

## **Lower Day Basin Proposed Capital Improvements Project Consistency Analysis**

In 2015 the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) reviewed the Lower Day Basin Proposed Capital Improvements Project and approved an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A copy of the original IS/MND is provided in Appendix 1 of this Memorandum. The proposed project consists of the following project components/activities.

### **Introduction**

The proposed project includes the expansion of stormwater capture at the existing Lower Day Basin (Basin) and potential future delivery of recycled water produced by IEUA Water Reclamation Facilities (WRFs) to the Basin which is located just south of Interstate 210 and west of Lower Day Creek channel in the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The Basin was originally constructed in 1975-1976 by the San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD). The Basin site includes two interconnected basins, Upper Day Basin and Lower Day Basin. The Lower Day Basin (SBCFCD Day Creek Basin #2) is situated on the southern two-thirds of the site and is approximately 22.6 acres in size.

Lower Day Basin is currently operated as a multi-purpose facility serving primarily as a flood control facility and secondarily for recharge of storm and supplemental water. It has an upper basin which receives local stormwater runoff and a lower basin which is divided into three recharge cells and receives water from the Day Creek Channel for recharge during low-flow events by means of an existing rubber dam diversion structure and pipe conduit. The lower basin also receives inflow from a side channel overflow weir for flood control operation.

As a recharge facility the Lower Day Basin consists of the following assets:

1. Three recharge cells: Cell 1, Cell 2, and Cell 3.
  - *Lower Day Basin Cell 1* – Lower Day Basin Cell 1 receives storm water from Day Creek and storm water from a local storm drain system.
  - *Lower Day Basin Cell 2* – Lower Day Basin Cell 2 receives storm water and imported water from Day Creek and flows from Lower Day basin Cell 1.
  - *Lower Day Basin Cell 3* – Lower Day Basin Cell 3 receives flows from Lower Day Basin Cell 2.
2. Rubber Dam System at Day Creek
  - Flow released from the CB 15 MWD Imported Water Turnout and storm water can be dammed behind an inflatable rubber dam located at the northeast corner of Lower Day Basin.
3. Imported Water Turnout (CB 15 MWD)
  - The CB 15 MWD Imported Water Turnout is located near the intersection of Banyan Street and Day Creek in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, north of Lower Day Basin. It provides Lower Day and other downstream basins imported water through Day Creek Channel.

#### 4. Electrical Systems

- The electrical system is common to the basin and rubber dam system
- The Turnout's power is local.

#### 5. Instrumentation and Control Systems

- The basin and rubber dam controls are operated by a local PLC with a radio system that receives and transmits control data to the IEUA's Groundwater Recharge (GWR) servers for control and remote access.
- The turnout's control system is a local PLC with a cellular system that receives and transmits control data to the IEUA's GWR servers for control and remote access.

The purpose of the proposed basin modifications is to increase the Agency's groundwater recharge capacity as part of a comprehensive effort to enhance groundwater management in the Chino Basin and to support the groundwater demands (potable water supply) of the population within the Agency's service area.

### **Project Description**

The Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) and the Chino Basin Watermaster (CBWM) are proposing the Lower Day Basin Improvement Project (proposed project). The objective of this project is to increase the recharge capacity (recycled water (RW) and stormwater (SW)) recharged into the Chino Groundwater Basin, specifically in the three cells located at Lower Day Basin. Under the Recharge Master Plan Update (RPMU), the proposed improvements for Lower Day Basin will increase recharge capacity by an anticipated 789 acre-feet per year by modifying the San Bernardino County Flood Control District's (SBCFCD) diversion channel, installing a control gate valve on Cell 3's midlevel outlet, and improving the Basin embankments.

With the proposed modifications Lower Day Basin will function as a modified flow-through basin through modification of the existing diversion and inlet channel structures which are located on the northeast of the basin. Additional modifications include the installation of flow control gates in the Day Creek channel. Gate structure(s) will provide the capability to fully adjust diversion rates through the diversion and Davy Creek channels. The gate in the Day Creek channel will function to impede water flowing through the channel so that it can be diverted through the existing diversion channel into Lower Day Basin. Gates will automatically raise or lower to maintain the set channel water surface elevation. If the Basin is filled to capacity, the gate will function to allow only enough water into the facility to keep the Basin full.

The proposed project includes modifications to the Basin inlets and outlets that will allow more storm water to be diverted into the Basin and stored at higher elevations for longer durations. There will be no modifications to the physical size, layout/configuration or storage volume of the Basin. The proposed improvements will allow the Basin operations to be modified to achieve increased groundwater recharge.

The storage volume of the Upper Basin (about 44 acre-feet (af) is held entirely at elevations lower than the topography surrounding the Basin. The majority of the volume of the Lower Basin is also held at elevations lower than the topography surrounding the Basin (408 af of the total 558 af). The remaining 150 af of storage volume is held by an above grade embankment measuring from 0 to 7 feet in height around the southern one-third of the Lower Basin.

The water level in the Lower Basin is controlled by a low-level, 36-inch diameter gated outlet, a mid-level, 72-inch diameter ungated outlet and by a reinforced concrete overflow spillway. The low-level outlet is positioned at elevation 1,364.0 feet (NAVD 88); the mid-level outlet is positioned at 1,382.0 feet (NAVD 88); the overflow spillway is positioned at elevation 1,400.0 feet (NAVD 88); and the toe of the slope of the outside perimeter embankment is at approximately 1,393.0 feet (NAVD 88).

The proposed project would gate the mid-level outlet and allow water to be stored up to elevation 1,398.0 feet (NAVD 88) until such time it is infiltrated into the groundwater basin or released to downstream recharge facilities. Refer to the drawings in Appendix 1 that illustrate these features. This equates to a regular storage elevation approximately 5.0 feet higher than the outside toe of slope of the perimeter embankment. The volume of water stored between elevation 1,393.0 feet and 1,398.0 feet (NAVD 88) is approximately 106 af.

The existing earth embankment structure at the south end of the Lower Day Basin will be evaluated and (if required) reconstructed to meet the requirements of a dam embankment under the jurisdiction of the Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD). Improvements to the dam structure may include excavation of the existing embankment to expose firm, undisturbed and stable material across the entire width and length of the embankment and excavation of a keyway or cutoff trench that will extend to an underlying impervious material, or to a depth considered adequate to prevent piping or seepage through the embankment. The dam embankment will be constructed at a typical slope of about 3:1 (H:V) on the upstream side and 2:1 (H:V) on the downstream side.

The project will also include modifications to a “mid-level outlet” pipe to gain additional recharge storage. The outlet pipe is located on the far southeast corner of the Basin. Currently, the existing this outlet sits approximately 16-feet below the height of the Basin spillway. Without a gate structure on the outlet, the storage water height cannot be raised above the outlet. This project will consider the placement of a weir gate on the face of this outlet to gain additional recharge storage volume. The new Lower Day Basin will be able to store and recharge an additional 789 acre-feet/year of storm water in addition to the existing baseline storm water recharge capacity of 395 acre-feet/year.

### **Reaffirmation and Consistency Evaluation**

At the request of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), IEUA has been conducted a review of the adopted IS/MND to reaffirm the impact findings and verify “consistency” with Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines for this project’s adopted IS/MND. This request is based on the fact that the original Initial Study is now more than five years old and in order to consider a project for funding the State Board requires CEQA documentation must be less than five years in age or reaffirmed to be consistent with such a document.

A copy of Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines is provided in Appendix 2 of this document. A summary of Section 15162 is provided in the following text.

If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after certification of an EIR or MND, the Lead Agency may: (1) prepare a subsequent EIR if the criteria of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) are met, (2) prepare a subsequent negative declaration, (3) prepare an addendum, or (4) prepare no further documentation. (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(b) Approach 4 above, prepare no further documentation, is based on

determining that the current conditions are “consistent” with the conditions considered in the original environmental document.

Under Section 15162, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is required only when:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the negative declaration due to the involvement of any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine which of the preceding findings are appropriate for the approval of the funding for the proposed project. Following the 2021 Initial Study Environmental Checklist Form for content, an analysis of the project’s “consistency” with the 2015 Initial Study is presented below. To restate the term “consistency” entails an evaluation of the adopted (2014) Initial Study to determine whether any of the circumstances outlined in Section 15162 have occurred that might require the preparation and processing of a second-tier CEQA environmental document. Also, please note that although IEUA is seeking funding from the State Board to offset costs associated with implementing this project, most of the active, ground disturbing activities associated with the project have already been implemented. Only limited new impacts will occur from implementing the remaining project elements.

### Aesthetics

The four standard aesthetic issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 7 and 8. All four aesthetic issues were found to be less than significant for the whole project without any recommended mitigation. Specifically, Section I.a concluded that the full project would not cause any significant adverse impact to scenic vistas; Section I.b determined that impacts to scenic

resources would be less than significant; Section I.c found that visual impacts to the existing site and surrounding area would be less than significant; and Section I.d found light and glare impacts to be less than significant due to existing background lighting in this urban area. All of the Basin modifications are still below the elevation of the surrounding ground surface. Thus, there has been no change in circumstances that would result greater adverse impact to aesthetic issues from implementing the proposed Basin improvements under the current circumstances. Impacts remain the same in 2021 as identified in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the aesthetic findings in the 2018 Initial Study.

### Agricultural and Forestry Resources

The five standard agricultural and forestry resource issues are evaluated in the 2015 Initial Study on pages 9 and 10. All agricultural and forestry issues were found to have no potential for adverse impacts for the whole project without any recommended mitigation. This finding was based on the whole of the Lower Day Basin functioning as a flood control and water management facility which is located in an urbanized area. Thus, the project area contained no agricultural land or forest land and the circumstances remain the same today. With no change in circumstances that would result greater adverse impact to agricultural and forestry issues from implementing the proposed Lower Day Basin improvements, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015. Thus, the implementation of the project is consistent with the agricultural and forestry findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Air Quality

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous five air quality issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into three simple questions. The three current air quality issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 11 through 22 and Appendix 1 to the 2015 Initial Study. All four air quality issues were found to be less than significant for the project as a whole, with implementation of three mitigation measures. The Lower Day Basin improvements are currently about 90+% installed. Air emissions have generally followed the impact forecast for construction activities outlined in the Initial Study and future operational emissions will be minor, consisting of limited electricity consumption and random maintenance trips. Since the 2015 Initial Study, background air quality emissions have been reduced and ambient air quality has remained essentially the same. Due to cleaner construction equipment available now and due to the greater amount of renewable energy being generated by SCE, current air emissions associated with construction and operation have been slightly reduced relative to 2015. Thus, the implementation of the project is consistent with the air quality findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Biological Resources

The six standard biological resource issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 23 through 26 and Appendix 2 to the Initial Study. Biological resource issues were determined to have potentially significant adverse impacts and four mitigation measures were identified to reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant impact level. Since 2015 the only change in the biological resources found at the site are the facilities already installed as part of the IEUA Lower Day Basin improvement project. The only ground disturbing activity remaining will be some minor trenching within existing disturbed right-of-way to install electricity distribution lines. No sensitive species were affected by the construction activities and all four mitigation measures were implemented during project implementation. There has been no change in circumstances at the site that would result greater adverse impact to biology resource issues from implementing the proposed project improvements under the current circumstances. Impacts remain the same in

2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the biological resource findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Cultural Resources

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous four cultural resource issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into three simple questions. The three current cultural resource issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 28 through 30 and Appendix C to the 2015 Initial Study. One cultural resource issue was found to be less than significant for the whole project without any recommended mitigation. Two cultural resource issues were found to be potentially significant and one mitigation measure was identified to reduce this potential to a less than significant impact. Specifically, Section V.a concluded that the full project would not cause an significant adverse impact due to historic resources as they did not exist at the project site (no historic resources were found at the site with most of the construction completed at the site); Section V.b determined that project implementation could result in potentially significant adverse impacts and implementation of one mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (Native American monitors were retained and no archaeological resources were encountered at the site); Section V.c found that the potential for exposing human remains is low, but included the monitoring mitigation measure to reduce impacts to a less than significant level (no human remains were encountered at the project site). However, due the lack change in cultural resources at the project site since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the cultural resource findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Energy

Energy was not a topic of evaluation in the 2015 Initial Study Checklist form. It was added to the Checklist in 2020. There are two energy questions on this checklist: will the project result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy; and would implementation of the project conflict with or obstruct renewable energy plans or energy efficiency. The proposed project has no specific characteristics that would conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Energy consumption during construction relied on CARB certified large equipment and other available equipment to meets the current standards of energy conservation. However, the primary energy conservation will be gained through the use of locally generated water for recharge instead of importing water from either northern California or from the Colorado River. This results in substantial energy savings which is further bolstered by IEUA's renewable energy portfolio which includes extensive solar electricity generation, wind energy generation, more effective management of biosolids (recycled), lastly generation and use of energy (methane) from wastewater operations and conversion of green waste to methane. Thus, the proposed project and IEUA support facilities do not result in wasteful or inefficient/unnecessary energy consumption and comply with local and state plans for energy efficiency.

### Geology and Soils

The six standard geology and soil issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 4-34 through 30 and Appendix D to the Initial Study. The 2020 Checklist form actually adds an additional question, but it is not new as the paleontological issue was transferred from the cultural resources section to geology and soils. All of the geology and soil issues, except potential exposure of the site to erosion during construction, were found to have no potential for significant adverse impacts for the whole project without any recommended mitigation. Specifically, Section VII.a concluded

that the site has minimal geotechnical constraints and following the design requirements in engineered plans ensured a less than significant impact (no seismic related impacts have occurred during construction and no human occupied structures were created by the project that could be adversely impacted by seismic-related events); Section VII.b addresses the potential for erosion at the site and concluded that by implementing standard erosion control requirements and two mitigation measures adequate erosion control would result in a less than significant adverse impact (no adverse erosion impacts have resulted during construction and permanent erosion control measures have been integrated into the project); Section VII.c found that the site has minimal geotechnical constraints and following the design requirements in the engineered plans would ensure a less than significant impact (no geotechnical constraints have been encountered during construction and non are anticipated during future operations); Section VII.d found that the project site has no expansive soil and no potential exists for any adverse impacts at the site (no expansive soils were encountered within the project site); Section VII.e found the site will not use subsurface wastewater disposal systems and no potential exists to adversely impact the environment (no subsurface wastewater disposal systems have been installed at the site); and Section VII.f found a low or no potential for paleontological resources and none were encountered during construction. Thus, there has been no change in circumstances at the site that would result in greater adverse impact to geology and soil issues from implementing the proposed Basin improvements under the current circumstances. Impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the geology and soil findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The two current greenhouse gas emission (GHG) issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 33 through 37 and Appendix 1 to the 2015 Initial Study. Both GHG issues were found to be less than significant with no mitigation measure. Specifically, Section VIII.a concluded that the proposed project would generate an estimated 52 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e which in 2015 was considered a less than significant level (the project's construction has generally followed the construction scenario envisioned in the 2015 Initial Study); and Section VIII.b determined that proposed project would not conflict with existing GHG plans and policies. Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the GHG findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous eight hazards and hazardous materials issues in the 2018 Initial Study have been consolidated into seven questions. The seven current hazard and hazardous material issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 37 and 38. During construction a potential for accidental spills could require remediation and a mitigation measure was identified. All other hazards and hazardous materials issues were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation or no potential for adverse impact. Specifically, Section IX.a concluded that the full project would not cause any significant adverse impact due to use or generation of hazardous waste no hazardous wastes would be generated routinely (this finding remains accurate; Section IX.b determined that project construction could result in accidental release impacts and mitigation was required to ensure that any such accidental spill would be properly managed and remediated (no accidental spills have occurred during construction); Section IX.c found that the potential for exposing schools to hazards would be minimal even though a school is located within the ¼ mile threshold (no spills have occurred that could threaten the school during construction); Section IX.d found that the potential for onsite contamination by hazardous materials was less than significant based on a review of known contaminated sites (no

contaminated sites were encountered during construction; Section IX.e found that the potential site exposure to airport hazards is less than significant because the distance to the nearest airport (Ontario and Cable Airports) is more than five miles away and the project site is not within any airport hazard zones and no private airports occur within the vicinity of the project site; Section IX.f found that due to minimal changes in the local circulation system, no potential exists to interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan (this finding is still accurate); and Section IX.g found that the potential for exposing future structures to wildfire hazards are low as the site does not contain any habitable structure is not in a high wildfire hazard zone and is located within an urbanized area (this finding is still accurate). Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the hazards and hazardous material findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous nine hydrology and water quality issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into five questions. The five current cultural resource issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 39 through 41. All hydrology issues were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation or no potential for adverse impact. However, water quality issues were found to be potentially significant and one mitigation measure was identified to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Specifically, Section X.a concluded that the project could cause significant adverse impact to water quality and mitigation was required to implement best management practices as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) during construction (the SWPPP was prepared and implemented during construction and no water quality degradation was noted during construction); Section X.b determined that project implementation would result in positive benefit to groundwater resources and would enhance sustainable groundwater management because it will recharge surface and recycled water into the Chino Basin (this finding remains accurate); Section X.c found that the proposed project would not substantially alter the onsite drainage pattern, would not substantially increase offsite runoff, would not increase potential for exposure to flood hazards, and potential for erosion and sedimentation would not substantially increase based on the construction and operation activities being located in a flood control and recharge basin (this finding remains accurate); Section X.d found that the project site is not exposed to significant offsite flood hazards, such as a tsunami that would release pollutants due to project inundation (this finding is still accurate); and Section X.e found that the proposed project would not obstruct a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan (as noted above the project will benefit and support the Chino Basin groundwater management plans). Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study (other than the improvements that will facilitate additional groundwater recharge), impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the hydrology and water quality findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Land Use and Planning

The two current Land Use and Planning issues have replaced the three issues in the 2015 Initial Study. Land use and planning issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 42 and 43 of the 2015 Initial Study. Both land use and planning issues were found to be less than significant impacts in the 2015 Initial Study. Specifically, Section XI.a concluded that the full project would not result in a significant adverse impact due to physically dividing any existing community (this finding remains accurate); and Section XI.b determined that proposed enhancement of recharge at the existing Lower Day Basin is consistent with the existing General Plan designation and

zoning resulting in a less than significant impact without mitigation (this finding remains accurate). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the land use and planning findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Mineral Resources

The two current issues have remained the same as discussed in the 2015 Initial Study. Mineral resource issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on page 43 of the 2015 Initial Study. Both mineral resource issues were found to be less than significant impacts in the 2015 Initial Study. Specifically, Section XII.a concluded that the project site does not contain any significant mineral resources and the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact due loss of availability to such resources (this finding remains accurate); and Section XII.b determined that proposed project site is not designated as containing mineral resources of value and project implementation would result in a less than significant impact without mitigation (this finding remains accurate). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the mineral resource findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Noise

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous six noise issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into three questions. The three current noise issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 44 through 46. Noise related to construction activities were determined to be potentially significant and required six mitigation measures to reduce potential construction noise to a less than significant impact level. The other noise issues were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation or no potential for adverse impact. Specifically, Section XIII.a concluded that the project construction could cause significant adverse impact due to construction activities (six mitigation measures were identified for implementation) but operational noise and groundbourne vibration would be less than significant; Section XIII.b determined that project implementation would not result in groundbourne vibration impacts due to lack of sensitive receptor proximity to construction activity; and Section XIII.c found that the potential site exposure to airport noise is less than significant because the distance to the nearest airports is more than three miles away. Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the noise issues in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Population and Housing

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous three population and housing issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into two questions. Population and housing issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on page 47 of 2015 Initial Study. Both population and housing issues were found to have no adverse impacts in the 2015 Initial Study as the project will not affect area population or housing resources. Specifically, Section XIV.a concluded that the project site will not alter existing population and housing resource issues in the City (this finding remains accurate); and Section XIV.b determined that proposed project would not displace any people or houses and project implementation would result in no adverse impact under this issue (this finding remains accurate). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the population and housing findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

## Public Services

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the public service topics remain the same as in the 2015 Initial Study. Public Service issues are evaluated on pages 47 and 48 of the 2015 Initial Study. The five public service issues were found to have less than significant and no adverse impact on the environment. Specifically, Section XV.a concluded that the project demands on the City Fire and Police Departments would result in less than significant impacts to these City services as an isolated public infrastructure facility (this finding remains accurate); and the proposed project would have no adverse impacts on schools; parks, and other public facilities because it would not generate demand for such services (this finding remains accurate). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the public service findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

## Recreation

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the recreation topics remain the same as in the 2015 Initial Study. Recreation issues are evaluated on pages 48 and 49 of the 2015 Initial Study. The two recreation issues were found to have no adverse impact on the environment. Specifically, Section XVI.a concluded that the project would not generate demand for recreation facilities and would therefore have no adverse impact on existing facilities (this finding remains accurate); and Section XVI.b found the project would not construct new recreation facilities that could have any adverse impacts on the environment (this finding remains accurate). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the recreation findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

## Transportation

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous six Transportation issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into four questions. The four current transportation issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 49 and 50. one of the transportation issues (2015) was determined to be less than significant with mitigation (XVII-d in the 2021 Initial Study). All other issues were determined to be less than significant or no impact. One issue, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), issue XVII-b, was not evaluated in the 2015 Initial Study, but is considered in this consistency evaluation. Specifically, Section XVII.a concluded that the full project would not cause any significant adverse transportation impacts without implementing mitigation measures (this finding remains accurate); Section XVII.b introduces the new topic of VMT but all trips in support of the proposed project are limited to those that are essential to complete the project (this finding remains accurate); Section XVII.c found that the potential site access improvements would ensure that no significant roadway hazards would occur from project implementation (this finding remains accurate); and Section XVII.d found that the potential site access improvements could interfere with emergency access and mitigation was required to address this issue (mitigation was implemented by the contractor). Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the transportation issues in the 2015 Initial Study.

## Tribal Cultural Resources

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the topics remain the same as in the 2015 Initial Study, the year Tribal Cultural Resources were added to the Checklist. These issues are evaluated in the cultural section on pages 28 through 30 and Appendix C to the 2015 Initial Study. The two tribal cultural resource issues were found to have a potential for significant adverse impact and one mitigation

measure was identified to reduce this impact to a less than significant impact level. Specifically, Section XVIII.a concluded that the project had a potential to cause a change in the significance of a listed or eligible for listing resource but mitigation (Native American monitoring) would reduce this impact to a less than significant impact level (monitoring was implemented to the satisfaction of the tribe); and Section XVIII.b found the project could adversely impact a resource of significance to a California Native American tribe, but mitigation could reduce this impact to a less than significant impact level (no tribal cultural resources were encountered). Based on the available data, the impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the tribal cultural resource findings in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Utilities and Service Systems

In the new Checklist Form (2021) the previous seven utility and service system issues in the 2015 Initial Study have been consolidated into five questions. The current utility and service system issues are evaluated in the Initial Study on pages 51 and 52. All utility and service system issues were determined have no impact or to be less than significant without mitigation. Specifically, Section XIX.a addresses impacts connecting with water, wastewater, and stormwater management systems and to electricity, natural gas and telecommunications systems. The only utility used at the project site is electricity. Power is available at the site, but the only remaining ground disturbing activity is to install a short trench (about 25 feet in length) to extend electricity to the remainder of the site. Thus, facilities to connect and utilize these systems will not result in significant construction impacts or expansion of the utility systems themselves. Issue XIX.b concluded that the full project would require a minor quantity of water to control fugitive dust but not otherwise make demand on the water supply system; for issue XIX.c the project would not have any effect on any wastewater system; for issue XIX.d the volume of solid waste generated by the proposed project will not exceed the capacity of the local landfills, and by law all green must be recycled if possible ; and issue XIX.e the project was be required to be consistent with solid waste reduction goals established by the State. This finding remains accurate for all utility issues today. Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the utility and service system issues in the 2015 Initial Study.

### Wildfire

Wildfire was not a topic of evaluation in the 2015 Initial Study Checklist form. It was added to the Checklist in 2020. However, the wildfire issue was addressed in the 2015 Initial Study under the Hazards topic. There are four wildfire questions on the current checklist. Based on the data regarding wildfire and the site-specific circumstances, it was concluded that the proposed project would result or experience less than significant wildfire impacts without mitigation. Specifically, Section XX.a determined that the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan (refer to the finding in IX.f above); Section XX.b concluded that none of the factors that could exacerbate wildfire risk at the project site exists that would expose any humans to pollutant concentration or spread of wildfire; Section XX.c determined no additional support for area wildfire management infrastructure would be required due to implementation of the proposed project; and Section XX.d concluded that the site would not be exposed to significant post-fire hazards due to the location of the project site. Finally, this project has no specific characteristics that would conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for management of wildfire within this portion of the City of Rancho Cucamonga. Due to the lack of change in site circumstances since the 2015 Initial Study, impacts remain the same in 2021 as they would have been in 2015, and the implementation of the project is consistent with the finding of less than significant impact substantiated in the preceding analysis.

## Conclusion

The State Water Resources Control Board requested that the project applicant (Inland Empire Utilities Agency) provide reaffirmation that none of the circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that might require preparation of a second-tier CEQA document have occurred since the project was entitled in 2015 relying on an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for compliance with the CEQA. The preceding evaluation documents and substantiates that no new circumstances or site conditions have occurred which would require a second-tier environmental document to be prepared. Based on this evaluation, it is recommended that the State Board find the environmental conditions remain consistent with the IEUA-approved Lower Day Basin Proposed Capital Improvements Project and the project will not cause or result in any new significant or different impacts than forecast in the adopted 2015 IS/MND. Reliance on the 2015 IS/MND is the appropriate CEQA environmental determination for the State Board's CEQA compliance.



---

Inland Empire Utilities Agency  
Shivaji Deshmukh, P.E.  
General Manager