

# 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 #: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: Old Jarvis Road Irrigation Well Destruction Project

Lead Agency: Alameda County Water District (ACWD)

Contact Name: Douglas Young

Email: douglas.young@acwd.com

Phone Number: 510-668-4452

Project Location: Newark, Alameda County

*City*

*County*

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

The Project is located at the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge, Mayhew Landing Unit in the City of Newark, Alameda County, California.

ACWD proposes to properly destroy two abandoned irrigation wells that are potentially acting as pathways for saltwater intrusion into the lower drinking water aquifers. This action will eliminate the abandoned wells as a potential source of brackish groundwater identified in the area. Debris within the two wells will be cleaned out, the existing well casing perforated, and the casing will be backfilled with a neat cement sand slurry mixture. The upper portion of the casing will be removed and the resulting hole will be filled to grade with native material.

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

1. Air Quality - Diesel exhaust and short-term dust degradation of air quality may occur. Implementation of Compliance BAAQMD Measure AIR-1 would reduce project construction emissions to below less than significant.
2. Biological Resources - The sites are located in the vicinity of nesting areas for endangered species. Implementation of the Refuge's Biological Opinion Mitigation Measures would reduce the impact to less than significant.
3. Cultural Resources - Destruction activities could potentially unearth unknown archaeological deposits. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, potential impacts to historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.
4. Geology and Soils - Destruction activities could potentially destroy paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant.
5. Hydrology and Water Quality - Destruction activities could impact water quality, surface flow, and drainage direction. Implementation of consistent with the USFWS SUP and identified in Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will reduce the impacts to less than significant.
6. Noise - Destruction activities may have short term noise impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will reduce the effects to less than significant levels.
7. Tribal Resources - Destruction activities could potentially unearth unknown archaeological deposits. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 would reduce the impacts to less than significant. Any findings would be brought to the attention of the Native American Heritage Commission.
8. Mandatory Findings of Significance - Demolition activities could, in the short term, degrade the quality of the environment, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and noise. Implementation of the listed Mitigation Measures above will reduce the impacts to less than significant.

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

A None at this time.

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

Department of the Interior- Department of Fish and Wildlife  
State Water Quality Control Board