CITY OF LATHROP
INITIAL STUDY (IS)/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

The purpose of this IS/EA is to satisfy the environmental review requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, because of federal funding)). Please note: Under CEQA, proposed development is referred to as a "project," and under NEPA, it is referred to as an "action." For purposes of simplification, in this document, the proposed development will be referred to as "the proposed project" or "the project."

This document was prepared as a combined Initial Study (CEQA) and Environmental Assessment (NEPA) document to allow the City to use one environmental document for both CEQA and NEPA review. The City completed the CEQA process and adopted the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) on December 15, 2004. The Notice of Determination and Findings are included as an appendix to this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA). Following adoption of the IS/MND, the City revised this document to include additional project details for consideration as part of the NEPA review process. No substantial new information, as defined under CEQA, or new impacts have been identified.

This IS/EA follows the outline given in the CEQA Guidelines Checklist to address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. NEPA also requires analysis of project alternatives in the same level of detail as the proposed project. As discussed below under item 12, except for the No Project Alternative, all other alternatives were considered for further analysis but rejected. Thus, in addition to the proposed project, this environmental review addresses environmental impacts associated with the No Project Alternative.

The environmental issues typically addressed under CEQA are similar to the issues addressed under NEPA, with a few exceptions. The responses to each of the Checklist questions below are meant to satisfy the environmental review requirements for both CEQA and NEPA for each of the environmental issues. Following the Checklist is a list of the NEPA issues and a reference to the corresponding CEQA issue in the Checklist, where the reader can find the discussion of that issue. For those NEPA issues not addressed in the CEQA Checklist, a discussion of the proposed project's potential impacts related to those issues is provided.

1. Project Title

Lathrop Well 10

2. Lead Agency

City of Lathrop
Public Works Department
390 Towne Center Drive
Lathrop, CA 95330
Attn: Cary Keaten

3. Cooperating Agency

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Attn: David Albright

4. Preparers of the IS/FONSI

Impact Sciences
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1825
Oakland, CA 94612
Attn: Elizabeth Purl

5. Total Cost of Project/Action and EPA's Portion

Project/Action Cost: $1,120,000.
EPA Portion: $523,800

6. Project Location

The project site is located in the eastern portion of the City of Lathrop, just west of the Union Pacific Railroad, south of Louise Avenue, east of McKinley Avenue, and north of Yosemite Avenue (refer to **Figure 1, Project Location**, and **Figure 2, Project Site Plan**).

7. *General Plan* Designations

The City's General Plan designates the project site as GI (General Industrial).

8. Zoning

The zoning for the project site is IL (Limited Industrial), which specifically identifies public utility structures (such as wells) as a permitted use.

9. Existing On-site Land Uses

The project site is undeveloped and is located within disturbed grassland. Vegetation on the site is predominately composed of non-native grass species. No trees, aquatic resources, or ground depressions indicative of vernal pools are present on the site.

10. Nearby Land Uses

The project site is bounded by a detention basin associated with the Super Stores warehouse to the north and west, the Union Pacific Railroad to the east, and roughly graded land and large warehouses associated with an industrial park, belonging to Lathrop Industrial Park, to the south and to the west.

11. Purpose and Need of Project

11a. Background

Annual demand for potable water in the City of Lathrop is estimated at approximately 2,500 acre-feet per year (AFY) for a population of 11,000 in 2000.[1] The City's domestic water supply is primarily from groundwater. The City currently has four groundwater wells (Wells 6 though 9) that are considered active. The combined capacity of the City's four operating wells is approximately 5,000 gpm. A fifth existing well, Well 5, was taken out of service in 1995 due to possible groundwater contamination from the Sharpe Army Depot.

Other private well systems in the City supply water to private businesses including J.R. Simplot Company, Libbey-Owen Ford, and DDJC-Sharpe. Water for agricultural uses in West Lathrop and West Central Lathrop is provided by a combination of private wells and private pump stations that draw water directly from the San Joaquin River. The City's municipal water distribution and wastewater collection systems are mostly limited to the existing developed eastern area of the City.

In order to meet future demand, the City adopted the Water, Wastewater, and Recycled Water Master Plan (the Master Plan) in 2001. The Master Plan includes the development of Well 10 to replace Well 5. The replacement of Well 5 has been delayed for several years due to the absence of financial resources to complete the work. Recent support from the EPA through project funding is allowing this needed project to move forward. The existing water supply serving the City has been operating without sufficient capacity

[1] City of Lathrop, 2003 Urban Water Management Plan.

Figure 1

Figure 2

to meet the peak water demand periods while also maintaining the fire flow and emergency storage goals of the City. The project is intended to meet the deficiencies caused by the loss of Well 5.

In the longer term, the Master Plan also includes participation in the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) South County Water Supply Program (SCWSP) to meet the City's water demand. The SCWSP is a joint effort of the SSJID and the cities of Escalon, Manteca, Lathrop, and Tracy, to supply treated potable water to the participating cities. The source of the water is the Stanislaus River. The project includes a new water treatment plant located near Woodward Reservoir and 36.5 miles of pipeline ranging in diameter from 20-inch to 54-inch to transport treated water to various turnouts for each of the four cities. Initially, the SCWSP is anticipated to provide about half of Lathrop's annual water supply and by the year 2020, surface water deliveries will likely meet 75 percent of the City's water requirements. The SCWSP is also intended to maintain groundwater use within the safe yield of the groundwater basin. Groundwater pumping within the City of Lathrop is projected at 5,100 AFY by 2025. Total water demand is projected at 16,900 AFY by 2025, with the balance to be supplied by surface water deliveries.[2]

11b. Purpose and Need

The loss of City Well 5 has created a water supply shortage for the existing City service area. The water system operation following decommissioning of Well 5 has relied on emergency storage in existing tanks to meet maximum day demands and this storage has been depleted after several successive maximum day water use occurrences. In addition, the City water supply is at risk of severe shortages should an unscheduled outage occur such as resulting from a pump motor failure at one of the other existing City Wells. Such shortages could result in non-compliance with drinking water standards and place the City in violation of laws requiring the City to provide a safe, reliable source of drinking water.

The replacement of Well 5 with a new well would provide additional supply as projected in the Master Plan and allow the City to avoid the chronic use of emergency storage during peak water use periods. In addition, the existence of an additional source would provide redundancy needed to account for the occurrence of unscheduled outages and provide a prudent level of reliability. The replacement well would meet the Master Plan's goal of providing a reliable supply under conditions in which one well was out of service for an extended period.

12. Description of Alternatives (NEPA Requirement)

12a. Proposed Project

The proposed project alternative includes development of a new well (Well 10) on an approximately 0.9-acre site that is entirely within the site for the approved Lathrop Industrial Park. The City intends to secure the rights to the project site from its current owners, Super Stores Industries and Lathrop Industrial Development LLC. The well site development would include a 50-foot (ft) by 75 ft paved area (3,750 square feet) with a 9-ft-high split face, masonry block building to house the pump and equipment. Other facilities associated with the well include the following:

- electric motor and on/off controls;
- discharge piping and valves to shut off water flow;
- diesel engine generator for emergency standby power during a power outage;

[2] Ibid.

- 400-gallon aboveground storage tank storing sodium hypochlorite for disinfection;

- radio telemetry to communicate with the City's Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system; and

- retention pond to contain stormwater runoff from the project site and for use during water quality tests.

The entire well site would be surrounded by an 8-ft fence topped with barbed wire; entrance into the well site would be through a locked gate.

Well 10 would be similar in configuration and operation to the existing, unused Well 5. It is expected to be approximately 300 ft deep and would tap into an aquifer that is part of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta groundwater sub-basin. The target production from this well would be 1,500 gallons of water per minute (gpm). A twelve-inch diameter pipeline would extend east approximately 250 ft from the well site, and would connect to planned water pipelines connecting Well 8 to the north and Well 9 to the south with the rest of the City's water distribution system.. The proposed location of Well 10 is approximately 600 yards southeast of the location analyzed in the Master Plan EIR.

The proposed project would not increase the total quantity of groundwater pumping over that projected by the Master Plan. Pumping capacity would be increased and pumping would be reallocated among existing wells and the proposed new well, reducing the need to draw on emergency storage during peak water use periods. Well 10 would also provide redundancy in case of the loss of another well.

Manganese. Manganese is a secondary contaminant that affects the taste and odor of drinking water, but is not a health concern. Concentrations of manganese in some supply wells in the region exceed the secondary drinking water standard of 0.05 milligrams per liter (mg/l). Manganese has not been detected above the threshold in Well 5; however, it has been detected in other nearby wells and it is possible that the proposed Well 10 would exceed the standard as well. In order to provide a conservative (worst-case) analysis, it is therefore assumed that the water from Well 10 would require treatment. Treatment would consist of piping the water from Well 10 through existing right of ways to a plant to be located in Lathrop, south of the Well 10 site. Manganese would be removed using and oxidation filtration process. This process includes use of sodium hypochlorite to oxidize the soluble manganese and an adsorptive sand media to remove the manganese. Periodic backwashing is required to remove the accumulated manganese. Backwash water would be held in a tank and the manganese allowed to settle out. Backwash water would be reclaimed at the head of the treatment plant following the settling period. Periodic removal of accumulated solids would be removed by commercial waste hauler and disposed of off-site.

Arsenic. The City will be required to comply with new standards for arsenic in drinking water by 2006. The existing Well 5 arsenic concentration has not been reviewed but was within the drinking water standard of 50 micrograms per liter (μg/l) at the time it was shut down due to contamination at the Sharpe Army Depot and the City lost use of the resource. The drinking water standard has been reduced from 50 μg/l to 10 μg/l on a federal level, and will be no higher than 10 μg/l on the state level when the state establishes the corresponding standard. Once the proposed well is put in service, periodic testing for arsenic would be required. If test results showed that arsenic concentrations exceeded the drinking water standard, the City would be required to reduce concentrations to below the threshold prior to delivery to the point of consumption.

The existing City wells around the proposed Well 10 site exceed the 10 μg/l drinking water standard for arsenic and it is therefore assumed that the replacement well for Well 5 may also exceed the standard. If so, water supplied from this well would require treatment. Treatment may follow one of two approaches: blending with surface water or

removal through a variety of processes. The City is commissioning a technical evaluation of alternatives in 2005 to establish a Compliance Plan and Schedule. The most likely treatment alternatives are:

1. Blending with surface water. This option would require installation of an additional buried pipeline within existing right of ways to connect the new well to the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) Surface Water Project turnout. Blending could be accomplished with either a new connection to the existing tank using a wall penetration, an inline blending station, or a new tank and booster pump station. The California State Department of Health Services (DHS) will provide comments to the 2005 Compliance Plan and Schedule and at that time the use of an in-line blending station will be discussed. DHS may prefer a new tank and booster pump station for blending. The three alternatives have potential facilities ranging from a buried 10 by 12 vault for blending, to a 24-foot-tall, 70-foot-diameter tank with 20 by 20 block building for booster pumps. All blending alternatives will include the pipeline from the well to the tank.

2. Treatment for arsenic reduction. This could include disposable adsorptive medias, regenerable ion exchange, or coagulation/filtration. Each process would have somewhat different procedures for chemical handling, solids reduction, and arsenic disposal. However, they would be somewhat similar in their general appearance. They all would include a 30-foot by 60-foot process area with either steel pressure vessels 16 to 20 feet tall or horizontal tanks. The Well 10 treatment facility conceptual plan is to route the untreated water to Well 9 for treatment using a plant serving both wells. Typically all processes would require some chemical treatment. Treatment could include one or more of the following processes and would produce the associated waste products:

a. Throwaway Adsorptive Media – Sodium Hypochlorite, CO2 gas

b. Ion Exchange - Sodium Hypochlorite, Caustic, Brine

c. Coagulation/Filtration - Sodium Hypochlorite, Ferric Chloride

Treatment would occur, if needed, at either the existing SSJID site (blending) or the existing Well 9 site (reduction). All of the options could be accomplished within the footprint of existing or planned water supply facilities, and thus within the area examined in the Master Plan EIR. The final determination of alternatives, costs, facilities and ultimate approach is to be part of the 2005 Compliance Plan. Any treatment option, if needed, would occur off-site, would be system-wide rather than specific to Well 10, and would be subject to separate environmental review as part of the Compliance Plan and Schedule process.

Potential arsenic reduction treatment methods include ion exchange, adsorptive media, ferric chloride feed with filtration, and blending. These processes include steel structures and chemical feed systems including sodium hypochlorite, ferric chloride, carbon dioxide and brine.

12b. No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, development of Well 10 would not occur. The existing water supply serving the City has been operating without sufficient capacity to meet the peak water demand periods while also maintaining the fire flow and emergency storage goals of the City. The no project alternative would result in the continued exposure of the community to possible water shortages, low pressures and fails to support a safe and reliable water supply for the City of Lathrop.

12c. Other Project Alternatives Considered But Rejected

Retrofit of Existing Wells with Larger Pumps

Under this project alternative, all of the existing wells in Lathrop currently pumping groundwater would be retrofitted with larger pumps, increasing the cumulative amount of water supply from these wells equal to the amount of water that could be obtained through development of Well 10. This alternative was considered for further analysis but rejected due to the inability of this alternative to provide a reliable water source. Although retrofitting the existing wells could address the immediate peak water use deficiencies, it would do nothing to improve redundancy in the case that one of the wells suffers a mechanical or other failure. Additionally, applying greater demands on the existing wells, especially those in the western portion of the City, would likely exacerbate the saltwater intrusion problem the City is currently experiencing. Thus, it was determined that this alternative would seriously fall short of meeting the City's existing needs for a reliable water source and the alternative was not considered any further.

Alternate Site Location

Under this project alternative, Well 10 would be developed at a different location. This alternative was considered for further analysis but rejected because the project site is preferred for technical reasons. The Source Group, Inc. was contracted by the City to conduct an evaluation of three potential well sites for the proposed Well 10. Based on their analysis contained in the *Groundwater Capture Zone Modeling – Proposed Well 10 Locations* report, the proposed siting of Well 10 was determined to be the best location, resulting in the lowest potential to impact the existing well production, the movement of the residual contaminant plume beneath the J.R. Simplot facility, and the increased movement of saline groundwater from the west. In the western portion of the City, additional groundwater pumping would likely contribute to the existing saltwater intrusion problem. Suitable sites in the eastern portion of the City are limited because of the potential to interfere with the groundwater pumping at one of the many wells scattered throughout this area. The other possible locations for Well 10 are in the vicinity of the proposed location and provide access to the same aquifer. Thus, the environmental impacts associated with development of Well 10 on these sites would be similar to those associated with the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative was not considered any further.

Implementing Additional Conservation Measures

Under this project alternative, the City would implement additional conservation measures, such as limiting water use to certain hours of the day, limiting the amount of water used per day, fining those who exceed use limits, etc., beyond those that are already in effect. The City has adopted a Water Conservation Ordinance that includes such measures. The Ordinance provides for a phased approach to conservation measures, with phases ranging from voluntary conservation measures (Phase I) to mandatory use restrictions and penalties intended to reduce consumption by 50 percent (Phase IV). The severity of a drought or water emergency would determine when each conservation phase would be implemented. Implementation of Phase IV measures would reduce projected water demand from the projected normal-year total of 16,900 AFT to approximately 8,900 AFY. However, because surface water deliveries would be reduced in a drought, groundwater pumping is projected to remain stable at 5,100 AFY under single-dry-year conditions, and to increase to 5,800 AFY under multi-year drought conditions.[3] This alternative would therefore not reduce total groundwater demand and would not eliminate the need to replace the lost capacity of Well 5. Thus, this alternative was not considered any further.

[3] Ibid.

Alternate Source: San Joaquin River

Under this project alternative, the City would withdraw water from the San Joaquin River in an amount equal to that which could be obtained through development of Well 10. (Note that this alternative differs from the City's planned use of Stanislaus River water as part of the SSJID/SCSWSP described above.) Additionally, a water treatment plant would need to be constructed in order to supply a water source that meets applicable water quality standards for potable water supplies. This alternative was considered for further analysis but rejected because development of new water rights to the San Joaquin River, if possible, would require years of negotiations and not resolve the immediate need for a safe and reliable water supply. Also, development of a water treatment plant would likely result in as many, if not more environmental impacts than development of Well 10 at its proposed location. Thus, this alternative was not considered any further.

13. Additional Information

On July 10, 2001, the Lathrop City Council certified the Final EIR for the Water, Wastewater, and Recycled Water Master Plan (herein referred to as the Master Plan and the Master Plan EIR). The Master Plan EIR analyzed the environmental impacts related to development of the water and wastewater infrastructure described in the Master Plan, which includes development of Well 10. Section 15168 of the CEQA *Guidelines* states that a negative declaration prepared for a subsequent activity (i.e., development of Well 10), which was previously analyzed in a Program EIR (i.e., the Master Plan EIR), can incorporate information contained in the Program EIR by reference. Thus, where appropriate, this Initial Study incorporates environmental setting information, impact conclusions, and mitigation measures presented in the Master Plan EIR. The analysis contained in this document will be used to determine if the proposed project would result in any new or increased impacts not previously identified in the Master Plan EIR that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

As described above, the proposed location of Well 10 is approximately 600 yards southeast of the location analyzed in the Master Plan EIR. Both of these sites are relatively flat, are surrounded by similar land uses, and do not contain any development. Additionally, the design characteristics of the proposed Well 10 are essentially the same as those described in the Master Plan EIR. Unless otherwise noted in the responses to the CEQA *Guidelines* Checklist questions below, given the proximity of the two sites and the similar design characteristics, the environmental conditions and impacts described in the Master Plan EIR for the original location and design of Well 10 are the same as for the proposed location.

The 0.9-acre well site is within the site of the approved Lathrop Industrial Park. An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) were prepared for the Industrial Park in December 2001. Where appropriate, this Initial Study incorporates by reference the IS/MND for the Industrial Park. The IS/MND document is on file and available for review at the City of Lathrop.

Other public agencies whose approval is required:

- Approval of the FONSI by the U.S. EPA;
- Permit to operate a public water system from the State Department of Health Services; and
- Well Permit from San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health.

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.

	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources
	Air Quality		Biological Resources
	Cultural Resources		Geology and Soils
	Hazards		Hydrology and Water Quality
	Land Use and Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population and Housing
	Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Circulation		Utilities and Service Systems
	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

CEQA DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

_____ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

__X__ 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 proposed proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

_____ 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 measure 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.

_____ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measure that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:_____ Date:_____, 2006

Deanna Walsh
City of Lathrop

Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact:

A significant environmental impact that was not previously identified or is greater than the impact identified in the Program EIR.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:

A significant environmental impact that was not previously identified or is greater than the impact identified in the Program EIR and can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

New or Increased Impact – Less Than Significant:

An environmental impact that was not previously identified or is greater than the impact identified in the Program EIR but is less than significant.

No Impact/No New or Increased Impact:

An environmental impact that was either not previously identified in the Program EIR but simply does not apply to the project, or is an environmental impact that was previously identified in the Program EIR but was found to: 1) not apply to the project; 2) be less than significant; or 3) be less than significant with mitigation.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
1. **AESTHETICS** - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, development of Well 10 would not adversely affect scenic resources within East Lathrop.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The location and design of Well 10 are very similar to that described in the Master Plan EIR. Thus, similar to what was concluded in the Master Plan EIR, project impacts related to substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista would be less than significant. The project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

No trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings are located on the project site. Additionally, the project site is not within a state scenic highway. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would substantially damage scenic resources. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 2.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Master Plan EIR concluded that because Well 10 would be located in an existing industrial complex, the visual character of the site would not substantially change.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. Although the proposed location of Well 10 is not in the industrial complex as described in the Master Plan EIR, the location is only approximately 600 yards away from its original location and is still on land and surrounded by land that is zoned and designated for industrial uses. Further, although the project site is undeveloped, the site is disturbed and is surrounded by developed uses. Thus, similar to what was concluded in the Master Plan EIR, development of Well 10 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, construction of Well 10 would result in less-than-significant construction-related lighting impacts because construction activities would be limited to daytime hours. No residual significant impacts related to light or glare were identified.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. Similar to what was discussed in the Master Plan EIR, the project's construction-related activities would be limited to daytime hours. Operation of Well 10 would include some minor outdoor lighting for safety purposes. Also, there are no sensitive receptors within proximity of the site that could be affected by light associated with the project. Thus, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant and consistent with the impacts identified in the Master Plan EIR. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would create a new source of substantial light or glare. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

2. **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES** - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
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 Master Plan EIR concluded that the development of Well 10 would not occur on Farmland.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. Development of Well 10 at its proposed location would convert approximately one-half an acre of Prime Farmland and approximately one-half an acre of Locally Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. However, the likelihood of the this land being used for agricultural purposes is remote, because existing land uses (the Union Pacific Railroad) and lands surrounding the site that are currently being developed into parking lots would essentially preclude the site from ever being used as farmland, and farming such a small amount of land would not likely

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

be economical. In addition, this land is identified as an industrial land use under the Master Plan and has been approved for development under a separate project, the Lathrop Industrial Park. The IS/MND for the Lathrop Industrial Park analyzed impacts to agricultural resources and found the impacts to be less than significant. Also, the City plans to implement a farmland mitigation fee program in connection with settlement of the South San Joaquin Irrigation District litigation (this is included as a mitigation measure in the back of this document). Thus, impacts related to conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance into a non-agricultural use would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to a non-agricultural use. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 3, 18.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The project site is not currently zoned for agricultural use and is not under Williamson Act contract. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 4.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See response to 2a.

Proposed Project

Existing lands surrounding the project site are currently developed or in the process of being developed. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 4.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
3. **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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
According to the Master Plan EIR, construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project could generate daily particulate matter (PM_{10}) emissions that would have a significant impact on local and regional air quality. Mitigation measures included in the Master Plan EIR include the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) construction air quality mitigation measures. The Master Plan EIR concludes that implementation of these measures would reduce construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, the Master Plan EIR concludes that stationary source emissions, such as those from electrical-powered pump and motor and emergency backup diesel generators, during project operation would not exceed the annual threshold of 10 tons/year for each of the ozone precursor pollutants, reactive organic gases (ROG), and nitrogen oxide (NO_x). Further, because the project would generate an extremely small number of traffic trips, operational mobile source emissions associated with the project would be minimal. As a result, long-term increases in regional pollutants would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures were required. <u>Proposed Project</u> The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. During construction, trenching for the pipelines and grading of the well site would generate PM_{10} emissions, which could result in a significant impact. However, the project applicant would be required to implement the SJVAPCD construction air quality mitigation measures (as described above and included in the Master Plan EIR and listed at the back of this document). Implementation of these measures would ensure that air quality impacts during construction would be less than significant. During operation, the project would result in stationary source emissions of ozone precursor pollutants, ROG, and NO_x due to use of an electrical-powered pump and motor and an emergency backup diesel generator. Also, the project would result in an increase in mobile source emissions generated by employees visiting the site. However, as discussed in the Master Plan EIR, stationary and mobile source emissions generated by the project would be minimal and would not exceed the significance criteria for the pollutants. Thus, operation-related air quality impacts would be less than significant. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue. <u>No Project Alternative</u> Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1 and 4.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 3a.				
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	☐	☐	☐	☒

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				

According to the Master Plan EIR, long-term increases in regional pollutants associated with the proposed wells, water pipelines and associated facilities in the Master Plan would be less than significant.

Proposed Project

As noted previously, the proposed project would have minimal, less-than-significant impacts on long-term increases in regional pollutants. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a net increase of a criteria pollutant. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See response to 3a.

Proposed Project

No sensitive receptors are located in the vicinity of the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 2.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, no long-term odors will be generated as a result of the installation of the proposed wells and pipelines.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. Similar to what was described in the Master Plan EIR, the project would not generate any long-term odors. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would create objectionable odors. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
4. **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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), 16 U.S.C. Section 1531 *et seq*., requires that that United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issue a permit prior to actions that would result in killing, harming, or harassing a federally-listed endangered or threatened species. This permit process is directed under Section 7 of the ESA for actions in which a federal agency is involved and in a similar process under Section 10a of the ESA for state and local agencies, as well as for individuals. Federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS (or National Marine Fisheries Service for some species) prior to undertaking actions that may affect endangered species. A federal agency is required to obtain a biological opinion from the USFWS on whether its actions may jeopardize the continued existence of any threatened or endangered species. Federal agencies are prohibited from enacting activities that would jeopardize the continued existence of these species. California provides similar procedures for state agencies to follow under the California Endangered Species Act, California Fish and Game Code Section 2090 *et seq*.

Proposed Project

As discussed at the beginning of this document, the proposed location of Well 10 is different than the location analyzed in the Master Plan EIR. Because of this, Impact Sciences' staff conducted a site survey and database search to assess the biological conditions of the proposed site.

Special-status plant species known to occur in the project area are associated with marsh, swamp, or riparian scrub habitats (California Native Plant Society Database 2003). Due to the lack of suitable habitat found on the project site, no special-status plant species are expected to occur on the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to special-status plant species, including federally-listed endangered or threatened plant species.

No ground squirrels or burrows where observed within the project boundaries. Given the lack of burrows, the project site is considered to provide marginal nesting habitat for burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*). Therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts to the burrowing owl.

Although the project site and areas immediately surrounding the site do not contain any suitable Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni)* nesting habitat, this species could potentially forage on the site. Therefore, impacts to Swainson's hawk, which is a state-threatened species (but not a federally-listed species), from the loss of foraging habitat would be significant. The Master Plan EIR identified loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat as a significant impact associated with buildout of the Master Plan. Mitigation measures identified in the Master Plan EIR for impacts to Swainson's hawk include: provision of suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat or coverage under the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), which would require project applicants to pay $1,690.00 for the loss of every acre of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The City has indicated that they would seek coverage under the SJMSCP for the loss of the 0.9 acres resulting from the proposed project. This would reduce project impacts to Swainson's hawk to a less-than-significant level. The project would not affect any federally-listed endangered or threatened animal species.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would 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

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1, 4, 6, and 7.				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) regulates impacts to wetlands and other waters under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), 33 U.S.C. Section 1251. Projects that involve excavating dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, must be reviewed and authorized by the ACOE and reviewed by the U.S. EPA. Executive Order 11990 requires that federal agencies, to the extent permitted by law, avoid construction in wetlands unless no practicable alternative to the construction exists and that all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands, including opportunities for public review of plans or proposals, are provided. The CDFG has the authority to reach an agreement with an individual proposing to affect intermittent or permanent streams and other wetlands pursuant to Section 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code. According to the Master Plan EIR the project site does not contain any riparian areas or other biological resources potentially under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) or the CDFG. <u>Proposed Project</u> Based on a subsequent site visit, Impact Sciences' staff confirms that the project site does not contain any riparian areas or other biological resources potentially under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) or the CDFG. No further discussion is necessary. <u>No Project Alternative</u> Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFG or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1 and 6.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 4b.				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The Master Plan EIR did not identify any significant impacts to the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

Proposed Project

With the exception of some open space areas, land surrounding the project site is already developed. The project site is not part of a wildlife corridor. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would 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. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1 and 6.

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

Proposed Project

All other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources have been addressed through the analyses of potential impacts elsewhere in this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts related to ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed Project

The SJMSCP was developed to minimize and mitigate impacts to plant and wildlife habitat resulting from the conversion of open space to non-open space, projected to occur in San Joaquin County between 2001 and 2051. Participation in the SJMSCP is voluntary for local jurisdictions and project proponents. According to the Master Plan EIR, the City of Lathrop adopted the SJMSCP on January 16, 2001. So as a result, the City has the opportunity to seek coverage under the SJMSCP. As stated previously, the City has indicated that they would seek coverage under the SJMSCP for the loss of the 0.9 acre resulting from the proposed project and pay the required $1,690.00 per acre fee. Payment of this fee would ensure that the project would not conflict with the provisions of the SJMSCP. Project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1 and 4.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
5. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. Section 470f, as amended (Pub. L. 89-515), and its implementing regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800) require federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on properties listed, or eligible for listing, for the National Register of Historic Places. It also requires that agencies provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment on actions that will directly or indirectly affect properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The criteria for evaluating NRHP eligibility, or significance, of historic properties are found in 36 CSF 60.4.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. Section 470aa-11, requires the issuance of permits to excavate any archaeological resources on Native American tribal or federal lands. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. Section 300 *et seq*., requires federal agencies and museums receiving federal funds to inventory and repatriate human remains, associated and unassociated funerary objects, and items of cultural patrimony to Native Americans. These items must be returned, upon request, to lineal descendants or to Indian tribes with the closest cultural affiliation.

Section 15065 of the CEQA *Guidelines* mandates a finding of significance if a project would eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. In addition, pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it "may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource." A "substantial adverse change" means "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is impaired." Material impairment means altering "…in an adverse manner those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources."

According to the Master Plan EIR, project-related construction activities associated with installation of proposed pipelines in the southern portion of East Lathrop could result in potentially significant impacts to a recorded cultural resource site or undiscovered/unrecorded cultural resources sites. Mitigation measures proposed in the EIR do not specifically address unknown prehistoric cultural resources.

Proposed Project

Pacific Legacy, Inc. conducted a literature search, Native American consultation, and archaeological survey of the proposed Well 10 site (see the report included in **Appendix A** of this IS/EA). Two previously identified cultural resources are located within ½ mile of the project site; these are the Western Pacific Railroad (now Union Pacific) line, located adjacent to the east of the proposed well location, and the SSJID Drainage Channel, located just east of this rail line.

A search of the "Sacred Lands Inventory" of the Native American Heritage Commission and notification of individuals and organizations that may have additional information or concerns about the project area did not identify any Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The on-site survey also did not identify any cultural resources within the proposed project boundaries.

No known prehistoric cultural resources exist within the project area. However, as stated in the Master Plan EIR, project-related construction activities associated with the development of the well and proposed pipelines could result in potentially significant impacts to undiscovered or unrecorded cultural resource sites. The Master Plan EIR includes mitigation for impacts to unknown archaeological resources that would reduce potential impacts of Master Plan implementation related to unknown archaeological resources to a less-than–significant level. Implementation of the mitigation measures included at the end of this Initial Study would reduce any project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project would not affect any resources listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1, 21.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See response to 5a.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

Sedimentary deposits associated with the San Joaquin River underlie the project site. Thick layers of clay, silts, and sands have buried any geologic units that could contain paleontological resources (if they ever existed). The project site does not contain any unique geologic features. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. No further discussion is necessary.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, project related construction associated with the development of proposed wells and pipelines could result in potentially significant impacts to as yet undiscovered or unrecorded human remains. Mitigation measures identified in the Master Plan EIR include suspending work at the specific construction site if remains have been uncovered, notifying the City of Lathrop Public Works Department, the County coroner, and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and adhering to the guidelines of the NAHC in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Master Plan EIR would reduce impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. During construction, unknown human remains could be encountered. However, the project applicant would be required to implement the mitigation described above and included at the back of this document. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Master Plan EIR would reduce impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would disturb any human remains. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1, 21.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
6. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, there are no known active faults in the project area. Additionally, the EIR concluded that the study area does not contain any Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zones.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. However, no known active faults occur in the project area, and the proposed location of Well 10 is not in any Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zone. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that could be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects related to rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Source: 1.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐

According to the Master Plan EIR, seismic activity within the San Andreas Fault system, the San Joaquin Valley region, or the Foothill Fault system could generate strong ground shaking within the project area. Although the project area would not likely experience a fault rupture, groundshaking could cause structural damage to pipelines and wells. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. Mitigation in the EIR included preparation of an Earthquake Response Plan for the proposed wells, pipelines, and associated facilities. Impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant with mitigation.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. Similar to what was described in the Master Plan EIR, the project site could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking in the event of an earthquake, which could potentially damage the well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The City conducted a Vulnerability Analysis, which considered the potential risk of damage or destruction to the City's water system due to natural (including earthquakes and human-induced disasters. After the analysis was completed, an Emergency Response Plan was developed. These efforts fulfill the mitigation requirements from the Master Plan EIR.

Additionally, a site-specific geotechnical report was prepared for Well 10. The report concludes that development of the proposed well, pipelines, and associated facilities is feasible and provides seismic design recommendations. Compliance with these recommendations would further reduce project impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking, and has been included as a mitigation measure. With the mitigation from the Master Plan EIR and the project-specific mitigation, the proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject to seismic ground shaking, and no related impacts would occur. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1 and 17.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Master Plan EIR identified western portions of the City along the San Joaquin River as having soils with a high potential for liquefaction. No impacts related to seismic-related ground failure in the area of Well 10 were identified.

Proposed Project

The project site does not contain soils that are susceptible to liquefaction. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1 and 17.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The project site is flat and is not adjacent to any slopes. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would expose people or structures to landslides. No further discussion is necessary.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, project-related construction activities associated with the installation of Well 10, pipelines, and associated facilities could expose soils to erosion and loss of topsoil, which would represent a potentially significant short-term construction-related impact. Mitigation identified includes submittal of a grading and erosion control plan for each project component and indication of which "best management practice" activities would be used to control erosion and sediment. Implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce the identified significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. Similar to what was described in the Master Plan EIR, the project would include installation of Well 10, pipelines, and associated facilities that could expose soils to erosion and loss of topsoil. However, the project applicant would be required to implement the mitigation measure prescribed in the Master Plan EIR (as described above and included in the back of this document) that would reduce impacts related to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

For a discussion of liquefaction impacts, see response to 6aiii. For a discussion of landslide impacts, see response to 6aiv.

According to the Master Plan EIR, the soils in the project area have a low potential for subsidence. The EIR did not identify any other impacts related to unstable soils.

Proposed Project

The project site does not contain soils that are susceptible to subsidence. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, potentially resulting in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1 and 17.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, the shrink-swell potential of soils within the project area is low.

Proposed Project

The project site contains soils with a low shrink-swell potential. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject substantial risks to life or property involving expansive soils. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would require use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No further discussion is necessary.

7. **HAZARDS** - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Master Plan EIR considered the potential impacts related to use of hazardous materials during the operation of Well 10. The Master Plan EIR concluded that the amount of hazardous materials used during the operation of the well would be minimal, and the potential for hazardous waste spills from this use would be negligible. Additionally, the Master Plan EIR describes the regulatory requirements with which the transport, handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials associated with the operation of Well 10 would be required to comply. The Master Plan EIR does not identify any significant hazardous materials impacts related to Well 10.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities and would also include the use of hypochlorite. This chemical would be stored in a 400-gallon aboveground storage tank (AST) and would be used for disinfection purposes. The transport, handling, use, and storage of this hazardous material would occur in compliance with the regulatory setting described in the Master Plan EIR. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See response to 7a and 7d.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

Proposed Project

The proposed project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school is Lathrop Elementary School, which is more than one mile away. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would emit hazardous materials. No further discussion is necessary.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, project-related construction activities could expose construction workers, adjacent land uses, and the environment to pre-existing listed and unknown hazardous materials contamination at proposed construction sites within East Lathrop. Any such occurrence would represent a potentially significant health and safety impact during construction. Mitigation Measures identified in the Master Plan EIR include sampling soils that exhibit elevated readings, odor, or visual evidence of contamination for laboratory analysis. If the samples are found to be contaminated above Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) acceptable levels, the subject soils shall be excavated, segregated, treated (if required), and disposed of in accordance with DTSC requirements. The Master Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. During construction, trenching and grading activities could expose workers to hazardous materials contamination, if such contamination exists. However, based on a Phase 1 Site Assessment prepared for the entire City and a review of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database and the Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Information System (LUSTIS) database, the project site and areas surrounding the site are not listed as sites known to contain hazardous materials. Thus, the potential to encounter hazardous materials during project construction is very low. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1, 8, 9, and 15.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The closest airport to the proposed project site is the Stockton Metropolitan Airport, which is approximately 11.5 miles away from the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be within two miles of an airport,

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

resulting in a safety hazard. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 2.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

Based on a review of published aerial photographs, there are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard.

Source: 12.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, the proposed project would not impair implementation of existing emergency response or evacuation plans and would, therefore, result in less-than-significant health and safety impacts to emergency response/evacuation planning.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The project site is set approximately one quarter mile away from any roadway. Similar to what was discussed in the Master Plan EIR, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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

Proposed Project

According to the Lathrop-Manteca Deputy Fire Department, the project site is not susceptible to wildland fires. The proposed project would not result in any new impacts related to wildland fires. No further discussion is necessary.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss related to wildland fires. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 10.

8. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

According to the Master Plan EIR, construction-related activities could temporarily increase the amount of suspended solids in stormwater. However, as required under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction Activities, the project applicant would be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) detailing best management practices (BMPs) to avoid significant water quality impacts. The Master Plan EIR concluded that surface water impacts related to construction activities would be less than significant.

The Master Plan EIR also states that increased groundwater pumping could contribute to water quality degradation due to the eastward migration of groundwater containing total dissolved solids (TDS) that exceed the 500 mg/L standard. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. Mitigation prescribed in the Master Plan EIR included site-specific analyses to determine appropriate design parameters, including separation from existing wells, well depth, location of the aquifer to be pumped, and potential treatment requirements, and on-going water quality monitoring to determine whether additional treatment is required. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. During construction, drilling, grading, and trenching activities could increase the amount of suspended solids in stormwater runoff in the areas of the 0.9-acre well site and pipeline extension. Without mitigation, this would constitute a significant impact. However, a temporary berm would be placed around the drilling site during construction to contain any drilling spoils. Further, all construction activities would be subject to the conditions of an approved SWPPP. Similar to the conclusions of the Master Plan EIR, construction-related project impacts related to surface water quality would be less than significant.

The Source Group, Inc. was contracted by the City to conduct an evaluation of three potential well sites for the proposed Well 10. The Source Group study, together with this IS/EA, constitute the site-specific analyses identified as mitigation under the Master Plan EIR. Based on the analysis contained in The Source Group's report, *Groundwater Capture Zone Modeling – Proposed Well 10 Locations*, the proposed siting of Well 10 was determined to be the best location, resulting in the lowest potential to impact the existing well production, the movement of the residual contaminant plume beneath the J.R. Simplot facility, and the increased movement of saline groundwater from the west. Additionally, the project applicant would monitor the quality of water produced by Well 10 for several potential contaminants, including TDS, every 3 years as required by the State Department of Health Services. Total groundwater pumping would not increase above that projected by and analyzed in the Master Plan and Master Plan EIR. As discussed above in paragraph 12, Description of Alternatives, pumping capacity would be increased and pumping would be reallocated among existing wells and the proposed new well. Thus, implementation of the project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue, including cumulative impacts.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1, 16, 19, 20.

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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, Well 10 was projected to pump groundwater at a rate of approximately 1,250 gpm of groundwater and would result in less-than-significant impacts to groundwater supply.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The proposed Well 10 is projected to pump groundwater at a rate of approximately 1,500 gpm of groundwater, which is 250 gpm more than projected in the Master Plan EIR. However, the proposed Well 10 is a replacement for Well 5, and the overall amount of groundwater that would be extracted from Well 10 would not exceed the existing groundwater demand, which is currently being met through other wells plus the use of storage capacity. Also, the increase in the amount of impervious surfaces associated with development of Well 10 (approximately 3,750 square feet) would be minimal, and all runoff from the site would be directed into a retention basin for absorption into the ground. Thus, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to groundwater.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, the lack of replacement pumping capacity would lead to continued water supply shortages for the existing City service area, continued reliance on emergency storage in existing tanks, and the potential for lack of available fire flow. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, project impacts from some of the proposed facilities associated with the Master Plan could result in significant drainage impacts. The specific facilities identified in the Master Plan EIR that could create these impacts include the Water Recycling Plants, which would occupy sites of approximately 16 acres each. Mitigation included in the Master Plan EIR included development of a drainage plan that demonstrates that the existing/proposed drainage improvements would be adequate to safely retain, detain, and/or convey stormwater runoff. Implementation of the measure would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface on the site by 3,750 sf. A retention basin would be constructed on the

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

site to contain stormwater runoff from the site, allowing runoff from the site to percolate into the ground. The increase in the amount of impervious surface on the project site would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Also, as the project applicant would be required to implement the mitigation measure identified in the Master Plan EIR (i.e., preparation of a drainage plan). Thus, the proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to this issue.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would alter the existing drainage pattern. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, impacts related to flooding on or off site in the project area would be less than significant.

Proposed Project

See response to 8c. Similar to conclusions made in the Master Plan EIR, project impacts related to flooding would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would alter the existing drainage pattern or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

See response to 8c.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would create or contribute to runoff water. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See responses to 8a, 8d, and 8e.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
According to the Master Plan EIR, the project site is not located within a 100–year floodplain, and therefore, impacts related to the 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant. Proposed Project The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject to flooding. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 8g.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The western portion of the City contains levees, developed around the San Joaquin River to prevent potential flooding. However, the San Joaquin River is located over two miles away from the project site. Failure of levees along the river would not expose the project site to flooding. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would 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. No further discussion is necessary.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project Given that the project site is located approximately 70 miles away from the Pacific Ocean and is not located near any other large body of water, it is highly unlikely that the project site would be susceptible to inundation by a seiche or a tsunami. Thus, associated impacts would not be significant. Further, the topography of the project site and surrounding areas is relatively flat, and as such, the site would not be subject to mudflows. Thus, there would be no project impacts related to inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No further discussion is necessary.				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
9. **LAND USE AND PLANNING** - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The Master Plan EIR concluded that no impacts with regard to physical division of an established community would occur. Proposed Project The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The project site is near an open field and within an industrial area and is directly adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Similar to what was concluded in the Master Plan EIR, the project would not result in any impacts with regard to physical division of an established community. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that could potentially physically divide an established community. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1.				
b) Conflict with 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project As noted previously, the zoning designation for the project site allows for the placement of wells. The pipelines for the proposed project would generally occur within the rights-of-way of existing streets or across vacant fields (between the wells). As such, the proposed well is consistent with the zoning designation. Further, the proposed project is consistent with the Master Plan, which itself was adopted to avoid or lessen environmental impacts. Therefore impacts related to conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project would not occur. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1.				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 4f.				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
10. **MINERAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

According to the State Department of Conservation's Mineral Land Classification Map, Well 10 is identified as being located in Mineral Resource Zone-1 (MRZ-1), which is defined as an area where no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. Thus, no further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 11.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See response to 10a.

11. **NOISE** - Would the proposal 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Master Plan EIR, construction activities associated with development of the proposed pipeline facilities could cause short-term significant noise impacts to nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Although impacts would be temporary and intermittent, construction noise would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures in the Master Plan EIR for construction-generated noise include limiting hours of construction and properly outfitting and maintaining construction equipment with noise reduction devices. Mitigation also includes use of noise-attenuating buffers wherever possible. Implementation of the Master Plan EIR mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to construction noise levels in excess of City standards to a less-than-significant level.

The Master Plan EIR states that due to the small amount of project-generated traffic, increases in traffic noise levels along roadways would not be substantial (i.e., 3 d(B)A or greater).

The Master Plan EIR states that stationary noise levels associated with well operation could result in noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors that could exceed applicable noise standards. Mitigation in the Master Plan EIR includes shielding sources of noise to reduce noise levels at the location of sensitive receptors. Implementation of the mitigation would reduce impacts to a less-than- significant level.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. During project construction, construction activities would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. Noise levels associated with development of the well could reach approximately 97 d(B)A at 50 ft. During project operation, stationary noise sources associated with the well could generate noise levels up to 82 d(B)A at 50 ft. However, the closest sensitive-receptor is a residential development over one-half mile to the east of the project site and would not experience excessive noise levels from project construction or operation. Thus, project construction- and operation-related impacts would be less than significant. The proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to noise.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be exposed or generate excessive noise levels. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 1.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities, which would require grading, trenching, and drilling. These activities would require limited use of heavy construction equipment that would generate some groundborne vibration and noise but would not require the use of equipment, such as pile drivers, that would cause excessive groundborne vibration and noise. Further, no sensitive-receptors are located within proximity of the project site. Thus, impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No further discussion is necessary.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 10a.				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 10a.				
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 checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

Proposed Project

The closest airport to the proposed project site is the Stockton Metropolitan Airport, which is approximately 11.5 miles away from the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be within two miles of an airport. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 12.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

Based on a review of published aerial photographs, there are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 12.

12. **POPULATION & HOUSING** - Would the proposal:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Master Plan EIR stated that the implementation of the Master Plan would not develop new homes or businesses, which result in a substantial direct increase in population. The Master Plan would also not generate an increase in population beyond, or extend roads or other infrastructure into areas not already planned for and approved for growth under the City's General Plan, the West Lathrop Specific Plan, and the Zoning Ordinance. The Master Plan EIR concluded that impacts related to population would be less than significant. Further, the Master Plan EIR concluded that the increased employment generated by the Master Plan would be minimal and would not increase the demand for housing; impacts would be less than significant.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the development of a well, pipelines, and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would directly or indirectly induce

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
population growth in the area. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1.				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project There are no existing or proposed residences on the project site. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in the displacement of existing housing. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 2.				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 12b.				
13. **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:				
i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
According to the Initial Study included in the Master Plan EIR, implementation of the Master Plan would not result in any direct changes to the population of Lathrop. Since the demand for governmental services is based upon population, the Master Plan would not result in a need for new or altered government services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, and other governmental services. The Initial Study concluded that impacts would be less than significant. The Initial Study also stated that the Master Plan would indirectly influence population in the region since it would provide improved and/or expanded water and wastewater services. Because of this, the Master Plan EIR would address growth-inducing impacts. These impacts were addressed in the EIR and are discussed in response to 12a. Impacts were found to be less than significant. Proposed Project The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. The project would require a minimal amount of fire protection,				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

and all facilities would be constructed in accordance with the California Fire Code. Therefore, project impacts related to fire protection would be less than significant, similar to those identified in the Master Plan EIR. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to fire protection.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a demand for fire protection services. No further discussion is necessary.

ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Initial Study included in the Master Plan EIR, implementation of the Master Plan would not result in any direct changes to the population of Lathrop. The proposed wells, pipelines and water treatment facility would include structures that would require a minimal amount of additional police protection. All facilities would be constructed in accordance with applicable City safety policies and regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts to police protection services. Growth associated with implementation of the Master Plan was accounted for in the Lathrop General Plan and impacts associated with that growth were analyzed in the General Plan EIR. No new impacts relative to police protection services have been identified.

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. The project site would be surrounded by an 8-ft fence topped with barbed wire, and a locked gate, which would reduce the potential for vandalism. Therefore, project impacts related to police services would be less than significant, similar to what was identified in the Master Plan EIR. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any new or increase impacts related to police services.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a demand for police services. No further discussion is necessary.

iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. Therefore, there would be no project impacts related to schools. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a demand for school services. No further discussion is necessary.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. Therefore, there would be no project impacts related to parks and recreational facilities. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a demand for parks or recreational facilities. No further discussion is necessary.				
v) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. Therefore, project impacts related to other governmental services are not significant. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a demand for governmental services. No further discussion is necessary.				
14. **RECREATION** - Would the project:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 13a.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 13a.				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
15. **TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION** - 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The Initial Study prepared for the Master Plan EIR concluded that the Master Plan facilities would not generate a noticeable increase in vehicle trips, and related impacts would be less than significant. Proposed Project The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The operation of Well 10 would generate approximately one trip per day for periodic routine maintenance. Therefore, project impacts to traffic would be less than significant, as identified in the Master Plan EIR. Thus, the proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts related to traffic. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would generate traffic. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 13.				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 15a.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project Construction and operation of the proposed well and pipelines would not involve activities that would affect air traffic. No further discussion is necessary. Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in a change in air traffic patterns. No further discussion is necessary.				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact

Proposed Project

The proposed project does not involve any development of roadways. Access to the project site would be via a parking lot that abuts the site, which is currently under construction by an adjacent landowner. The planned adjacent land use is for large warehouse storage with high volume 18-wheel long haul tractor-trailer truck traffic. The project would not increase hazards due to any design feature or incompatible use resulting from truck or maintenance equipment access. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would increase traffic hazards. No further discussion is necessary.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

As discussed in 15b, the proposed project does not include construction of a roadway. A fire department lock box would be placed outside the proposed gate to provide the Lathrop Fire Department access to the well in the event of an emergency. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in inadequate emergency access. No further discussion is necessary.

Source: 13.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

Sufficient parking for the projected one trip per day, as discussed in 15a, would be located within the project site. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would result in inadequate parking capacity. No further discussion is necessary.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed Project

The project would not generate an amount of traffic that would require the use of alternative transportation. No further discussion is necessary.

No Project Alternative

Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would require use of alternative transportation. No further discussion is necessary.

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
16. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** - Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 8a.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities, which would not consume any water or generate any wastewater. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development or construction would occur that would 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. No further discussion is necessary. Source: 1.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 8e.				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project does not involve any residential or commercial uses and would not directly induce population growth in the area. The development of Well 10 is not intended to serve projected population growth but is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. The project would provide an additional source of water supply, necessary to meet existing needs, rather than requiring an added water supply. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would contribute to the current water supply. However, Well 10 is intended to replace the loss of Well 5 and to ensure that the City's water supply is sufficient to meet existing peak water demands, fire flow requirements, and emergency storage goals. If Well 10 were not developed, existing water supplies would remain deficient.				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 16d.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Proposed Project The proposed project includes development of a well, pipelines and associated facilities. The project would not generate any solid waste, except for minor amounts during construction. No further discussion is necessary. No Project Alternative Under the no project alternative, no development would occur that would generate solid waste. No further discussion is necessary.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒
See response to 16f.				
17. **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 pre-history?	☐	☐	☐	☒
As noted throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
The proposed project would be developed as part of the implementation of the Lathrop Water, Wastewater and Recycled Water Master Plan. The potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other projected				

The checked box to the right refers to the Proposed Project.	Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	New or Increased Impact Less Than Significant	No Impact/ No New or Increased Impact
development in the Master Plan Area have already been analyzed in the Master Plan EIR. Thus, the project would not result in any new or increased cumulative impacts.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒
As noted throughout the Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts after mitigation and thus, would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings.				

NEPA ISSUES

A. Noise

See responses to questions 11a through 11f.

B. Compatible Land Uses

See responses to questions 9a through 9c.

C. Social Impacts

The project would not: 1) require the relocation of any residences or businesses; 2) alter surface transportation patterns; 3) divide or disrupt established communities; 4) disrupt orderly, planned development; or 5) create an appreciable change in employment.

D. Environmental Justice

The racial makeup in the City of Lathrop generally includes 53 percent white, 20 percent unspecified race, 14 percent Asian, 6 percent mixed race, and 5 percent black or African American. No residential communities are located in proximity to the project site. Implementation of the project would supply the City an additional source of water that would assist the City in meeting its existing water demand created by all users within the City. No minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be adversely affected by the proposed project. Therefore, this project is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

Source: 14.

E. Air Quality

See responses to questions 3a through 3e.

F. Water Quality

See responses to questions 8a, 8c, and 8f,

G. Traffic

See responses to questions 15a through 15f.

H. Historic, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

See responses to questions 5a through 5d.

I. Biological Resources

See responses to questions 4a through 4f.

J. Wetlands

See responses to question 4c.

K. Floodplains

See responses to questions 8g and 8h.

L. Coastal Zone

The project site is approximately 70 miles from any coastal zone.

M. Section 4(f) Resources

The project site is not publicly-owned land and is not a public park, a recreational area of national, state, or local significance, a wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or a historic site or national, state, or local significance.

N. Wild and Scenic Rivers

The project site does not contain and is not located near any wild or scenic rivers.

O. Farmland

See responses to questions 2a through 2c.

P. Energy Supply and Natural Resources

The proposed project includes the use of electricity to operate the water pump and on/off controls and diesel fuel to operate the standby generator. The amount of electricity and diesel fuel required for these uses would be minimal and would not have a measurable effect on local supplies.

Q. Solid Waste Impacts

See responses to question 16g.

R. Construction Impacts

See responses to questions 3a, 8a, and 11a.

ACRONYMS

µg/L	Milligrams per liter
ACOE	Army Corps of Engineers
AST	Above ground storage tank
BMPs	Best management practices
CARB/ARB	California Air Resource Board
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
d(B)A	Decibel
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
ft	feet or foot
GI	General Industrial
gpm	Gallons per minute
LI	Limited Industrial
LUSTIS	Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Information System
MRZ-1	Mineral Resource Zone-1
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO_x	Nitrogen oxide
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
PM_{10}	Particulate matter
ROG	Reactive organic gases
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
sf	square feet
SJMSCP	San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TDS	Total dissolved solids
U.S. EPA/EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

MITIGATION MEASURES

The mitigation measures listed below include measures taken directly from the Master Plan EIR and new measures created to reduce potentially significant and significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation measures in the Master Plan EIR were crafted to address impacts related to all projected buildout in the entire Master Plan area and thus, are more comprehensive in design. The measures that pertain to the proposed project have been modified to maintain the intent of the measure and address project-specific impacts.

AIR QUALITY

All of the following mitigation measures apply to proposed development of the well and pipelines as modified by SJVUAPCD Guide:

1. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.

2. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

3. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut & fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.

4. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions or at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.

5. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where precede or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)

6. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Construction Impacts on Undiscovered/Unrecorded Archaeological Resources

1. The City shall require the following measures for unknown or unrecorded archaeological resources within the project area:

   A. Prior to clearing, grading, excavation, or construction on the project site, the property owner as well as the prime construction contractor shall provide a signed letter of acknowledgement that they are aware of the potential for unidentified buried or otherwise obscured archaeological or cultural deposits on the project site and that they accept responsibility to halt construction activity should cultural materials or human remains be unearthed during project construction. The letter of acknowledgement shall identify that the property owner and prime construction contractor have been cautioned by the City of Pinole on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying cultural resources or removing artifacts, human remains, bottles, and/or other cultural materials from the project site.

   B. If needed, a qualified archaeologist would be identified by the project sponsor prior to construction. The City would approve the project sponsor's selection for a qualified archaeologist. The archaeologist would have the authority to temporarily halt excavation and construction activities in

the immediate vicinity (ten-meter radius) of a find if significant or potentially significant cultural resources are exposed and/or adversely affected by construction operations.

C. If archaeological resources were discovered within the project area, reasonable time would be allowed for the qualified archaeologist to notify the proper authorities for a more detailed inspection and examination of the exposed cultural resources. During this time, excavation and construction would not be allowed in the immediate vicinity of the find; however, those activities could continue in other areas of the project site.

D. If any find were determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist, representatives of the project sponsor or construction contractor and the City, the qualified archaeologist, and a representative of the Native American community (if the discover is an aboriginal burial) would meet to determine the appropriate course of action.

E. All cultural materials recovered as part of the monitoring program would be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared according to current professional standards.

Construction Impacts on Undiscovered/Unrecorded Human Remains

1. If human remains are discovered at any construction sites during construction, work at the specific construction site at which the remains have been uncovered will be suspended, and the City of Lathrop Public Works Department and County coroner will be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC will be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

GEOLOGY

Ground Shaking

1. Design and installation of the well shall incorporate all relevant recommendations from the site-specific geotechnical report. (Condor Earth Technologies, August 2003). In particular, the report recommends that the following values be used for structure design according to the 1998 California Building Code Static Force Procedure:

   Soil Profile Type S_D
   Seismic Zone Factor, Z 0.3
   Near-Source Factor, N_a 1.0
   Near-Source Factor, N_v 1.0
   Seismic Coefficient, C_a 0.36
   Seismic Coefficient, C_v 0.54
   Near-Source Factors, N_a and N_v 1.0

   In addition, all foundation improvements should be designed and constructed in accordance with the 2001 CBC, Chapter 17 (Structural Tests and Inspections), Chapter 18 (Foundations and Retaining Walls), and all other sections applicable to the proposed structural improvements. Shallow spread foundations may be founded in engineered fill, provided the Grading and Earthwork Recommendations (Section 5.0) of the geotechnical report are adhered to during the design and construction of earthwork and foundation improvements.

Erosion

1. Prior to the development of the proposed pipelines and facilities, the City will require that the construction contractor submit a grading and erosion control plan for each project component, compliant with the City's ordinance for land leveling watercourse interference. The contractor shall indicate which "best management practice" (BMPs) will be implemented for construction activities to control erosion and sediment. BMPs which may be implemented, as appropriate, include but are not necessarily limited to the

following measures: phasing of grading activities; stabilization of exposed soils; silt fences; straw bale barriers; sandbagging; and mulching.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Groundwater Quality Impacts –TDS

1. A site-specific analyses will be undertaken for the proposed well to determine appropriate design parameters, including separation from existing wells, well depth, location of the aquifer to be pumped, and potential treatment requirements.

   On-going water quality monitoring of water from the City's existing and proposed municipal wells will be undertaken during the 30-year time horizon of the proposed project to determine whether additional treatment is required. If it is determined that additional treatment is required in order to comply with applicable drinking water standards (including the 500 mg/L. TDS standard), measures will be undertaken to assure compliance. These measures could include, but would not necessarily be limited to, the development of well-head treatment facilities, the blending of groundwater with surface water, and/or the relocation of the well further east (away from the salinity intrusion front).

Drainage Impacts

2. A drainage plan will be included as part of the development plan for the project facility. The drainage plan will describe how drainage will be handled at the facility site. The plan will demonstrate that the existing/proposed drainage improvements are adequate to safely retain, detain, and/or convey stormwater runoff through the facility site consistent with City requirements. Such improvements will be designed and constructed so as to not expose adjacent or downstream properties to an increased potential for flooding.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN PREPARING THE IS/FONSI

1. City of Lathrop, *Draft Environmental Impact Report Lathrop Water, Wastewater, and Recycled Water Master Plan*, March 2001.

2. Site visit conducted by Impact Sciences' staff Kerrie Nicholson on July 29, 2003.

3. *San Joaquin County Important Farmland Map*, State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 1998.

4. Walsh, Deanna, City of Lathrop, personal communication with Impact Sciences' staff Kerrie Nicholson, August 20, 2003.

5. *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, January 2002.

6. Site reconnaissance conducted by Impact Sciences' staff Josh Phillips on August 13, 2003.

7. California Department of Fish and Game, *California Natural Diversity Data Base*, Lathrop 7.5-minute quadrangle, August 2003.

8. United States Environmental Protection Agency, CERCLIS, RODS, and Archived Sites Information website, http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/topics/wasteinf.htm, hit on August 15, 2003.

9. California Environmental Protection Agency State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker website, http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/, hit on August 15, 2003.

10. Monty, Jim, Fire Marshal, Lathrop-Manteca Fire Prevention District, personal communication with Impact Sciences' staff Christine Lee, August 12, 2003.

11. Mineral Land Classification Map, Lathrop Quadrangle, Stockton-Lodi P-C Region, State Department of Conservation, 1988.

12. Terraserver.com, hit on August 11, 2003.

13. Comments provided by Kennedy-Jenks and the City of Lathrop to Impact Sciences on the Administrative Draft IS/EA, September 3, 2003.

14. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1, PL2, PL3, and PL4, http://factfinder.census.gov, August 13, 2003.

15 *Phase 1 Site Assessment*, Vistainfo, July 12, 2001.

16. *Groundwater Capture Zone Modeling – Proposed Well 10 Locations*, The Source Group, Inc., February 28, 2003.

17. *Geotechnical Engineering Study*, Grupe East Main Street Development, August 25, 2003.

18. Initial Study, site Plan Review Permit No. 01-059, 17500 Shideler Parkway, Lathrop Industrial Park, December 2001.

19. Nolte Associates, *City of Lathrop 2003 Urban Water Management Plan*, August 2004.

20. Nolte Associates, *City of Lathrop SB 610 Water Supply Assessment Report for Central Lathrop Specific Plan*, February 2004.

21. Pacific Legacy, Inc., *Archaeological Survey for Lathrop Well and Pipeline*, March 24, 2005.