


Addendum

Woodlake Sewer Extension Project

Prepared for:



City of Woodlake
350 N. Valencia Ave
Woodlake, CA 93286
(559) 564-8055
Contact: Jason Waters

Prepared by:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 840-4414

Contact: Emily Bowen, LEED AP

July 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Addendum Purpose.....	1
1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions.....	2
1.3 Incorporation by Reference.....	2
1.4 Addendum Process.....	2
SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	3
2.1 Location and Setting.....	3
2.2 Project Description.....	3
SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST.....	3
3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories.....	4
3.2 Environmental Analysis.....	5

Appendix A: *Mitigated Negative Declaration* – Woodlake Sewer Extension Project (2021)

Appendix B: Pipeline Alignment Extension Figure

Appendix C: Road Construction Emissions Model

SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION

This environmental document is an Addendum to the *Woodlake Sewer Extension Project* (Approved Project) Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND), adopted on June 14, 2021 (State Clearinghouse (2021040651), by the City of Woodlake. After filing the Notice of Determination, additional EDA grant money became available to extend the sewer and water pipelines.

In order to proceed with new infrastructure improvements, the City has determined that an Addendum should be prepared to the previous Project IS/MND. As demonstrated in this Addendum, there are no additional impacts and the IS/ND continues to serve as the appropriate document addressing the environmental impacts of these changes, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 Addendum Purpose

When a proposed project is changed or there are changes in environmental setting, a determination must be made by the Lead Agency as to whether an Addendum or Subsequent EIR or MND is prepared. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 sets forth criteria to assess which environmental document is appropriate. The criteria for determining whether an Addendum or Subsequent MND is prepared are outlined below. If the criteria below are true, then an Addendum is the appropriate document:

- No new significant impacts will result from the project or from new mitigation measures.
- No substantial increase in the severity of environment impact will occur.
- No new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts previously found not to be feasible have, in fact been found to be feasible.

Based upon the information provided in Section Three of this document, implementation of the Approved Project will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the IS/MND, and there are no previously infeasible alternatives that are now feasible. None of the other factors set forth in Section 15162(a)(3) are present.

As such, an Addendum is appropriate, and this Addendum has been prepared to address the environmental effects of the Project.

1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions

The previously Approved Project was evaluated under CEQA with an IS/MND in 2021. As previously discussed, additional grant money was made available to extend the sewer line and include a water line extension. This Addendum addresses the environmental effects associated with the Project to determine if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the original IS/MND. No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the IS/MND.

1.3 Incorporation by Reference

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Addendum has incorporated by reference the *Woodlake Sewer Extension Project IS/MND*, adopted on June 14, 2021 (State Clearinghouse #2009101084). Information from this document incorporated by reference into this Addendum have been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) which follow, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Addendum has been described. The documents and other sources which have been used in the preparation of this Addendum can be found as footnotes in the sections where they are referenced.

1.4 Addendum Process

As described in Section 1.1, an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.¹ An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or Negative Declaration.² The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.³ Once adopted, the Addendum, along with the original EIR or Negative Declaration, is placed in the Administrative Record, and the CEQA process is complete. A copy of the Addendum will be transmitted to the State Clearinghouse.

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a)

² CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(c)

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(d)

SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Location and Setting

The City of Woodlake is located in Tulare County in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley. The proposed Project is located along Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue, as discussed in the original IS/MND, and also further south along Blair Road and along Mulberry Street. Woodlake is bisected by SR 216 and SR 245 and the City is situated five miles north of SR 198. The proposed Project will largely occur in the current roadway right-of-way site along Bravo Avenue, Blair Road, Mulberry Street and Ropes Avenue.

Lands surrounding the proposed Project (lands on either side of Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue, see Figure 2 – Site Aerial of the original IS/MND) are primarily being utilized for agricultural or light industrial purposes. The lands surrounding the portion of Ropes Avenue located the furthest east, starting at S. Oaks Street, are being utilized for residential uses.

2.2 Project Description

As discussed in the original IS/MND, the Project includes the following over three phases:

- Removal of approximately 1,250 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main and manholes.
- Installation of approximately 2,220 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main, 4,200 lineal feet of 10-inch sewer main, 5,800 lineal feet of 15-inch sewer main, and 450 lineal feet of 4-inch force main.
- Construction and/or installation of the associated sewer system improvements, including a sewer lift station, manholes, sewer by-pass, pavement trench repair, utility adjustments, existing concrete improvements replacement, and striping modifications.

Changes to the Project description include extending the sewer line further south along Blair Road and extending the sewer line south on Mulberry Street, as provided in the Figure in Appendix B, for an additional 5,156 linear feet. Approximately 3,917 of water line will be installed along the same alignment as the additional sewer line.

SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any changed condition (e.g., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a

changed environment result (e.g., a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect).⁴

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the IS/MND prepared for the project. These environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist, since the proposed project does not introduce changes that would result in modification to the conclusion of the adopted IS/MND.

3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories

Conclusion in Prior IS/MND – This column provides a cross reference to the section of the IS/MND where the conclusion may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the IS/MND, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

New Circumstances Involving New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates where there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the IS/MND, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(a-d), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous FEIR or MND was certified as complete.

Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether the IS/ND provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category.

⁴ CEQA Guidelines Section 15162

3.2 Environmental Analysis

As explained in Section One, this comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the IS/MND was adopted require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent MND or EIR the IS/MND previously prepared.

As described in Section Two, an additional 5,156 linear feet of sewer line (with associated improvements as described in the original IS/MND project description), and an additional 3,917 linear feet of water line will be installed further south along the Blair Road alignment and along Mulberry Street. Because of this, new analysis for impacts within the Project area is provided in this Section of the Addendum on the following pages.

I. AESTHETICS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	None.
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	None.
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	None.
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted MND determined that the proposed Project would have no significant impacts to aesthetic resources. Additional construction activities will occur along the new pipeline alignments; however, as stated in the adopted MND, construction activities will be temporary in nature. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/ND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.	No. There is no forest land on site.	No. There is no forest land on site.	No. There is no forest land on site.	None.
e. Involve other changes in the existing	No Impact.	No. The project will	No. The project will	No. The project will	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	

DISCUSSION

As discussed in the adopted MND, the pipelines will be installed within the existing right of way and will be installed underground. The Project purpose is to improve the existing sewer and water system and does not have the potential to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forestland. There is no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The Project will have continue to have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	None.
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	None.
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on air quality. The proposed Project includes extending the sewer line an additional 5,156 linear feet, and extending the existing water line by 3,917, within the same alignment as the sewer line.

The estimated annual construction emissions of the extended pipeline installation were estimated by utilizing the Road Construction Emissions Model (Version 9.0.0) and is provided in Table 1 (see Appendix C). Also provided in Table 1 are the construction emissions estimates from the original IS/MND.

Table 1 – Proposed Project Construction Emissions

	VOC (ROG)	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Original IS/MND Emissions	0.54	5.56	0.81	0.34
Additional Pipeline Installation Emissions	0.17	1.79	0.45	0.15
Total Project Emissions	0.71	7.35	1.26	0.49
Annual Threshold of Significance	10	10	15	15
Significant?	No	No	No	No

As demonstrated in Table 1, construction emissions of the original IS/MND plus the pipeline extension would not exceed the SJVAPCD’s significance threshold for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	None.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	None.
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of	No Impact.	No. The project will not	No. The project will not	No. The project will not	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
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?		interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact.	No. There are no trees on site.	No. There are no trees on site.	No. There are no trees on site.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impacts on biological resources. The Project now includes extending the pipeline installation further south along Blair Road and along Mulberry Street, as demonstrated in the Figure in Appendix B. The pipeline installation and associated activities (manholes, street striping, etc.) will still occur within the existing street right-of-way and the pipelines will be installed underground. The area surrounding the aforementioned roadways is dominated by agricultural and industrial land uses and has undergone substantial ground disturbance. The additional pipeline installation would not cause an increase in biological impacts, as there are no biological resources on or surrounding the site. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No Impact.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	None.
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	Yes. CUL-1 and CUL-2.
c. Cause a disturbance in any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known human remains exist on site.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known human remains exist on site.	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known human remains exist on site.	Yes. CUL-1 and CUL-2.
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	No Impact.	No. The passage of time will not create any new impacts. No known historic, archaeological,	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known historic, archaeological,	No. The pipeline extension will not create any new impacts. No known historic, archaeological,	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		or paleontological resources exist on site.	or paleontological resources exist on site.	or paleontological resources exist on site.	

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to cultural resources, with mitigation implemented. As search was conducted at the California Historic Resources Information System that included the extended project area (see Appendix B of the original IS/MND). As discussed in the original IS/MND, although no known cultural or archaeological resources or human remains exist on site, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 will continue to be implemented to ensure that the Project will result in less than significant impacts with mitigation.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

- CUL – 1** Should evidence of prehistoric archeological resources be discovered during construction, the contractor shall halt all work within 25 feet of the find and the resource shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If evidence of any archaeological, cultural, and/or historical deposits is found, hand excavation and/or mechanical excavation shall proceed to evaluate the deposits for determination of significance as defined by the CEQA guidelines. The archaeologist shall submit reports, to the satisfaction of the City of Woodlake, describing the testing program and subsequent results. These reports shall identify any program mitigation that the project proponent shall complete in order to mitigate archaeological impacts (including resource recovery and/or avoidance testing and analysis, removal, reburial, and curation of archaeological resources).

- CUL – 2** In order to ensure that the proposed project does not impact buried human remains during project construction, the City shall be responsible for on-going monitoring of project construction. If buried human remains are encountered during construction, further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to

overlie adjacent remains shall be halted until the Tulare County coroner is contacted and the coroner has made the determinations and notifications required pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the coroner determines that Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c) require that he give notice to the Native American Heritage Commission, then such notice shall be given within 24 hours, as required by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c). In that event, the NAHC will conduct the notifications required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Until the consultations described below have been completed, the landowner shall further ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices where Native American human remains are located, is not disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the Most Likely Descendants on all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences and treatments, as prescribed by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b). The NAHC will mediate any disputes regarding treatment of remains in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.94(k). The landowner shall be entitled to exercise rights established by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) if any of the circumstances established by that provision become applicable.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

VI. ENERGY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	None.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	None.

DISCUSSION

As discussed in the original MND, during construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, and pipes. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Any impacts remain less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the original IS/MND remain unchanged.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Directly or indirectly cause 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.	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	None.
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	None.
iv. Landslides?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	None.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	None.
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	None.
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	None.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique	No. The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique	No. The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature.	CUL-1 and CUL-2.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		geologic feature.	geologic feature.		

DISCUSSION

The original IS/MND identified that no active faults underlay the project site and no erosion or loss of topsoil will occur. The Project site is not located within a currently designated Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone). The project does not include the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Mitigation is included to reduce impacts to unknown paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL-1 and CUL-2.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	None.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less Than Significant	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	None.

DISCUSSION

As discussed in the original IS/MND, the proposed Project would generate exhaust-related GHG emissions during construction resulting from construction equipment operation, material haul and delivery trucks, and by trips by construction worker vehicles; however, emissions would be less than one percent of the EPA reporting threshold. The installation of the additional linear feet of pipeline will generate additional CO₂; however, those additional emissions will be minimal.

The proposed Project is not a land-use development project that would generate vehicle trips and is not a roadway capacity increasing project that could carry additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a net increase in operational GHG emissions. As such, the proposed Project would not interfere or obstruct implementation of an applicable GHG emissions reduction plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable local plans, policies, and regulations for reducing GHG emissions. Any impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	None.
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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	None.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	None.
e. For a project located within an airport land	Less Than Significant.	No. The project is within Airport	No. The project is within Airport	No. The project is within Airport	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	None.
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	None.

DISCUSSION

The original IS/MND determined that there would be less than significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. The additional pipeline installation area would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	None.
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	None.
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?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	None.
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?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern on the site or area, and it would not alter the course	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern on the site or area, and it would not alter the course	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern on the site or area, and it would not alter the course	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	None.
f. Impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would less than significant impacts on hydrology and water quality. The additional pipeline installation would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Physically divide an established community?	No Impact.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	None.
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on land use and planning. The additional pipeline would be installed within the road right-of-way and it would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact to mineral resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there continues to be no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XIII. NOISE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	None.
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	None.
c. For a project located within a private airstrip or 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?	No Impact.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impact from noise. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in noise beyond what was previously analyzed, as construction methodology will be the same and once the pipeline and associated infrastructure is underground, no additional noise will be generated. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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)?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	None.
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	None.

RESPONSES

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on population and housing. The additional pipeline installation will not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there continues to be no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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:					
Fire protection?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	None.
Police protection?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	None.
Schools?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	None.

		expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	
Parks?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None.
Other public facilities?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impacts on public services. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVI. RECREATION

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on recreation. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	None.
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	None
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	None.
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on transportation. There are no changes to the Project description that

would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.
h. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	None.
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1,	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.

the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.					
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on tribal resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

Less than significant impact.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
could cause significant environmental effects?					
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foresee future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less Than Significant.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	None.
c. 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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	None.
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	None.
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statues and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XX. WILDFIRE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	None.
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	None.
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	None.
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and therefore	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and therefore there is no increased	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and therefore there is no increased	None.

slope instability, or drainage changes?		there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.	risk due to post-fire impacts.	risk due to post-fire impacts.	
-----------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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,	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not 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	No. The project would not 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-	No. The project would not 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-	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
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?		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.	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.	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)?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	None.
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	None.

RESPONSES


The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on mandatory findings of significance. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.


CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.



NOTES

- (SS)— PHASE 1
- (SS)— PHASE 2
- (W)— PHASE 2



C:\PROJECTS\2020\WOODLAKE INDUSTRIAL SEWER EXPANSION\2020-09-01\DWG\100000-01.dwg 17/2/2021 4:11 PM

PROJECT NO.: 200230
 DRAWN BY: AG
 CHECKED BY: MCM
 SCALE: AS SHOWN
 SHEET NO.: 1 of 1

OVERALL EXHIBIT

WOODLAKE INDUSTRIAL SEWER EXPANSION PROJECT
 WOODLAKE, CA



Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0

Daily Emission Estimates for -> Woodlake Sewer Addendum														
Project Phases (Pounds)	ROG (lbs/day)	CO (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	PM10 (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM10 (lbs/day)	Fugitive Dust PM10 (lbs/day)	PM2.5 (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM2.5 (lbs/day)	Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (lbs/day)	SOx (lbs/day)	CO2 (lbs/day)	CH4 (lbs/day)	N2O (lbs/day)	CO2e (lbs/day)
Grubbing/Land Clearing	1.18	10.39	12.37	10.54	0.54	10.00	2.56	0.48	2.08	0.02	2,228.28	0.59	0.05	2,257.05
Grading/Excavation	5.75	47.26	63.23	12.72	2.72	10.00	4.54	2.46	2.08	0.10	9,718.97	2.87	0.12	9,827.68
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	3.36	30.20	33.77	11.58	1.58	10.00	3.54	1.46	2.08	0.06	5,711.71	1.20	0.08	5,765.83
Paving	1.58	17.95	15.22	0.88	0.88	0.00	0.78	0.78	0.00	0.03	2,879.36	0.75	0.06	2,914.86
Maximum (pounds/day)	5.75	47.26	63.23	12.72	2.72	10.00	4.54	2.46	2.08	0.10	9,718.97	2.87	0.12	9,827.68
Total (tons/construction project)	0.17	1.46	1.79	0.45	0.08	0.37	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.00	287.82	0.08	0.00	290.93

Notes:
 Project Start Year -> 2021
 Project Length (months) -> 4
 Total Project Area (acres) -> 1
 Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (acres) -> 1
 Water Truck Used? -> Yes

Phase	Total Material Imported/Exported Volume (yd ³ /day)		Daily VMT (miles/day)			
	Soil	Asphalt	Soil Hauling	Asphalt Hauling	Worker Commute	Water Truck
Grubbing/Land Clearing	0	0	0	0	280	40
Grading/Excavation	0	0	0	0	880	40
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	0	0	0	0	600	40
Paving	0	0	0	0	480	40

PM10 and PM2.5 estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified.
 Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns G and H. Total PM2.5 emissions shown in Column I are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns J and K.
 CO2e emissions are estimated by multiplying mass emissions for each GHG by its global warming potential (GWP), 1, 25 and 298 for CO2, CH4 and N2O, respectively. Total CO2e is then estimated by summing CO2e estimates over all GHGs.


Total Emission Estimates by Phase for -> Woodlake Sewer Addendum														
Project Phases (Tons for all except CO2e. Metric tonnes for CO2e)	ROG (tons/phase)	CO (tons/phase)	NOx (tons/phase)	PM10 (tons/phase)	Exhaust PM10 (tons/phase)	Fugitive Dust PM10 (tons/phase)	PM2.5 (tons/phase)	Exhaust PM2.5 (tons/phase)	Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (tons/phase)	SOx (tons/phase)	CO2 (tons/phase)	CH4 (tons/phase)	N2O (tons/phase)	CO2e (MT/phase)
Grubbing/Land Clearing	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	9.80	0.00	0.00	9.01
Grading/Excavation	0.10	0.83	1.11	0.22	0.05	0.18	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.00	171.05	0.05	0.00	156.91
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	0.05	0.47	0.52	0.18	0.02	0.15	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.00	87.96	0.02	0.00	80.55
Paving	0.01	0.12	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	0.00	17.45
Maximum (tons/phase)	0.10	0.83	1.11	0.22	0.05	0.18	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.00	171.05	0.05	0.00	156.91
Total (tons/construction project)	0.17	1.46	1.79	0.45	0.08	0.37	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.00	287.82	0.08	0.00	263.93

PM10 and PM2.5 estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified.
 Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns G and H. Total PM2.5 emissions shown in Column I are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns J and K.
 CO2e emissions are estimated by multiplying mass emissions for each GHG by its global warming potential (GWP), 1, 25 and 298 for CO2, CH4 and N2O, respectively. Total CO2e is then estimated by summing CO2e estimates over all GHGs.
 The CO2e emissions are reported as metric tons per phase.

Initial Study

Woodlake Sewer Extension Project

Prepared for:



City of Woodlake
350 N. Valencia Ave
Woodlake, CA 93286
(559) 564-8055
Contact: Jason Waters

Prepared by:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 840-4414
Contact: Emily Bowen, LEED AP

April 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION4

 Project title.....4

 Lead agency name and address4

 Contact person and phone number4

 Project location4

 Project sponsor’s name/address.....7

 General plan designation7

 Zoning7

 Project Description.....7

 Surrounding Land Uses/Existing Conditions8

 Other Public Agencies Involved10

 Tribal Consultation10

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED11

DETERMINATION.....11

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST13

 I. AESTHETICS.....13

 II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.....16

 III. AIR QUALITY19

 IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....24

 V. CULTURAL RESOURCES28

 VI. ENERGY.....31

 VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....36

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....41

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS43

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.....54

XIII. NOISE55

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING58

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....60

XVI. RECREATION62

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.....63

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....65

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS67

XX. WILDFIRE.....69

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE71

LIST OF PREPARERS.....73

 Persons and Agencies Consulted.....73

PROJECT INFORMATION

This document is the Initial Study for the potential environmental effects of the City of Woodlake's (City) Sewer Extension Project (Project). The City of Woodlake will act as the Lead Agency for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. Copies of all materials referenced in this report are available for review in the project file during regular business hours at 350 N. Valencia Avenue, Woodlake, CA 93286.

Project title

Woodlake Sewer Extension Project

Lead agency name and address

City of Woodlake
350 N. Valencia Avenue
Woodlake, CA 93286

Contact person and phone number

Jason Waters, Community Services Director
City of Woodlake
(559) 564-8055

Project location

The City of Woodlake is located in Tulare County in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley. The proposed Project is located along Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. The Project will be constructed in three phases and entails extending sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, repairing pavement trenches, utility adjustments, modification of striping and installation of manholes, a sewer lift station, and a by-pass. Woodlake is bisected by SR 216 and SR 245 and the City is situated five miles north of SR 198.

Figure 1 – Location




Figure 2 – Pipeline Alignment



Project sponsor's name/address

City of Woodlake
350 N. Valencia Avenue
Woodlake, CA 93286

General plan designation

Primarily Industrial, with the easternmost section of Ropes Avenue transitioning to Medium Density Residential.

Zoning

Primarily ML (Light Industrial), with the easternmost section of Ropes Avenue transitioning to RA and R-1-7.

Project Description

The City of Woodlake intends to improve the existing sewer system by installing new sewer mains of various sizes and the associated improvements to areas of western Woodlake. The Project is a phased improvement plan designed to improve the City's existing public sewer system services.

The new sewer main alignment will start at Road 196 and Naranjo Boulevard and head south along Road 196 until it reaches Bravo Avenue. It will then head east on Bravo Avenue until it reaches Blair Road where it will then head south on Blair Road until it reaches Ropes Avenue. Next, it will head east along Ropes Avenue until it connects to the existing sewer main at Acacia Street. From the existing manhole on Ropes Avenue to Valencia Boulevard, the existing 8-inch sewer main will be replaced and upsized to a 15-inch main. A section of sewer main will also be installed on Blair Road from Naranjo Boulevard to Bravo Avenue.

Project Components

- Removal of approximately 1,250 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main and manholes.
- Installation of approximately 2,220 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main, 4,200 lineal feet of 10-inch sewer main, 5,800 lineal feet of 15-inch sewer main, and 450 lineal feet of 4-inch force main.
- Construction and/or installation of the associated sewer system improvements, including a sewer lift station, manholes, sewer by-pass, pavement trench repair, utility adjustments, existing concrete improvements replacement, and striping modifications.

Phase Descriptions

Phase 1 Project Description:

The Phase 1 Woodlake Sewer Extension Project is located along Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. The sewer main alignment will start at Blair Road and Naranjo Boulevard and head south to Ropes Avenue, where it will then turn east. The alignment will continue along Ropes Avenue to Acacia Street, where it will connect to the existing sewer main. The work will include the installation of approximately 620 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main, 4,550 lineal feet of 15-inch sewer main, 450 lineal feet of 4-inch force main, a sewer lift station, manholes, pavement trench repair, utility adjustments, existing concrete improvements replacement, and striping modifications.

Phase 2 Project Description:

The Phase 2 Woodlake Sewer Extension Project is located along Road 196 and Bravo Avenue. The sewer main alignment will start at Road 196 and Naranjo Boulevard and head south to Bravo Avenue, where it will then turn east. The alignment will continue along Bravo Avenue to Blair Avenue, where it will connect to the Phase 1 Sewer Main Project. The work will include the installation of approximately 1,600 lineal feet of 8-inch sewer main, 4,200 lineal feet of 10-inch sewer main, manholes, pavement trench repair, and striping modifications.

Phase 3 Project Description:


The Phase 3 Woodlake Sewer Extension Project is located along Ropes Avenue. The sewer main replacement alignment will start at the manhole just west of Acacia Street and head east to Valencia Boulevard. The work will include the upsizing of approximately 1,250 lineal feet of existing 8-inch sewer main to a 15-inch sewer main, reconstruction of manholes, utility adjustments, sewer by-pass, existing concrete improvements replacement, pavement trench repair, and striping modifications.

Surrounding Land Uses/Existing Conditions

The proposed Project will largely occur in the current roadway right-of-way site along Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue.

Lands surrounding the proposed Project (lands on either side of Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue, see Figure 2 – Site Aerial) are primarily being utilized for agricultural or light industrial purposes. The lands surrounding the portion of Ropes Avenue located the furthest east, starting at S. Oaks Street, are being utilized for residential uses.

Figure 3 – Phasing Information



Other Public Agencies Involved

- State of California Native American Heritage Commission
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
- Caltrans District 6

Tribal Consultation

The City of Woodlake has not received any project-specific requests from any Tribes in the geographic area with which it is traditionally and culturally affiliated with or otherwise to be notified about projects in the City of Woodlake.

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.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

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.

- 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 project 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 measures 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



4/27/21

Jason Waters

Date

Community Services Director

City of Woodlake

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Woodlake is located on the San Joaquin Valley floor at the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountain range. On clear days, the peaks are visible from the majority of the City. The proposed sewer system improvements will pass through established agricultural and industrial areas of the City, with the easternmost portion transitioning to a residential neighborhood. The Project area consists mainly of roadways being utilized for vehicle transportation in the City of Woodlake, along Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. There are no adopted scenic resources or scenic vistas in the area. State Routes (SR) in the proposed Project vicinity include 216, 245 and 198.

RESPONSES

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Woodlake General Plan does not identify any scenic vistas within the proposed Project area; however, the peaks of the Sierra Nevada mountain range are clearly visible on many days of the year. A scenic vista is generally considered a view of an area that has remarkable scenery or a resource that is indigenous to the area.

The proposed Project involves existing sewer main removal, installation of new sewer mains of various sizes, and the installation of the associated sewer system improvements, which include a sewer lift station, manholes, and sewer by-pass, among others. Views of surrounding areas will not be substantially impacted by the Project, since the majority of the finished work will be below grade. The majority of the work will be installed underground. Any construction of at-grade structures, will be in compliance with county and community standards. As such, the proposed Project will not impede any scenic vistas.

Construction activities will occur over three phases and will be visible from the adjacent residences, businesses and roadsides; however, the construction activities will be temporary in nature and will not affect a scenic vista, as described above.

There are no state designated scenic highways within the immediate proximity to the Project site. California Department of Transportation Scenic Highway Mapping System identifies SR 198 east of SR 99 as an Eligible State Scenic Highway.¹ This is the closest highway, located approximately 5.2 miles south of the Project site; however, the Project site is both physically and visually separated from SR 198 by intervening land uses. In addition, no scenic highways or roadways are listed within the Project area in the City of Woodlake's General Plan or Tulare County's General Plan. Based on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the City's General Plan, no historic buildings exist on the Project site. The

¹ California Department of Transportation. California State Scenic Highways. <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed April 2021.

proposed Project would not cause damage to rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a State scenic highway corridor. Any impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Nighttime lighting is necessary to provide and maintain safe, secure, and attractive environments; however, these lights have the potential to produce spillover light and glare and waste energy, and if designed incorrectly, could be considered unattractive. Light that falls beyond the intended area is referred to as “light trespass.” Types of light trespass include spillover light and glare. Minimizing all these forms of obtrusive light is an important environmental consideration. A less obtrusive and well-designed energy efficient fixture would face downward, emit the correct intensity of light for the use, and incorporate energy timers.

Glare results when a light source directly in the field of vision is brighter than the eye can comfortably accept. Squinting or turning away from a light source is an indication of glare. The presence of a bright light in an otherwise dark setting may be distracting or annoying, referred to as discomfort glare, or it may diminish the ability to see other objects in the darkened environment, referred to as disability glare. Glare can be reduced by design features that block direct line of sight to the light source and that direct light downward, with little or no light emitted at high (near horizontal) angles, since this light would travel long distances. Cutoff-type light fixtures minimize glare because they emit relatively low-intensity light at these angles.

Current sources of light in the Project area are from the surrounding commercial and agricultural uses, and the vehicles traveling along Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. The Project will not include any new sources of lighting. Accordingly, the Project would not create substantial new sources of light or glare. Potential impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project area is located along Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. The roadways that comprise the proposed Project are located in an area zoned ML by the Woodlake General Plan, except for a small portion of the easternmost part of Ropes Avenue, which is zoned RA.² The majority of the work required for Project development will occur in the existing right-of-way.

RESPONSES

- 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?
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?
- d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The proposed Project will be constructed in three phases and entails extending sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, and installing the associated sewer system improvements within the City of Woodlake. The mains and associated infrastructure will largely occur within the existing right of way and will be installed underground. The purpose of the Project is to improve the City's existing sewer system and does not have the potential to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forestland uses to non-forestland.

The roadways that comprise the proposed Project are located in an area zoned ML by the Woodlake General Plan, except for a small portion of the easternmost part of Ropes Avenue, which is zoned RA. The California Department of Conservation's Important Farmland Finder program considers approximately 50% of the area to be Urban and Built-Up Land, with the remaining lands are given the

² City of Woodlake General Plan, City of Woodlake Zoning Map. <https://cityofwoodlake.com/departments/planning/>. (See Planning Documents & Maps Link, Open in Google Docs.) Accessed April 2021.

designation of Farmland of Statewide Importance and Prime Farmland.³ However, most of the work necessary for the proposed Project will occur in the existing right-of-way. All improvements will take place within an area that is built up with rural and urban uses.

The proposed Project does not include land under a Williamson Act Contract. No conversion of forestland, as defined under Public Resource Code or General Code, as referenced above, would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

No land conversion from farmland would occur as a result of the proposed Project. The Project is not zoned for forestland and does not propose any zone changes related to forest or timberland. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

³ Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFE/>. Accessed April 2021.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The climate of the City of Woodlake and the San Joaquin Valley is characterized by long, hot summers and stagnant, foggy winters. Precipitation is low and temperature inversions are common. These characteristics are conducive to the formation and retention of air pollutants and are in part influenced by the surrounding mountains which intercept precipitation and act as a barrier to the passage of cold air and air pollutants.

The proposed Project lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, which is managed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD or Air District). National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been established for the following criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and lead (Pb). The CAAQS also set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility.

Air quality plans or attainment plans are used to bring the applicable air basin into attainment with all state and federal ambient air quality standards designed to protect the health and safety of residents

within that air basin. Areas are classified under the Federal Clean Air Act as either “attainment”, “non-attainment”, or “extreme non-attainment” areas for each criteria pollutant based on whether the NAAQS have been achieved or not. Attainment relative to the State standards is determined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The San Joaquin Valley is designated as a State and Federal extreme non-attainment area for O₃, a State and Federal non-attainment area for PM_{2.5}, a State non-attainment area for PM₁₀, and Federal and State attainment area for CO, SO₂, NO₂, and Pb.

Standards and attainment status for listed pollutants in the Air District can be found in Table 1. Note that both state and federal standards are presented.

Table 1 - Standards and Attainment Status for Listed Pollutants in the Air District

	Federal Standard	California Standard
Ozone	0.075 ppm (8-hr avg)	0.07 ppm (8-hr avg) 0.09 ppm (1-hr avg)
Carbon Monoxide	9.0 ppm (8-hr avg) 35.0 ppm (1-hr avg)	9.0 ppm (8-hr avg) 20.0 ppm (1-hr avg)
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.053 ppm (annual avg)	0.30 ppm (annual avg) 0.18 ppm (1-hr avg)
Sulfur Dioxide	0.03 ppm (annual avg) 0.14 ppm (24-hr avg) 0.5 ppm (3-hr avg)	0.04 ppm (24-hr avg) 0.25 ppm (1-hr avg)
Lead	1.5 µg/m ³ (calendar quarter) 0.15 µg/m ³ (rolling 3-month avg)	1.5 µg/m ³ (30-day avg)
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg)	20 µg/m ³ (annual avg) 50 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg)
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	15 µg/m ³ (annual avg)	35 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg) 12 µg/m ³ (annual avg)

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

Additional State regulations include:

CARB Portable Equipment Registration Program – This program was designed to allow owners and operators of portable engines and other common construction or farming equipment to register their equipment under a statewide program so they may operate it statewide without the need to obtain a permit from the local air district.

U.S. EPA/CARB Off-Road Mobile Sources Emission Reduction Program – The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires CARB to achieve a maximum degree of emissions reductions from off-road mobile sources to attain State Ambient Air Quality Standards (SAAQS); off- road mobile sources include most construction equipment. Tier 1 standards for large compression-ignition engines used in off-road mobile sources went into effect in California in 1996. These standards, along with ongoing rulemaking, address emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOX) and toxic particulate matter from diesel engines. CARB is currently

developing a control measure to reduce diesel PM and NOX emissions from existing off-road diesel equipment throughout the state.

California Global Warming Solutions Act – Established in 2006, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) requires that California’s GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This will be implemented through a statewide cap on GHG emissions, which was phased in beginning in 2012. AB 32 requires CARB to develop regulations and a mandatory reporting system to monitor global warming emissions levels.

RESPONSES

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b. 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?
- c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). At the Federal level, the SJVAB is designated as extreme nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, attainment for PM₁₀ and CO, and nonattainment for PM_{2.5}. At the State level, the SJVAB is designated as nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} standards. Although the Federal 1-hour ozone standard was revoked in 2005, areas must still attain this standard, and the SJVAPCD recently requested an EPA finding that the SJVAB has attained the standard based on 2011-2013 data⁴. To meet Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, the SJVAPCD has multiple air quality attainment plan (AQAP) documents, including:

- Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan (EOADP) for attainment of the 1-hour ozone standard (2004);
- 2007 Ozone Plan for attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard;
- 2007 PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation; and
- 2008 PM_{2.5} Plan.

Because of the region’s non-attainment status for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, if the project-generated emissions of either of the ozone precursor pollutants (ROG or NO_x), PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} were to exceed the SJVAPCD’s significance thresholds, then the project uses would be considered to conflict with the attainment plans. In addition, if the Project uses were to result in a change in land use and corresponding

⁴ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Guide to Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015. Page 28. <https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/FINAL-DRAFT-GAMAQI.PDF>. Accessed April 2021.

increases in vehicle miles traveled, they may result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled that is unaccounted for in regional emissions inventories contained in regional air quality control plans.

The annual significance thresholds to be used for the Project for construction and operational emissions are as follows⁵:

- 10 tons per year ROG;
- 10 tons per year NO_x;
- 15 tons per year PM₁₀; and
- 15 tons per year PM_{2.5}.

The project will result in both construction emissions and operational emissions as described below.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

Site preparation and Project construction would involve excavating, grading, hauling, and various activities needed to construct the Project. During construction, the Project could generate pollutants such as hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, and suspended PM. A major source of PM would be windblown dust generated during construction activities. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soils. Vehicles leaving the site could deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM₁₀ emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM₁₀ emissions would depend on soil moisture, the silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of operating equipment. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site.

Operational Emissions

The sewer mains and associated sewer system improvements are passive in nature and will not generate any on-site emissions.

Total Project Emissions

The estimated annual construction emissions are provided below. The Road Construction Emissions Model (Version 9.0.0), was used to estimate construction emissions resulting from sewer extension. It is important to note that all excavated soils will remain on-site. It was also assumed that sewer extension

⁵ San Joaquin Valley Air Control District – Air Quality Threshold of Significance – Criteria Pollutants. <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf>. Accessed April 2021.

construction would take approximately 12 months, with construction occurring in phases. There will be no operational emissions after construction. Modeling results are provided in Table 2 and the Road Construction Emissions Model output files are provided in Appendix A.

Table 2 - Proposed Project Construction Emissions

	VOC (ROG) (tons/year)	NO _x (tons/year)	PM ₁₀ (tons/year)	PM _{2.5} (tons/year)
2021 Sewer Construction Emissions	0.54	5.56	0.81	0.34
Total Project Emissions	0.54	5.56	0.81	0.34
Annual Threshold of Significance	10	10	15	15
Significant?	No	No	No	No

Source: Road Construction Emissions Model results (Appendix A). Crawford & Bowen Planning (2021)

As demonstrated in Table 2, estimated construction emissions would not exceed the SJVAPCD's significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. As a result, the Project uses would not conflict with emissions inventories contained in regional air quality attainment plans and would not result in a significant contribution to the region's air quality non-attainment status⁶.

Any impacts to air resources would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in a primarily agricultural and industrial portion of the City of Woodlake. During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project site. The potential for diesel odor impacts is therefore considered less than significant.

As such, the proposed Project is not expected to produce any offensive odors that would result in frequent odor complaints. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

⁶ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Guide to Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015. Page 65. <https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAOL-2015/FINAL-DRAFT-GAMAOL.PDF>. Accessed April 2021.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

- e. 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?

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project site is located in a portion of the central San Joaquin Valley that has, for decades, experienced intensive agricultural and urban disturbances. Current agricultural endeavors in the region include dairies, groves, and row crops.

Like most of California, the Central San Joaquin Valley experiences a Mediterranean climate. Warm dry summers are followed by cool moist winters. Summer temperatures usually exceed 90 degrees Fahrenheit, and the relative humidity is generally very low. Winter temperatures rarely raise much above 70 degrees Fahrenheit, with daytime highs often below 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Annual precipitation within the proposed Project site is about 10 inches, almost 85% of which falls between the months of October and March. Nearly all precipitation falls in the form of rain and storm-water readily infiltrates the soils of the surrounding the sites.

Native plant and animal species once abundant in the region have become locally extirpated or have experienced large reductions in their populations due to conversion of upland, riparian, and aquatic habitats to agricultural and urban uses. Remaining native habitats are particularly valuable to native wildlife species including special status species that still persist in the region. According to the Woodlake General Plan, most of the open space in the Woodlake area is dominated by agriculture. Citrus, olives, and grazing land are the dominant uses.

The proposed Project is located along Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue, in western Woodlake. The Project will be constructed in three phases and entails extending sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, and installing the associated sewer system improvements within the City. The mains and associated infrastructure will largely occur within the existing right of way and will be installed underground. The area surrounding the aforementioned roadways is dominated by agricultural and industrial land uses, and has undergone substantial ground disturbance.

No aquatic or wetland features occur in the proposed Project site areas; therefore, jurisdictional waters are considered absent from the site.

RESPONSES

- 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is currently developed and occupied by Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue, in western Woodlake. Existing development has altered the natural landscape by removing potentially suitable natural habitat for sensitive plant or animal species within the Project area. There is virtually no vegetation found on the existing site. This factor suggests that the Project site is unlikely to serve as nesting habitat for bird species or any animal or plant species. Additionally, no wetlands or waters of the U.S. or water of the State were found within the Project area. No mitigation measures are recommended, and thus any impacts remain *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. There are no natural waterways, sensitive natural communities, or protected wetlands on the subject site. As such, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?

No Impact. There are no natural waterways or natural vegetation on the subject site, and the site is not used for movement of wildlife species or for a migratory wildlife corridor, nor is the site used for native

wildlife nursery sites. The site has been developed previously and is highly disturbed. There would be *no impact* to native species movement.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

No Impact. The City of Woodlake's General Plan includes policies for the protection of biological resources. The proposed Project would not conflict with any of the adopted policies. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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?

No Impact. The proposed Project site is not within an area set aside for the conservation of habitat or sensitive plant or animal species pursuant to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As such, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A record search of site files and maps was conducted at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center (IC), California State University, Bakersfield on (see Appendix B). These investigations determined that two cultural resource studies have been conducted within the proposed Project area and ten cultural resource studies have been conducted within a one-half mile radius.

The records revealed that there is one recorded resource within the Project area; a historic era railroad. Five recorded resources are within the one-half mile radius; historic era storage tanks, Bravo lake, another historic era railroad, a historic era canal and a historic era ditch. The historic era canal, known as the Friant-Kern Canal, has been given a National Register Status Code of 2S2, which indicates that this resource is eligible for being listed in the National Register of Historical Resources. No other records were found that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks.

Due to the fact that Project construction will occur mainly in the existing right of way previously described, the cultural resources report performed for the Project site stated that no further cultural resource investigation is recommended.

RESPONSES

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No Impact. As discussed above, though one historic resource was identified in the proposed Project area, the Project is not expected to impact the resource. The area has previously experienced extensive ground disturbance due to roadway construction and use. Therefore, Project development will not cause a substantial adverse change to the historic resource identified within or adjacent to the Project site. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project area is highly disturbed, consisting of existing roadways. There are no known or visible cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains that exist on the surface of the Project area. Therefore, it is determined that the Project has low potential to impact any sensitive resources and no further cultural resources work is required unless Project plans change to include work not currently identified in the Project description.

Although no cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources or human remains have been identified in the Project area, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measures CUL – 1 and CUL – 2 will be implemented to ensure that Project will result in *less than significant impacts with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL – 1 Should evidence of prehistoric archeological resources be discovered during construction, the contractor shall halt all work within 25 feet of the find and the resource shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If evidence of any archaeological, cultural, and/or historical deposits is found, hand excavation and/or mechanical excavation shall proceed to evaluate the deposits for determination of significance as defined by the CEQA guidelines. The archaeologist shall submit reports, to the satisfaction of the City of Woodlake, describing the testing program and subsequent results. These reports shall identify any program mitigation that the project proponent shall complete in order to mitigate archaeological impacts (including resource recovery and/or avoidance testing and analysis, removal, reburial, and curation of archaeological resources).

CUL – 2 In order to ensure that the proposed project does not impact buried human remains during project construction, the City shall be responsible for on-going monitoring of project construction. If buried human remains are encountered during construction, further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall be halted until the Tulare County coroner is contacted and the coroner has made the determinations and notifications required pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the coroner determines that Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c) require that he give notice to the Native American Heritage Commission, then such notice shall be given within 24 hours, as required by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c). In that event, the NAHC will conduct the notifications required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Until the consultations described below have been completed, the landowner shall further ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices where Native American human remains are located, is not disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the Most Likely Descendants on all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences and treatments, as prescribed by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b). The NAHC will mediate any disputes regarding treatment of remains in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.94(k). The landowner shall be entitled to exercise rights established by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) if any of the circumstances established by that provision become applicable.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

California’s total energy consumption is second-highest in the nation, but in 2018 the state’s per capita energy consumption ranked the fourth-lowest, due in part to its mild climate and its energy efficiency programs.⁷ In 2018, California was the top-ranking producer of electricity from solar, geothermal and biomass energy, and second in the nation in conventional hydroelectric power generation.

Energy usage is typically quantified using the British thermal unit (BTU). As a point of reference, the approximately amounts of energy contained in common energy sources are as follows:

Energy Source	BTUs ⁸
Gasoline	120,429 per gallon
Natural Gas	1,037 per cubic foot
Electricity	3,412 per kilowatt-hour

California electrical consumption in 2018 was 7,876.8 trillion BTU⁹, as provided in Table 3, while total electrical consumption by Tulare County in 2019 was 14.202 trillion BTU.¹⁰

⁷ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed April 2021.

⁸ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Energy Units and Calculators Explained. https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.php?page=about_energy_units. Accessed April 2021.

⁹ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed April 2021.

¹⁰ California Energy Commission. Electricity Consumption by County. <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx>. Accessed April 2021.

Table 3 – 2018 California Energy Consumption¹¹

End User	BTU of energy consumed (in trillions)	Percentage of total consumption
Residential	1,440.1	18.3
Commercial	1,510.4	19.2
Industrial	1,847.9	23.5
Transportation	3,078.4	39.1
Total	7,876.8	--

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reports that approximately 25.6 million automobiles, 5.2 million trucks, and 857,677 motorcycles were registered in the state in 2019, while in 2017 a total estimated 344.3 billion vehicles miles were traveled (VMT).¹²

Applicable Regulations

California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards)

California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 comprises the California Energy Code, which was adopted to ensure that building construction, system design and installation achieve energy efficiency. The California Energy Code was first established in 1978 by the CEC in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption, and apply to energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting in new residential and non-residential buildings. The standards are updated periodically to increase the baseline energy efficiency requirements. The 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards focus on several key areas to improve the energy efficiency of newly constructed buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings and include requirements to enable both demand reductions during critical peak periods and future solar electric and thermal system installations. Although it was not originally intended to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, electricity production by fossil fuels results in GHG emissions and energy efficient buildings require less electricity. Therefore, increased energy efficiency results in decreased GHG emissions.

California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part II, CALGreen)

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the California Green Buildings Standards Code (CALGreen in Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code) for all new construction statewide on July 17, 2008. Originally a volunteer measure, the code became mandatory in 2010 and the most recent update

¹¹ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed April 2021.

¹² Caltrans. 2017. California Transportation Fact Booklet. <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/research-innovation-system-information/documents/caltrans-fact-booklets/2019-cfb-a11y.pdf>. Accessed April 2021.

(2019) will go into effect on January 1, 2020. CALGreen sets targets for energy efficiency, water consumption, dual plumbing systems for potable and recyclable water, diversion of construction waste from landfills, and use of environmentally sensitive materials in construction and design, including eco-friendly flooring, carpeting, paint, coatings, thermal insulation, and acoustical wall and ceiling panels. The 2019 CALGreen Code includes mandatory measures for non-residential development related to site development; water use; weather resistance and moisture management; construction waste reduction, disposal, and recycling; building maintenance and operation; pollutant control; indoor air quality; environmental comfort; and outdoor air quality. Mandatory measures for residential development pertain to green building; planning and design; energy efficiency; water efficiency and conservation; material conservation and resource efficiency; environmental quality; and installer and special inspector qualifications.

Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act (SB 350)

The Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act (SB 350) was passed by California Governor Brown on October 7, 2015, and establishes new clean energy, clean air, and greenhouse gas reduction goals for the year 2030 and beyond. SB 350 establishes a greenhouse gas reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels for the State of California, further enhancing the ability for the state to meet the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050.

Renewable Portfolio Standard (SB 1078 and SB 107)

Established in 2002 under SB 1078, the state's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) was amended under SB 107 to require accelerated energy reduction goals by requiring that by the year 2010, 20 percent of electricity sales in the state be served by renewable energy resources. In years following its adoption, Executive Order S-14-08 was signed, requiring electricity retail sellers to provide 33 percent of their service loads with renewable energy by the year 2020. In 2011, SB X1-2 was signed, aligning the RPS target with the 33 percent requirement by the year 2020. This new RPS applied to all state electricity retailers, including publicly owned utilities, investor-owned utilities, electrical service providers, and community choice aggregators. All entities included under the RPS were required to adopt the RPS 20 percent by year 2020 reduction goal by the end of 2013, adopt a reduction goal of 25 percent by the end of 2016, and meet the 33 percent reduction goal by the end of 2020. In addition, the Air Resources Board, under Executive Order S-21-09, was required to adopt regulations consistent with these 33 percent renewable energy targets.

RESPONSES

- a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves construction and installation of sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, repairing pavement trenches, utility adjustments, modification of striping and installation of manholes, a sewer lift station, and a by-pass. The Project may consume high amounts of energy in the short-term during Project construction; however, the mains and associated sewer system improvements are passive and will not require substantial amounts of energy during Project operation.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of Title 24 standards significantly increases energy savings, and it is generally assumed that compliance with Title 24 ensures projects will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

As discussed in Impact XVII – Transportation/Traffic, the proposed Project would not generate on-going daily vehicle trips, other than for maintenance as needed. The length of these trips and the individual vehicle fuel efficiencies are not known; therefore, the resulting energy consumption cannot be accurately calculated. Adopted federal vehicle fuel standards have continually improved since their original adoption in 1975 and assists in avoiding the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy by vehicles.

As discussed previously, the proposed Project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation.

Therefore, any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Directly or indirectly cause 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Woodlake is situated along the western slope of a northwest-trending belt of rocks comprising the Sierra Nevada and within the southern portion of the Cascade Range. The Sierra Nevada geomorphic province is primarily composed of cretaceous granitic plutons and remnants of Paleozoic and Mesozoic metavolcanic and metasedimentary rocks, and Cenozoic volcan and sedimentary rocks.

There are no known active earthquake faults in the City of Woodlake. According to the Woodlake General Plan, the nearest active faults are the San Andreas, 65 miles west; the Owens Valley, 75 miles east; and the White Wolf; 75 miles south.

According to the City’s General Plan, much of the Project area has soils with high clay content that can expand and contract as water conditions change.

RESPONSES

- a-i. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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.
- a-ii. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

a-iii. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

a-iv. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is not located in an earthquake fault zone as delineated by the 1972 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Act. The nearest known potentially active fault is the Clovis Fault, located over thirty miles northwest of the site. No active faults have been mapped within the project boundaries, so there is no potential for fault rupture. It is anticipated that the proposed Project site would be subject to some ground acceleration and ground shaking associated with seismic activity during its design life. The Project site would be engineered and constructed in strict accordance with the earthquake resistant design requirements contained in the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC) for seismic zone III, as well as Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, and therefore would avoid potential seismically induced hazards on planned structures. The impact of seismic hazards on the Project would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves construction and installation of sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, repairing pavement trenches, utility adjustments, modification of striping and installation of manholes, a sewer lift station, and a by-pass. Construction activities associated with the Project involves demolition and ground preparation work. These activities could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the Project site. During construction, nuisance flow caused by minor rain could flow off-site. The City and/or contractor would be required to employ appropriate sediment and erosion control BMPs as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would be required by the California National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In addition, soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be minimized through implementation of the SVJAPCD fugitive dust control measures (See Section III). Once construction is complete, the Project would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Compliance with state regulations will ensure that impacts remain *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less than Significant Impact. See Section VI a. above. The site is not at significant risk from ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslide and is otherwise considered geologically stable. Liquefaction typically occurs when there is shallow groundwater, low-density non-plastic soils, and high-intensity ground motion. Groundwater wells in the City of Woodlake typically pull domestic water from depths ranging from 100 to 150 feet below the ground surface. The City of Woodlake is relatively flat which precludes the occurrence of landslides. Subsidence is typically related to over-extraction of groundwater from certain types of geologic formations where the water is partly responsible for supporting the ground surface; however, the City of Woodlake is not recognized by the U.S. Geological Service as being in an area of subsidence.¹³ Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. The proposed Project does not include the installation of a septic system, as it involves improvements to the existing sewer system. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. There are no unique geologic features in the Project vicinity. Although there are no known paleontological resources located in the Project area, site development does have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy an unknown paleontological

¹³ U.S. Geological Service. Areas of Land Subsidence in California. https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html. Accessed April 2021.

resource. Mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 are included to reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: CUL-1 and CUL-2

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Various gases in the earth’s atmosphere play an important role in moderating the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters earth’s atmosphere from space and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface. The earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation. GHGs are transparent to solar radiation but are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. Consequently, radiation that would otherwise escape back into space is retained, resulting in a warming of the earth’s atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect. Scientific research to date indicates that some of the observed climate change is a result of increased GHG emissions associated with human activity. Among the GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), ozone, Nitrous Oxide (NO_x), and chlorofluorocarbons. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are considered responsible for enhancing the greenhouse effect. GHG emissions contributing to global climate change are attributable, in large part, to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation. Global climate change is, indeed, a global issue. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria pollutants and TACs (which are pollutants of regional and/or local concern). Global climate change, if it occurs, could potentially affect water resources in California. Rising temperatures could be anticipated to result in sea-level rise (as polar ice caps melt) and possibly change the timing and amount of precipitation, which could alter water quality. According to some, climate change could result in more extreme weather patterns; both heavier precipitation that could lead to flooding, as well as more extended drought periods. There is uncertainty regarding the timing, magnitude, and nature of the potential changes to water resources as a result of climate change; however, several trends are evident.

Snowpack and snowmelt may also be affected by climate change. Much of California's precipitation falls as snow in the Sierra Nevada and southern Cascades, and snowpack represents approximately 35 percent of the state's useable annual water supply. The snowmelt typically occurs from April through July; it provides natural water flow to streams and reservoirs after the annual rainy season has ended. As air temperatures increase due to climate change, the water stored in California's snowpack could be affected by increasing temperatures resulting in: (1) decreased snowfall, and (2) earlier snowmelt.

RESPONSES

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would generate exhaust-related GHG emissions during construction resulting from construction equipment operation, material haul and delivery trucks, and by trips by construction worker vehicles. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published a rule for the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gases from sources that in general emit 25,000 metric tons or more of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year. As shown in the modeling results (Appendix A), the Project will produce approximately 909.48 metric tons of CO₂ during the 12 months of construction, which represents less than one percent of the reporting threshold.

The proposed Project is not a land-use development project that would generate vehicle trips and is not a roadway capacity increasing project that could carry additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a net increase in operational GHG emissions. As such, the proposed Project would not interfere or obstruct implementation of an applicable GHG emissions reduction plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable local plans, policies, and regulations for reducing GHG emissions. Any impacts related to GHG emissions would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

		Less than Significant		
	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The area immediately surrounding the proposed Project consists primarily of industrial and agricultural. The Project site is currently utilized as existing roadways – Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue.

RESPONSES

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. This impact is associated with hazards caused by the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Proposed Project construction activities may involve the use and transport of hazardous materials. These materials may include fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, and other chemicals used during construction. Transportation, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Compliance would ensure that human health and the environment are not exposed to hazardous materials. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program through the submission and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction

activities to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur during construction activities.

The operational phase of the proposed Project would occur after construction is completed. The proposed Project includes land uses that are considered compatible with the surrounding uses. None of these land uses routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials, or present a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment occur. Therefore, the proposed Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

No Impact. No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the Project site. This condition precludes the possibility of activities associated with the proposed Project exposing schools within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site to hazardous materials. *No impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?

No Impact. The proposed Project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Geotracker and DTSC Envirostor databases – accessed in April 2021).¹⁴ There are no hazardous materials sites that impact the Project. As such, *no impacts* would occur that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

¹⁴ California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Envirostor Database.
<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=woodlake+ca>. Accessed April 2021.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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 result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips in the Project vicinity. The Woodlake Municipal Airport is located a little over one mile south/southeast of the site. The proposed site is located inside the Tulare County Airport Land Use Plan's Proposed Airport Influence Area; however, the site is not within any Safety Zones.¹⁵ The proposed land use would not substantially contribute to the severity of an aircraft accident nor result in a substantial safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. Thus, any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The Project will not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- g. 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?

No Impact. There are no wildlands on or near the Project site. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

¹⁵ Tulare County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. December 2012. <https://tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/rma-documents/planning-documents/tulare-county-comprehensive-airport-land-use-plan/>. Accessed April 2021.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off- site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Woodlake obtains its water supply from a vast aquifer underlying the San Joaquin Valley. The City provides water service to all developed areas within the City and the unincorporated county service area called Wells Tract, which contains approximately 50 residential dwellings.

Water is supplied to the City by five wells that are located in the southern portion of the City; adjacent to the St. Johns River. The yield of city wells ranges from 350 to 1,500 gallons per minute.

RESPONSES

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project has the potential to impact water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements during construction (temporary impacts) and operation. Impacts are discussed below.

Construction

Although the proposed Project site is relatively small in scale, grading, excavation and loading activities associated with construction activities could temporarily increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Construction activities also could result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas.

Three general sources of potential short-term construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the proposed project are: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion and transportation, via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. Generally, routine safety precautions for handling and storing construction materials may effectively mitigate the potential pollution of stormwater by these materials. These same types of common sense, “good housekeeping” procedures can be extended to non-hazardous stormwater pollutants such as sawdust and other solid wastes.

Poorly maintained vehicles and heavy equipment leaking fuel, oil, antifreeze, or other fluids on the construction site are also common sources of stormwater pollution and soil contamination. In addition, grading activities can greatly increase erosion processes. Two general strategies are recommended to prevent construction silt from entering local storm drains. First, erosion control procedures should be implemented for those areas that must be exposed. Secondly, the area should be secured to control offsite migration of pollutants. These Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be required in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be prepared prior to commencement of Project construction. When properly designed and implemented, these “good-housekeeping” practices are expected to reduce short-term construction-related impacts to less than significant.

In accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Program, the Project will be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements to prepare a SWPPP designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB and are an existing regulatory requirement.

Operation

During operation, the proposed sewer system improvements would not include any process that would result in degradation of surface water or ground water quality. The Project is intended to protect existing groundwater conditions by containing and transporting waste to the City’s wastewater treatment facility, so the potential for groundwater contamination is reduced.

Therefore, any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than Significant Impact. Project demands for groundwater resources would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies and/or otherwise interfere with groundwater recharge efforts being implemented by the City of Woodlake. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
- i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite;
 - ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
 - iii. 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; or
 - iv. impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is unlikely to introduce new non-permeable surfaces. The new sewer mains and associated improvements will be installed within the existing road, right-of-way, or other easements and will not alter any existing drainage patterns. There are no waterways in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Project. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- d. In flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed sewer mains and associated improvements are mostly located outside the Flood Inundation Area, defined by the City of Woodlake Special Flood Hazard Area

Map. There is a small portion of W. Ropes Avenue which may be considered to lie in Zone A, or the Special Flood Hazard Area¹⁶; however, the pipeline will be installed underground and will not alter any drainage patterns.

The City of Woodlake is located inside the Terminus Dam inundation area. If the Terminus Dam failed while at full capacity, its floodwaters would arrive in Woodlake within approximately six hours. The Project is located inside the Dam Inundation Area, defined by the City of Woodlake Dam Inundation Area Map. Dam failure has been adequately planned for through the Tulare County MJLHMP, which the proposed Project is required to be in compliance with. Project implementation will not conflict with any water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

¹⁶ Tulare County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. March, 2018. <https://tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/planning-building/environmental-planning/environmental-planning-resources/tulare-county-2017-multi-jurisdictional-local-hazard-mitigation-plan/>. Page B-21. Accessed April 2021.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project site is in the southwestern portion of the City of Woodlake. The proposed sewer main installation is located in a primarily agricultural and industrial area of the City. The site is currently being utilized for roadways, see Figure 3 – Aerial Map. The site is zoned Light Industrial and the General Plan Land Use Designation is Industrial, with the easternmost portion of Ropes Avenue being Medium Density Residential.

RESPONSES

a. Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The construction and operation of the Project would not cause any land use changes in the surrounding vicinity nor would it divide an established community, as public utility use within an industrial area is considered acceptable. *No impacts* would occur as a result of this Project.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The proposed Project includes the removal of existing pipelines and the installation of new sewer mains and the associated improvements. The immediate vicinity of the proposed Project site is comprised of primarily industrial and agricultural land uses. The area is highly disturbed with urban uses. The proposed Project has no characteristics that would physically divide the City of Woodlake. Once construction is completed, disturbed ground will be restored. Access to the existing surrounding establishments will remain.

The proposed Project would not conflict with current zoning in and around the Project site. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

There are no known mineral resources within the planning area and no known mining of mineral resources occurs in the City of Woodlake. The closest significant mineral resources consist of sand and gravel deposits along the St. Johns River southeast of Woodlake, near the Sierra Nevada foothills.¹⁷

RESPONSES

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. There are no known mineral resources in the proposed Project area and the site is not included in a State classified mineral resource zones. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

¹⁷ City of Woodlake General Plan. Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Conservation Element. Page 7.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project site is located partially within the City of Woodlake in an industrial and agricultural area, see Figure 2 – Pipeline Alignment.

RESPONSES

a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact.

Short-term (Construction) Noise Impacts

Proposed Project construction related activities will involve temporary noise sources. Typical construction related equipment include graders, trenchers, small tractors and excavators. During the proposed Project construction, noise from construction related activities will contribute to the noise environment in the immediate vicinity. Activities involved in construction will generate maximum noise levels, as indicated in Table 5, ranging from 79 to 91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, without feasible noise control (e.g., mufflers) and ranging from 75 to 80 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, with feasible noise controls.

Table 5
Typical Construction Noise Levels

Type of Equipment	dBA at 50 ft	
	Without Feasible Noise Control	With Feasible Noise Control
Dozer or Tractor	80	75
Excavator	88	80
Scraper	88	80
Front End Loader	79	75
Backhoe	85	75
Grader	85	75
Truck	91	75

The distinction between short-term construction noise impacts and long-term operational noise impacts is a typical one in both CEQA documents and local noise ordinances, which generally recognize the reality that short-term noise from construction is inevitable and cannot be mitigated beyond a certain level. Thus, local agencies frequently tolerate short-term noise at levels that they would not accept for permanent noise sources. A more severe approach would be impractical and might preclude the kind of construction activities that are to be expected from time to time in urban environments. Most residents of urban areas recognize this reality and expect to hear construction activities on occasion.

Though most of the Project area is zoned as Light Industrial, residences exist along S. Blair Road and W. Ropes Avenue and are considered sensitive receptors. Construction-related short-term, temporary noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the Project area, but is temporary and would not occur after construction is completed. In addition, construction activities would not occur between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM, in accordance with Woodlake Municipal Code Section 8.24.020, which limits work “between the hours of ten p.m. of one day and seven a.m. of the following day...”

Long-term (Operational) Noise Impacts

The primary source of on-going noise from the proposed Project will be minimal as the new sewer mains and associated improvements are passive in nature and will not create any on-site noise. As such, any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

No Impact. The Project is located within the Woodlake Airport influence area, but is located outside the CNEL noise contours, as projected by the Tulare County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Woodlake’s 2000 population was 6,651, up from the 1990 census figure of 5,678. The State Department of Finance, which provides population projections for cities and counties in California, estimated Woodlake’s population to be 7,773 on in 2020.¹⁸

The pipeline alignment will follow the existing right of way through primarily agricultural and industrial areas of the City.

RESPONSES

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

¹⁸ State of California Department of Finance. E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2019 and 2020. <https://dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-1/>. Accessed April 2021.

No Impact. There are no new homes associated with the proposed Project and there are no residential structures currently on-site. The proposed Project would be a public utilities operation that would temporarily provide construction jobs in the Woodlake area, which could be readily filled by the existing employment base, given the City's existing unemployment rates. The proposed Project will not affect any regional population, housing, or employment projections anticipated by City policy documents. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

		Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	

- 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:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project site is located in an area that is already served by public service systems. The City of Woodlake Fire Department provides the city and the surrounding area with fire protection services. The Fire Department and the Woodlake Police Department are between one-half mile and two miles east of the proposed Project area. The Woodlake Union School District and Tulare County Office of Education serves the Project area and the City provides several types of parks and other public facilities.

RESPONSES

- 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:

Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site will continue to be served by the City of Woodlake Fire Department, which is between one-half mile and two miles east of the proposed Project basin site. No additional fire personnel or equipment is anticipated, as the site is already served by the Fire Station. The impact is *less than significant*.

Police Protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will continue to be served by the City of Woodlake Police Department. No additional police personnel or equipment is anticipated. The impact is *less than significant*.

Schools?

No Impact. The direct increase in demand for schools is normally associated with new residential projects that bring new families with school-aged children to a region. The proposed Project does not contain any residential uses. The proposed Project, therefore, would not result in an influx of new students in the Project area and is not expected to result in an increased demand upon District resources and would not require the construction of new facilities. There is *no impact*.

Parks?

No Impact. The Project would not result in an increase in demand for parks and recreation facilities because it would not result in an increase in population. Accordingly, the proposed Project would have *no impacts* on parks.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed Project is within the land use and growth projections identified in the City's General Plan and other infrastructure studies. The Project, therefore, would not result in increased demand for, or impacts on, other public facilities such as library services. Accordingly, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Woodlake currently has two developed park sites and one privately owned park site, located in Olivewood Estates. Willow Court Park, containing 3.91 acres, contains a baseball field, playground equipment and a low elevation area designated for storm water detention. Miller-Brown Park, containing 6.74 acres, houses playground equipment, picnic arbors, a skate park feature, and a basketball court. A small watercourse traverses the area. In addition to the city's parks, the athletic fields on the campuses of Woodlake's two school districts provide recreational opportunities after school hours.

RESPONSES

- 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?
- 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?

No Impact. The proposed Project does not include the construction of residential uses and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Therefore, the proposed Project would not cause physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities from increased usage or result in the need for new or expanded recreational facilities. The Project would have *no impact* to existing parks.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/
TRAFFIC

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project is located along Road 196, Bravo Avenue, Blair Road and Ropes Avenue. The Project will be constructed in three phases and entails extending sewer main alignments, replacing existing sewer mains, repairing pavement trenches, utility adjustments, modification of striping and installation of manholes, a sewer lift station, and a by-pass. Woodlake is bisected by SR 216 and SR 245 and the City is situated five miles north of SR 198.

RESPONSES

- a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project, upon completion, would not cause a substantial increase in traffic, reduce the existing level of service, create any additional congestion at any intersections, or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. The installation of sewer mains and the associated improvements will not generate any additional traffic (beyond construction-related traffic trips) and as such, level of service standards would not be exceeded. There are no components of the proposed Project that would increase hazards due to a geometric design feature. As traffic due to construction activities would be temporary in nature; the proposed Project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic or result in inadequate emergency access. Construction schedules pertaining to sewer mains within roadways will be coordinated with police/fire/emergency services. Adequate emergency access will be maintained at all times.

Once installed, the new pipelines would not generate significant additional traffic trips per day, other than as needed for periodic maintenance. Any personnel assigned to maintenance of the sewer system would be expected to generate minimal vehicle trips to and from the site. This operational aspect would not deteriorate the performance of the existing circulation system. The Project will not conflict with any circulation program, plan, ordinance or policy. Emergency access will not be impacted, nor will the site plan increase hazards to the local roadways. Therefore, this impact is *less than significant*.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

RESPONSES

- a). Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less than Significant Impact. A Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) is defined under Public Resources Code section 21074 as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of size and scope, sacred place, and object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included and that is listed or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources or in a local register of historical resources, or if the City of Woodlake, acting as the Lead Agency, supported by substantial evidence, chooses at its discretion to treat the resource as a TCR. As discussed above, under Section V, Cultural Resources, criteria (b) and (d), no known archeological resources, ethnographic sites or Native American remains are located on the proposed Project site. As discussed under criterion (b) implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce impacts to unknown archaeological deposits, including TCRs, to a less than significant level. As discussed under criterion (d), compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would reduce the likelihood of disturbing or discovering human remains, including those of Native Americans.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has performed a Sacred Lands File search for sites located on or near the Project site, with negative results. The NAHC also provided a consultation list of tribal governments with traditional lands or cultural places located within the project area. An opportunity has been provided to Native American tribes listed by the Native American Heritage Commission during the CEQA process as required by AB 52. No responses were received by the City in response to the consultation request within the mandatory response timeframes; therefore, this Initial Study has been completed consistent and compliant with AB 52. Any impacts to TCR would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: No additional measures are required.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Visalia Landfill plant is approximately 15.5 miles southwest of the proposed Project site, while the Woodlake Wastewater Treatment Plant is located between 0.7 and 2.0 miles southeast of the site.

RESPONSES

- a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- c. 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?
- d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes the installation of new sewer mains and the associated improvements. The proposed Project would not require service for water or solid waste disposal. The Project is intended to be a substantial expansion the City of Woodlake's existing sewer system. Therefore, the City of Woodlake's utilities and service systems would be improved by the new sewer mains and aforementioned additions. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Human activities such as smoking, debris burning, and equipment operation are the major causes of wildland fires. Within Tulare County, over 1,029,130 acres (33% of the total area) are classified as “Very High” fire threat and approximately 454,680 acres (15% of the total area) are classified as “High” fire threat. The portion of the county that transitions from the valley floor into the foothills and mountains is characterized by high to very high threat of wildland fires.¹⁹ While the City of Woodlake is nestled at the base of the foothills, the majority of the City is developed into urban uses or in active agriculture, severely

¹⁹ Tulare County General Plan Background Report. February 2010. Page 8-21.

reducing the risk of wildland fire. According to the Tulare County Background Report Figure 8-2, the majority of the City has no threat of wildfire. The proposed Project site is relatively flat in an area actively utilized with primarily industrial and agricultural uses.

RESPONSES

- a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in an area developed with industrial and agricultural uses, which precludes the risk of wildfire. The area is flat in nature which would limit the risk of downslope flooding and landslides, and limit any wildfire spread.

To receive building permits, the proposed Project would be required to be in compliance with the adopted emergency response plan. As such, any wildfire risk to the project structures or people would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

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 prehistory?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

RESPONSES

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 prehistory?

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the proposed Project is not expected to have substantial impact on the environment or on any resources identified in the Initial Study. Mitigation measures have been incorporated in the Project to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant*.

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)?

Less than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. Due to the nature of the Project and consistency with environmental policies, incremental contributions to impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable. The proposed Project would not contribute substantially to adverse cumulative conditions, or create any substantial indirect impacts (i.e., increase in population could lead to an increase need for housing, increase in traffic, air pollutants, etc.). The impact is *less than significant*.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the project is not expected to have substantial impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Mitigation measures have been incorporated in the Project to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant*.

LIST OF PREPARERS

Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.

- Emily Bowen, LEED AP, Principal Environmental Planner
- Travis Crawford, AICP, Principal Environmental Planner
- Caroline Gibbons, Assistant Planner

Persons and Agencies Consulted

City of Woodlake

- Jason Waters, Community Services Director
- Rebecca Griswold, Planner I

Appendix A

Roadway Construction

Emissions Model

Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0

Daily Emission Estimates for -> Woodlake Sewer Extension Project														
Project Phases (Pounds)	ROG (lbs/day)	CO (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	Total PM10 (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM10 (lbs/day)	Fugitive Dust PM10 (lbs/day)	Total PM2.5 (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM2.5 (lbs/day)	Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (lbs/day)	SOx (lbs/day)	CO2 (lbs/day)	CH4 (lbs/day)	N2O (lbs/day)	CO2e (lbs/day)
Grubbing/Land Clearing	1.44	12.14	13.86	5.61	0.61	5.00	1.58	0.54	1.04	0.03	2,576.97	0.61	0.05	2,608.11
Grading/Excavation	6.01	49.01	64.72	7.80	2.80	5.00	3.56	2.52	1.04	0.10	10,067.65	2.90	0.13	10,178.74
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	3.62	31.95	35.26	6.66	1.66	5.00	2.56	1.52	1.04	0.06	6,060.39	1.22	0.09	6,116.89
Paving	1.84	19.69	16.65	0.95	0.95	0.00	0.84	0.84	0.00	0.03	3,227.46	0.78	0.06	3,265.32
Maximum (pounds/day)	6.01	49.01	64.72	7.80	2.80	5.00	3.56	2.52	1.04	0.10	10,067.65	2.90	0.13	10,178.74
Total (tons/construction project)	0.54	4.61	5.56	0.81	0.25	0.56	0.34	0.23	0.12	0.01	909.48	0.23	0.01	919.12

Notes: Project Start Year -> 2021
 Project Length (months) -> 12
 Total Project Area (acres) -> 5
 Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (acres) -> 1
 Water Truck Used? -> Yes

Phase	Total Material Imported/Exported Volume (yd ³ /day)		Daily VMT (miles/day)			
	Soil	Asphalt	Soil Hauling	Asphalt Hauling	Worker Commute	Water Truck
Grubbing/Land Clearing	0	0	0	0	480	40
Grading/Excavation	0	0	0	0	1,080	40
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	0	0	0	0	800	40
Paving	0	0	0	0	680	40

PM10 and PM2.5 estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified.

Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns G and H. Total PM2.5 emissions shown in Column I are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns J and K.

CO2e emissions are estimated by multiplying mass emissions for each GHG by its global warming potential (GWP), 1, 25 and 298 for CO2, CH4 and N2O, respectively. Total CO2e is then estimated by summing CO2e estimates over all GHGs.

Total Emission Estimates by Phase for -> Woodlake Sewer Extension Project														
Project Phases (Tons for all except CO2e. Metric tonnes for CO2e)	ROG (tons/phase)	CO (tons/phase)	NOx (tons/phase)	Total PM10 (tons/phase)	Exhaust PM10 (tons/phase)	Fugitive Dust PM10 (tons/phase)	Total PM2.5 (tons/phase)	Exhaust PM2.5 (tons/phase)	Fugitive Dust PM2.5 (tons/phase)	SOx (tons/phase)	CO2 (tons/phase)	CH4 (tons/phase)	N2O (tons/phase)	CO2e (MT/phase)
Grubbing/Land Clearing	0.02	0.16	0.18	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	34.02	0.01	0.00	31.23
Grading/Excavation	0.32	2.59	3.42	0.41	0.15	0.26	0.19	0.13	0.05	0.01	531.57	0.15	0.01	487.56
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	0.17	1.48	1.63	0.31	0.08	0.23	0.12	0.07	0.05	0.00	279.99	0.06	0.00	256.37
Paving	0.04	0.39	0.33	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	63.90	0.02	0.00	58.65
Maximum (tons/phase)	0.32	2.59	3.42	0.41	0.15	0.26	0.19	0.13	0.05	0.01	531.57	0.15	0.01	487.56
Total (tons/construction project)	0.54	4.61	5.56	0.81	0.25	0.56	0.34	0.23	0.12	0.01	909.48	0.23	0.01	833.82

PM10 and PM2.5 estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified.

Total PM10 emissions shown in column F are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns G and H. Total PM2.5 emissions shown in Column I are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions shown in columns J and K.

CO2e emissions are estimated by multiplying mass emissions for each GHG by its global warming potential (GWP), 1, 25 and 298 for CO2, CH4 and N2O, respectively. Total CO2e is then estimated by summing CO2e estimates over all GHGs.

The CO2e emissions are reported as metric tons per phase.

Appendix B

CHRIS Search Results



To: Emily Bowen
Crawford Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291

Record Search 21-098

Date: March 29, 2021

Re: City of Woodlake Sewer Expansion Project

County: Tulare

Map(s): Ivanhoe & Woodlake 7.5'

CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.

The following are the results of a search of the cultural resource files at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. These files include known and recorded cultural resources sites, inventory and excavation reports filed with this office, and resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the OHP Built Environment Resources Directory, California State Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest. Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the OHP are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area.

PRIOR CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS

According to the information in our files, there have been two previous cultural resource studies conducted within the project area, TU-00426 and TU-01445. There have been ten cultural resource studies conducted within a one-half mile radius, TU-00015, 00409, 00443, 01013, 01014, 01196, 01389, 01392, 01498, and 01813.

KNOWN/RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS

There is one recorded resource within the project area, P-54-004632, an historic era railroad. There are five recorded resources within the one-half mile radius, P-54-003992, 004003, 004034, 004614, and 004875. These resources consist of historic era storage tanks, Bravo Lake, another historic era railroad, an historic era canal, and an historic era ditch.

Resource P-54-004614, the Friant-Kern Canal, has been given a National Register Status Code of 2S2, indicating this property has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places by a consensus through the Section 106 process. The resource is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources. There are no other recorded cultural resources within the project area or radius that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We understand this project consists of improvement and expansion of the existing sewer system in the City of Woodlake. Further, we understand the project activities will take place in the existing right-of way of several roadways. As such, no further cultural resource investigation is recommended at this time. However, if cultural resources are unearthed during project activities, all work must halt in the area of the find and a qualified, professional consultant should be called out to assess the findings and make the appropriate mitigation recommendations. A list of qualified consultants can be found at www.chrisinfo.org.

We also recommend that you contact the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento. They will provide you with a current list of Native American individuals/organizations that can assist you with information regarding cultural resources that may not be included in the CHRIS Inventory and that may be of concern to the Native groups in the area. The Commission can consult their "Sacred Lands Inventory" file to determine what sacred resources, if any, exist within this project area and the way in which these resources might be managed. Finally, please consult with the lead agency on this project to determine if any other cultural resource investigation is required. If you need any additional information or have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (661) 654-2289.

By:

Celeste M. Thomson, Coordinator

Date: March 29, 2021

Please note that invoices for Information Center services will be sent under separate cover from the California State University, Bakersfield Accounting Office.