

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2009072018

Project Title: Aquifer Storage and Recovery Program Draft Supplemental EIR

Lead Agency: City of Roseville

Contact Name: Terri Shirhall, Environmental Coordinator

Email: tshirhall@roseville.ca.us

Phone Number: 916-774-5536

Project Location: Roseville, Placer County

City

County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Draft Supplemental EIR (SEIR) is a supplement to the Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Program Draft and Final EIR (SCH No. 2009072018) certified by the City of Roseville March 29, 2012. The 2012 ASR EIR addressed the environmental impacts of constructing and operating 13 ASR wells. Eight of the 13 wells have been constructed. Of the remaining five wells covered in the 2012 ASR EIR, two are still to be constructed, and are addressed in the Draft SEIR, in addition to six well sites not previously evaluated in the 2012 ASR EIR. Two of the proposed eight sites are considered back-up sites, only to be considered if other proposed sites are found to be infeasible.

ASR wells would be designed and constructed with capabilities to both inject and extract water. Well sites would average between 0.5 and 1 acres. Well casings would extend to a depth of approximately 500 feet. Underground components would include a well casing, filter pack, cement, downhole control valve, pump and column pipe. Above ground infrastructure would include pumps, electrical, and disinfection equipment. ASR well sites typically include a small building structure to enclose and secure all the well infrastructure. Above ground buildings are approximately 30 feet wide by 40 feet long by 16 feet high.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The proposed project includes all mitigation measures listed in the 2012 ASR Program FEIR, including the City's Mitigating Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards that apply to all development activities within the City limits.

The proposed project would not result in new or more severe potentially significant impacts, and the 2012 ASR Program Final EIR adequately addresses potential impacts to most of the resource areas, including: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, including greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; land use and planning; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; transportation and traffic; and utilities and service systems. The following resource areas are considered in a revised impact analysis in the Draft Supplemental EIR: Hydrology and Water Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources.

Mitigation measures identified in the SEIR include: Noise Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: Use of Sound Attenuation Measures during Well Drilling, 4.3-4: Prior to Well Drilling the City will Provide Notice to Residents Subject to Potential Noise Impacts; 4.2-3: Reduce Well Pump (Operational) Noise Levels. Air Quality Mitigation Measures AQ-1: Best management practices; Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hazard-1: Best management practices; Cultural Resources: Consistency with City Tribal Consultation Policies; Biological Resources mitigation requiring nesting surveys and erosion/sedimentation prevention.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Areas of controversy for the proposed project would be the same as those identified in the 2012 ASR Program Final EIR, which include those associated with water quality, growth inducement, fairness (e.g., different aesthetic characteristics of water delivered between Roseville residents), alternatives, and peak shaving. Therefore, no additional analysis is warranted, and the analysis of Alternatives 2-5 presented in the 2012 ASR Program Final EIR is adequate.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board