation	\boxtimes	Public Services	\square	Agricultural Resources
\boxtimes	Noise	\boxtimes	Biological Resources	\boxtimes	Mandatory Findings of Signif.

E. Evaluation of Environmental Effects

Тор	vics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
1.	LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?					\boxtimes
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)	Have any substantial impact on the existing character of the vicinity?	\boxtimes				

Additional Land Use Significance Criterion Evaluated in the PEIR

Substantially disrupt or displace existing land uses or land use activities

See Chapter 4, Section 4.2, and Chapter 5, Section 5.2, for discussion of plans and policies, for WSIP facilities and water supply/system operations, respectively. See Chapter 4, Section 4.3, Land Use and Visual, for discussion of impact upon the existing character of the vicinity associated with WSIP facility improvement projects. This issue (criterion c) is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect the existing character of the vicinity. The program would not physically divide established communities; therefore, criterion (a) is not discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
2.	AESTHETICS—Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	\boxtimes				
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting?					
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or substantially impact other people or properties?					

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.3 and 4.16, Land Use and Visual, for discussion of visual quality effects of the WSIP facility improvement projects. See Chapter 5, Sections 5.3.8, 5.4.7 and 5.5.7, for discussion of visual quality effects of the proposed water supply option and system operations. However, criterion (d) is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect views in the area or substantially impact other people or properties.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
3.	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)?					
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?					
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					

See Chapter 7, Growth Inducement Potential, for discussion of program effects on population growth, including direct and indirect effects. The program would not displace existing housing units, create demand for additional housing or displace people; therefore, criteria (b) and (c) are not discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
4.	CULTURAL RESOURCES— Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?					
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?					
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?					
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		\boxtimes			

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.7 and 4.16, Cultural Resources, for discussion of cultural resources effects of the WSIP, including effects of the proposed water supply option and system operations. Therefore, this resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5.

Тор	vics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
5.	TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION— Would the project:					
a)	Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?					
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (unless it is practical to achieve the standard through increased use of alternative transportation modes)?					

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, an obstruction to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?					
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses, or interfere with existing transportation systems (including vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle networks), causing substantial alterations to circulation patterns or major traffic hazards.					
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		\boxtimes			
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity that could not be accommodated by alternative solutions?		\boxtimes			
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., conflict with policies promoting bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.), or cause a substantial increase in transit demand that cannot be accommodated by existing or proposed transit capacity or alternative travel modes?					

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.8 and 4.16, Traffic, Transportation, and Circulation, for discussion of traffic effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. The level of service standards established by county congestion management agencies and documented in congestion management plans are intended to regulate long-term traffic impacts due to future development, and do not apply to temporary construction projects; no further consideration of this criterion (b) is required. The program would not have the potential to change air traffic patterns at any airport in the area; therefore, criterion (c) is not discussed.

This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect traffic, transportation or circulation.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
6.	NOISE—Would the project:					
a)	Expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					
b)	Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					
d)	Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	\boxtimes				
e)	For a project located within an area covered by 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), expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					
g)	Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?					\boxtimes

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.10 and 4.16, Noise and Vibration, for discussion of noise and vibration effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. The WSIP facilities are not located within an airport land use plan area, nor in the vicinity of a private airstrip, therefore criterion (e) and (f) are not discussed. The WSIP facilities are not a noise-sensitive use; therefore, criterion (g) is not discussed.

This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect noise and vibration.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
7.	AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria establish district may be relied upon to make the following			•	or air pollu	ition control
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes		
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					

Тор	vics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		\boxtimes			
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			\boxtimes		

Additional Air Quality Significance Criteria Evaluated in the PEIR

 Conflict with the state goal of reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020, as set forth by the timetable established in AB 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.9 and 4.16, Air Quality, for discussion of air quality effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect air quality.

Тор	vics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
8.	WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:					
a)	Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?					\boxtimes
b)	Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?					\boxtimes

The program would have no effect on wind patterns since proposed facilities would either be located below ground; be located in, adjacent to or replace existing structures; or have a maximum height of 40 feet but not in a location that affects public areas. In addition, the program would not create new shadows in a manner that would affect recreational facilities (discussed separately under Recreation) or other public areas due to the maximum height and location of proposed structures. This resource area is not discussed in either Chapter 4 or 5.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
9.	RECREATION—Would the project:					
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?					
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					
c)	Physically degrade existing recreational resources?		\boxtimes			

Additional Recreation Significance Criteria Evaluated in the PEIR

- Remove or damage existing recreational resources directly
- Cause environmental impacts (such as air quality or noise effects) that would indirectly result in deterioration in the quality of the recreational experience
- Disrupt access to existing recreation facilities (which would divide a community from some of the established amenities used by its members)

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.12 and 4.16, Recreational Resources, for discussion of effects of WSIP facility improvement projects on recreational resources, and see Chapter 5, Sections 5.3.8, 5.4.7, and 5.5.7 for discussion of effects of the proposed water supply option and system operations on recreational resources. The program would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or require the construction/expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, criteria (a) and (b) are not discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
10.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					
d)	Not have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?					
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					
f)	Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		\boxtimes			
g)	Be out of compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		\boxtimes			

Additional Utilities and Service Systems Significance Criterion Evaluated in the PEIR

Disrupt operation of or require relocation of regional or local utilities

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.11 and 4.16, Public Services and Utilities, for discussion of effects of WSIP facility improvement projects on services and utilities. This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect public services and utilities.

The program would result in improvements and possibly expansion of existing water facilities (part of criterion b) as part of the increased system reliability objectives of the WSIP; these impacts are discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 7 of the PEIR. The existing entitlements are discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1, Existing Water Rights and Entitlements, and new or expanded water supply resources are described in Chapter 3 as part of the proposed water supply option (criterion d). The effects of the proposed water supply option are discussed in Chapters 5 and 7.

The program would have no effect on wastewater treatment requirements (criterion a) The program would not require construction or expansion of wastewater facilities (other part of criterion b), and any increase in wastewater demand associated with implementation of WSIP is addressed under secondary impacts of growth in Chapter 7 (criterion e). The program would not require construction or expansion of existing storm drainage facilities (criterion c). Therefore, these criteria are not further discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
11.	PUBLIC SERVICES— Would the project:					
a)	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the 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 public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?					

The program would not directly affect the need for public services or governmental facilities, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other services. Chapter 7, Section 7.4, addresses potential changing needs for these services and facilities as a result of the indirect or secondary effects of growth. The direct effects of WSIP facility project construction and/or operation on neighboring schools are discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.3, under Land Use; and effects on parks are discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.12, Recreational Resources. Otherwise, this resource area is not discussed further in Chapters 4 or 5.

Topics:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
12.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES— Would 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 and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?					

Τομ	vics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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?		\boxtimes			
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?					

Additional Biological Resources Significance Criterion Evaluated in the PEIR

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG, NMFS, or USFWS.
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including the *Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Management Plan*.

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.6 and 4.16, Biological Resources, for discussion of effects of WSIP facility improvement projects on biological resources, and see Chapter 5, Sections 5.3.6, 5.3.7, 5.4.5, 5.4.6, 5.5.5, and 5.5.6 for discussion of effects of the proposed water supply option and system operations on fisheries and other biological resources.

Тор	ics:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
13.		OLOGY AND SOILS— uld the project:					
a)	sub	pose people or structures to potential stantial adverse effects, including the risk of s, 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?			\boxtimes		

Тор	pics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes		
	iv) Landslides?			\boxtimes		
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes		
c)	Be located on a geologic or soil unit 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 or corrosive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?		\boxtimes			
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?					
f)	Substantially change the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?			\boxtimes		

Additional Geology and Soils Significance Criteria Evaluated in the PEIR

- Substantially change the topography such that ecological, hydrologic, or aesthetic functions are adversely affected, or substantially change any unique geologic or physical features of the site or area
- Potentially result in onsite or offsite land subsidence that would cause substantial structural damage, increased flooding, or altered drainage patterns

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.4 and 4.16, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, for discussion of geologic/seismic effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. This resource area is generally not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not affect soils and seismicity; however, geomorphology effects on stream channels are discussed in Chapter 5, Sections 5.3.2, 5.4.2, and 5.5.2. None of the WSIP projects are expected to construct septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal facilities; therefore, criterion (e) is not discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
14.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		\boxtimes			
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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site?					
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off the site?					
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		\boxtimes			
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 authoritative flood hazard delineation map?					
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?					
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					
j)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					

Additional Hydrology and Water Quality Significance Criteria Evaluated in the PEIR

 Result in substantial adverse changes in operations or substantial decreases in water deliveries for water users, as measured by significant changes in reservoir storage, timing or rate of river flows, or water quality

- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the
 alteration of the course of the stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial
 erosion or siltation or adversely affect the ecological, hydrologic or aesthetic functions of
 the site or area
- Substantially alter stream flows such that they are outside the range of pre-project (pre-WSIP) conditions and result in adverse hydrologic effects
- Substantially alter stream flows such that they are outside the range of pre-project (pre-WSIP) conditions and result in substantial hydrologic changes
- Substantially impair a water body's ability to support its designated beneficial uses, as specified by the State Water Resources Control Board
- Substantially impair a water body's ability to support beneficial uses designated by the State Water Resources Control Board or Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Violate any water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade water quality

See Chapter 4, Section 4.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, for discussion of hydrology and water quality effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. See Chapter 5, Sections 5.3 (Tuolumne River System and Downstream Water Bodies), Section 5.4 (Alameda Creek System and Related Resources), Section 5.5 (Peninsula Watershed Resources), and Section 5.6 (Westside Basin Groundwater Resources) for discussion of effects of the proposed water supply option and system operations on hydrology and water quality. The program would not involve the construction of housing; therefore, criterion (g) is not discussed. The program would not expose people to a significant flood risk or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow; therefore, criterion (i) and (j) are not discussed.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
15.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would 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 into the environment?					
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?					

Тор	oics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 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, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					\boxtimes
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?			\boxtimes		

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.14 and 4.16, Hazards, for discussion of hazards effects of WSIP facility improvement projects. This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not involve use or exposure to hazards. The program would not be located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, criteria (e) and (f) are not discussed. Section 4.8, Traffic, Transportation, and Circulation discusses access for emergency response vehicles with respect to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans (criterion g).

Topics:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
16.	MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would 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?					
c)	Encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?					

Additional Mineral and Energy Significance Criteria Evaluated in the PEIR

Reduce the production of renewable energy

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.15 and 4.16, Energy Resources, and Chapter 5, Section 5.3.9, for discussion of energy effects of the WSIP. Mineral resources in the WSIP area consist primarily of fuel resources and industrial minerals (e.g., aggregate, sand and gravel, and clay). Although access to these resources could be lost due to the conversion of lands underlain by these resources to other uses, conversion of land within close proximity to the resources, or due to changes in land ownership (e.g., non-renewal of a lease where active mining is occurring), none of the WSIP projects would result in a loss of mineral resources or make them inaccessible. Furthermore, construction of pipelines and other public engineering projects is excluded from Surface Mining and Reclamation Act regulation. Therefore, impacts related to the loss of mineral resources would be not applicable to WSIP projects and are not discussed further in Chapters 4 or 5.

Тор	ics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
17.	7. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department 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, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation, to non- agricultural use?					
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		\boxtimes			
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural use?					

See Chapter 4, Sections 4.13 and 4.16, Agricultural Resources, for discussion of the effects of the WSIP facility improvement projects on agricultural resources. This resource area is not discussed in Chapter 5 because the proposed water supply option and system operations would not directly affect agricultural resources, although the program effects on water supplies for agricultural use are discussed in Chapter 5.

Topics:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
18.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE— Would 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, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species.					
b)	Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant 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 that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					

See Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 for complete discussion of effects of WSIP on the physical environment.

F. Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures

See Chapter 6 for description of mitigation measures. No improvement measures are recommended for the WSIP.