INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title: Replacement Well Project

2. Lead agency: Woodville Public Utility District

16716 Avenue 168 Woodville, CA 93258

3. Contact person: Dennis R. Keller

Dennis R. Keller

Consulting Civil Engineer, Inc.

(559) 732-7938

4. Project location: Northeast corner of Road 164 and Avenue 164

(extension)

A portion of Section 19, Township 21 South, Range 26 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, Tulare County, California. A portion of Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 233-190-021, 233-150-014 and 233-150-016.

5. Latitude, Longitude: 36°05'15.8" N, 119°12'19.7" W

6. General plan designation: Mixed use (General Plan Policy PF 2.6); Project consistent with General Plan Policy PFS-2.5. (See Exhibit A, Tulare County Administrative decision

No. 0510.)

7. Zoning: R-1-M (Single Family Residential - Special Mobile

Home)

8. Description of project: The proposed Replacement Well Project (Project) calls

The proposed Replacement Well Project (Project) calls for the drilling, casing and development of a permanent municipal drinking water supply well. The well will be equipped with a water lubricated pump, electric motor and chlorine disinfection system and a hydropneumatic tank fabricated and installed for pressure control purposes. On-site improvements are proposed to include fencing, site surfacing and lighting. The electrical connection is to the Southern California Edison electrical grid. The well installation is proposed to be furnished with a standby diesel fueled generator to address power service during serving utility outage conditions.

The well is to be constructed on existing District controlled land. A transmission pipeline is proposed to be constructed to connect the completed production well to the existing District water distribution system. Other off-site improvements are to include an access road from the well site to a public road. Site drainage provisions

are tied to the existing adjacent Tulare County storm water basin. Easements and permits are required to be obtained to accommodate construction, operation, maintenance and replacement of off-site improvements. See Exhibit A for Figure A, General Project Location.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The surrounding land use is agricultural, vacant land. Residences are located within 170 feet of the well site.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required

State Water Resources Control Board, Tulare County, San Joaquin Valley Air District and Lower Tule River Irrigation District.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The	environmental factors checked le checklist and subsequent discussion	pelow would be potentially affection on the following pages.	cted by this project, as indicated by	
	Aesthetics	Agriculture & Forestry	☐ Air Quality	
	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils	
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	
	Land Use/Planning	Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	
	Population/Housing	☐ Public Services	Recreation	
□ <i>′</i>	Transportation/Traffic	Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	
DET	ERMINATION: (To be complete	ed by the Lead Agency)		
On t	he basis of this initial evaluation:			
	I find that the proposed proje NEGATIVE DECLARATION	ct COULD NOT have a significa N will be prepared.	ant effect on the environment, and a	
\boxtimes	I find that although the propo will not be a significant effect agreed to by the project pro- prepared.	t in this case because revisions i	ant effect on the environment, there in the project have been made by or GATIVE DECLARATION will be	
	I find that the proposed pro ENVIRONMENTAL IMPAC	ject MAY have a significant of TREPORT is required.	effect on the environment, and an	
	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.			
Signa	ature K. Cle	01	March 7072 Date	
	uis Keller, Consulting Civil Engin		blic Utility District	
r11111	ed name	For		

Issues:

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? The Proposed Project does not result in a change in the scenic characteristics of the site and surrounding agricultural areas. The site consists of a water production well, chlorine disinfection system, hydropneumatic tank, fencing, site surfacing, electrical and a standby electrical generator. The well site is about 170 feet from the nearest public road and residential homes. The Project also includes underground pipelines to connect the new well to the existing water distribution system, electrical power underground conduit and an access road.				⊠
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? There are no scenic resources on or near the Proposed Project site and pipeline access road alignments. The Project is not located adjacent to or near a state scenic highway.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? The Proposed Project would occur on District controlled lands and on public entity lands secured with permission by the controlling agency. Historically, all of or portions of the Proposed Project site have been farmed, periodically left in a fallowed condition, or utilized for agricultural irrigation water conveyance and recbarge facilities.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? The Proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. A light pole is proposed to be installed at the well site. Given the location of well site, as described in "I.a." above, the proposed light pole will have no adverse impact.				

II. AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timherland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? All land impacted by the Project is inside the urban development boundary. The following describes the well site: 1) The land for the proposed well site is a (65'x119') easement dedicated to the Woodville Public Utility District per Tract No. 702, recorded June 6, 1996, Book 37 of Maps at Page 44, Tulare County Recorder; 2) Land use is "Mixed Use" (See Exhibit A, Tulare County Administrative Decision No. 0510). The land for the proposed pipelines is located on land dedicated for public use or land currently used for agricultural irrigation. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the Tulare County Important Farmland 2016 map showed the well site to be identified as "Prime Farmland" and the pipeline alignments identified as "Prime Farmland" or "Urban and Built-up Land."

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

<u>II.</u>	AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES (continued)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? No. The Proposed Project site is not located on land subject to 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 in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? There are no forest lands within the boundary of the Proposed Project.				\boxtimes
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? No. See response to II.c.				\boxtimes
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? See response to H. a.				⊠

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
would the project: a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable air quality plan. During construction, however, the District and the selected contractor(s) would be required to comply with the San Joaquin Valley Air District's Regulation VIII. See additional information below.				\boxtimes
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? See response to III. a.				\boxtimes
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? See response to III. a.				\boxtimes
 d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? See response to III. a. 				\boxtimes
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? The Proposed Project consists of a municipal water well and a pipeline and will not create objectionable odors. The Project Well site sits approximately 1/3 mile west of the Woodville Elementary School boundary.				\boxtimes

Additional Information: The air quality impacts from the construction activities and the annual operation and maintenance activities from the operation of the Proposed Project have been evaluated using CalEEMod against thresholds established by the San Joaquin Valley Air District and are estimated to be well below any threshold.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? A biological reconnaissance field survey was conducted on September 10, 2019, to determine if sensitive species, habitats, or other environmental issues occur on the site. The survey included a field visit and search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). The proposed well site is a previously disced fallow field adjacent to several residences within the unincorporated community of Woodville, California. The pipeline installation area adjacent to the well site is a fallow field that was previously disced, an elementary school and the field vard of the Lower Tule River Irrigation District. No sensitive species were observed on or adjacent to the Proposed Project site during the biological survey. No sensitive species tracks, trails, diggings, and scat (feces), or prey remains were observed on or near the Project site during the survey. Habitats for sensitive species (e.g. vernal ponds, creeks, rivers, marshes, pools, swamps. sloughs, sandv washes. estuaries, cliffs, caves, riparian, meadows, woodlands, savannahs, playas, alkaline soils, adobe-heavy clay soils, alkali sink habitat, chenopod scrub habitat, juniper-sage flats, grasslands with rolling hills) are not present on or adjacent to the Proposed Project site, and this these species do not occur on or adjacent to the Project site. Sensitive habitats such as riparian, creeks, streams or wetlands do not occur on or adjacent to the Proposed Project site. Though no sensitive species were observed, as an avoidance measure, a preconstruction survey is recommended to be conducted prior to any ground disturbing

Less than Significant With Less than Potentially Significant Mitigation Significant Impact Incorporation Impact No Impact \boxtimes П П

activities to ensure that no sensitive species, such as ground nesting birds, have moved onto the Project site.

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? A biological reconnaissance survey conducted in September, 2019, did not identify the presence of riparian habitat on or adjacent to the Proposed Project Site.		
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, hut not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? A biological reconnaissance survey conducted in September, 2019, did not identify any wetlands on or adjacent to the Proposed Project Site.		
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? The Proposed Project would not result in circumstances that would impede movement of common native wildlife.		×
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? The Proposed Project is not in conflict with the Draft Woodville Community Plan-2019 which is a part of the General Plan Policies of Tulare County.		×
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 Habitat Conservation Plan has been identified for the Proposed Project area.		\boxtimes

Additional Information: A Biological Reconnaissance and Survey Report was completed in September, 2019, that included a field survey completed in September, 2019. The Report included a search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? The Class III inventory/Phase I survey fieldwork was conducted on October 24, 2019 with parallel transects spaced at 15-meter intervals walked along the approximately 9-acre total survey area. No cultural resources of any kind were identified within the survey area. Based on these results, the Woodville PUD Well Replacement Project does not have the potential to result in significant impacts or adverse effects to historic resources or historic properties and a finding of No Historic Properties Affected was recommended.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? A search of NAHC Sacred Lands File was completed. Using the NAHC contact list, five tribes were contacted to determine if culturally sensitive resources were known to exist within or around the Proposed Project area, if they had specific concerns about the project. According to the NAHC and the contacted tribes, no other archaeological resources, sacred sites, traditional cultural places or trial cultural resources were known within or adjacent to the Proposed Project Site. Based on the results of the records search, the study area was considered to have low archaeological sensitivity. The Phase I survey fieldwork was conducted on 24 October, 2019, with parallel transects spaced at 15-meter intervals walked along the entire approximately 9-ac Project APE. No historical or archaeological resources of any kind were present within the study area.				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? The study area falls on the Tule River Fan. According to the geoarchaeological model developed by				\boxtimes

	Meyer et al. (2010), the study area has a very low potential for buried archaeological deposits. Buried sites and cultural resources are therefore considered to be unlikely within the Project APE.		
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? See response to V.b. Measures shall be implemented during construction to address discovery of human remains or other archaeological resources.		\boxtimes

<u>Additional Information:</u> A Class III Inventory/Phase I Field Survey was completed in November, 2019, that included field surveys, record surveys and tribal contacts.

<u>VI</u>	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially	Less than Significant With	Less than	
	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 hased on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. According to Table 4 in Special Publication 42, prepared hy the California Divisions of Mines and Geology, the nearest city which is affected by earthquake fault zones is the City of Bakersfield which is located approximately 50 miles south of the Proposed Project area. Additionally, the Proposed Project, as located, is not shown in an area designated to be affected by active earthquake fault zones.				
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? See response to VI.a(i).				\boxtimes
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? See response to VI.a(i).				\boxtimes
	iv) Landslides? See response to VI.a(i).				\boxtimes
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? The Project site is level.				\boxtimes
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? See VI.a. The Draft Woodville Community Plan 2019 indicated soil types of loam to sandy loam with low to moderate shrink swell potential.				⊠
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? The Proposed Project does not include the construction of permanent dwelling structures.				

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (continued)

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? The Proposed Project is to construct and develop a municipal water well, install pipelines and ancillary facilities and furnish water to the Community of Woodville. This question does		
	not apply.		

Less than Significant VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Potentially With Less than Would the project: Significant Significant Mitigation Impact Incorporation Impact No Impact a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? The Proposed Project estimated is to generate approximately 176 metric tons (MT) of emissions during construction and about 105 \Box \Box \boxtimes \Box MT of emissions during annual operations, both which are significantly less than the 25,000 MT of emissions action threshold. Consequently, the Proposed Project will not have a significant impact as to greenhouse gas emissions. b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? Proposed Project should not conflict with any \Box X applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOU 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? The weste will be equipped with a disinfection system. Typically the disinfection system. Typically the disinfection system consists of a dosing pump that is connected the discharge pipe and a thirty (30) galled drum or larger of hypochlorite solution (12.5% chlorine). For a typical well site Woodville, the solution use is about 1 gallons per day, depending on the time year. The routine transport and use of the material is done in accordance with the material's Material Safety Data She (MSDS). During the course of construction the contractor and his use of any hazardo materials is regulated by appropria California and federal laws.	se, ell on m to on on in -5 of he he et n, us			
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or to environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving to release of hazardous materials into the environment? The Project will include containment system for the sodius hypochlorite solution.	ole he he			
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, waste within one-quarter mile of an existing proposed school? Woodville Elementa School is located about 1,760 feet east of twell site. The sodium hypochlorite solution will be housed in a containment system at the containment system will he located insite a six foot high chain link fence with lock gates. The handling and use of the materiposes no risk to Woodville Elementa School.	or or ry he on id de ed al		\boxtimes	

	II. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS ATERIALS (continued)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? The Proposed Project site is not a hazardous materials site. The site is not on the "Cortese list." The closest "Cortese list" site is located in Porterville which is about 10 miles east of the site.				\boxtimes
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 for people residing or working in the project area? The Proposed Project site is located approximately nine (9) miles from the closest public airport (Porterville Airport).				\boxtimes
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? No. See response to VIII.e.				\boxtimes
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Given the nature of this Project and the small quantity of chemicals to be stored, no impairment is likely.				
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? The Proposed Project site consists of leveled, vacant land and level land used for agricultural purposes. No changes in adjacent land uses are proposed.				\boxtimes

IX. 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? Upon completion of the construction, the well site will be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? The well is to replace the capacity from an existing well with water quality that currently is near or exceeds the State's maximum contaminant levels for Nitrates.				
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? The Proposed Project well site (65'x119') would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area as to erosion or siltation. Provisions will be made to discharge storm water to an adjacent storm basin dedicated to Tulare County.				
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? The Proposed Project well site (65'x119') would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area regarding flooding. Provisions will be made to discharge storm water to an adjacent storm basin dedicated to Tulare County.				

(c	IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (continued) Would the project:		Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide suhstantial additional sources of polluted runoff? See response to IX.d.				\boxtimes
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? The Proposed Project, whether during construction or following completion, would not degrade water quality. The well will be constructed to local and State water well standards.				
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? There are no dwelling units to be constructed as part of the Proposed Project.				×
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? The Proposed Project site is located outside the 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) according to the County of Tulare General Plan, Background Report, Figure 8-1, Flood Hazards. See Exhibit A.				\boxtimes
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levce or dam? See response to IX.h.				\boxtimes
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? The Proposed Project site is located over 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not subject to inundation by tsunami. The Proposed Project site is not located adjacent to an enclosed body of water that could be subject to a seiche. The Proposed Project site is not located in an area where mud flows occur.				

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impost
a)	Physically divide an established community? The Proposed Project area is located on the southwest corner of the unincorporated community of Woodville. See Figure A in Exhibit A.			Impaçı	No Impact
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? According to Tulare County Administrative Decision No. 0510, the water well replacement proposal is consistent with the adopted plans and policies of the County of Tulare. (See Exhibit A).				
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? No Habitat Conservation Plan has been identified for the Project area. The Proposed Project well site consists of leveled, vacant land or agricultural land. The Proposed Project pipeline alignments consist of leveled land utilized for agricultural irrigation.				\boxtimes
<u>XI.</u>	MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant With	Less than	
We	ould the project:	Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	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? No portion of the Proposed Project site is located within the California Mineral Land Classification System (CMLCS) Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) or Aggregate Resource Area (ARA) according to Open File Report 97-01.				
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? See response to XI.a.				\boxtimes

	I. NOISE ould the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant	N- 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? Upon completion, the Proposed Project will not exhibit an increase in existing noise levels, except during emergency power outages when the emergency generator will operate and during periodic operation of the emergency generator for operation and maintenance purposes of about 20 hours per year. The proposed emergency generator will be equipped with sound attenuation provisions. During construction, potential exists for boundary noise in excess of the Tulare County's General Plan standards. The selected contractors will be required by construction specification provisions to abide by all applicable laws and limit noise generation.		Incorporation	Impact	
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? See response to XII.a.				\boxtimes
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? See response to XII.a.				\boxtimes
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? See response to XII.a.				\boxtimes
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The Proposed Project is not located within the impact area of an airport land use plan. The nearest public airport (Porterville Airport) is approximately nine (9) miles away. See response to XILa.				⊠

XII. NOISE (continued)

Would	the	proj	ject:
-------	-----	------	-------

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? There is no private airstrip in the vicinity of the Proposed		\boxtimes
	Project area. See response to XII.a.		

XIII. 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)? The scope of Proposed Project is to replace the production capacity from an existing water well that is near or exceeds the State's maximum contaminant level for Nitrates. The potential exists that additional building (housing) could occur on parcels within the Urban Development Boundary (UDB). This, however, is a result of growth management and is the purpose of the UDB.				
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing bousing, necessitating the construction of replacement bousing elsewhere? The Proposed Project well site is located on District controlled land. The Proposed Project well site does not displace or otherwise affect existing housing. The Proposed Project pipeline alignments under consideration will not displace any existing housing.				\boxtimes
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? See response to XIII.b.				\boxtimes

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impac
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:				
The water production and distribution system facilities represent the only public services affected. Temporary water shut-offs may he required to the existing system in the areas affected by construction when new water pipelines are connected to the existing water pipelines.				
Fire protection?				\boxtimes
Police protection?				\boxtimes
Schools?				\boxtimes
Parks?				\boxtimes
Other public facilities?				\boxtimes

XV. 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 he accelerated? The Proposed Project will have no impact on existing parks or recreational facilities.				×
h) 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? The Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities.				\boxtimes

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Import
a)					No Impact
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? All construction activities will be performed on District controlled land or within granted pipeline easements or public rights of way, which would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.				\boxtimes
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? See response to XVI.a.				\boxtimes
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? See response to XVI.a.				\boxtimes
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? During pipeline construction, the contractor will be required, under provisions of an issued county encroachment permit, to provide emergency access at all times.				

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Less than Significant		
(continued)	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? See response to YVI a				\boxtimes

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
the applica Board? D discharge	astewater treatment requirements of able Regional Water Quality Control loes not apply. A permit for waste is not anticipated to he required for sed Project.				
water or expansion of which of effects? T new water checklist,	wastewater treatment facilities or of existing facilities, the construction could cause significant environmental he Proposed Project will result in er facilities. As discussed in this the construction of said facilities generate adverse environmental				⊠
storm water existing for could cause The Propwill direct dedicated	r result in the construction of new er drainage facilities or expansion of acilities, the construction of which se significant environmental effects? cosed Project's well site (65'x119') et storm water to a storm hasin to Tulare County and will not difficant environmental effects.				\boxtimes
the project resources, needed? I water sup required to	cient water supplies available to serve ct from existing entitlements and or are new or expanded entitlements. The Proposed Project is a municipal oply project. The well driller will be to apply to the County of Tulare for lling permit.				\boxtimes
treatment the project the project provider's Proposed					

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (continued)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Solid waste generation associated with the Proposed Project will occur during the construction phase. Specifications will require proper handling and disposal of construction-related materials in accordance with federal, state and local statutes and regulations. In general, the construction-related materials (i.e., concrete, soil, etc.) can be recycled. The operation of the water well will not generate solid wastes.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? See response to XVII. f.				\boxtimes

Less than XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF Significant **SIGNIFICANCE** Potentially With Less than Significant Mitigation Significant Would the project: Impact Incorporation Impact No Impact 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? As described in the previous sections, the Proposed Project will not result in any adverse impacts. Any short-term related П X impacts that might occur during construction would be mandated to a less than significant level based on Proposed Project design and/or construction specification requirements. Though no sensitive species observed during the biological reconnaissance field survey conducted on September 10, 2019, a pre-construction survey is proposed to be conducted prior to any ground disturbing activities to ensure that no sensitive species, such as ground nesting hirds, have moved onto the site and could potentially be impacted by construction

activities.

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)?	П	\boxtimes
	The Proposed Project is not part of a tiered or serial project. There are no elements of other projects which rely on the completion of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the individual considerations of the Proposed Project and their described potential impacts do not have related impacts on other projects which need to be collectively analyzed.		1 -2
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		\boxtimes
	No single or cumulative adverse effects on the human population have been identified.		

- 1. Figure A: General Project Location;
- 2. Tulare County Administrative Decision No. 0510;
- EnviroStor screen print showing no cleanup sites or permitted sites inside the Project Area; and
- 4. Figure 8-1: Flood Hazards.

KELLER/WEGLEY

BEFORE THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF INVESTIGATION AND)	
REPORT OF PROPOSED REPLACEMENT WELL)	Administrative Decision No. 0510
FOR THE WOODVILLE PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT)	
/GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL NO. GPR 18-007)	

Decision of the Planning Director of the County of Tulare regarding the replacement of an existing Woodville Public Utility District water production well and appurtenances, in order to improve their water supply reliability capability and finding of consistency with the Tulare County General Plan for Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 233-190-021, located on the west side of Road 164 (Louise Street), approximately 406 feet south of Camara Avenue, in the Community of Woodville; Section 19, Township 21S, Range 26E, MDB&M, on an easement in favor of the Woodville Public Utility District for a water well site, per Subdivision Tract Map No. TM 702, recorded on June 6, 1996 as Document No. 96-040328, to be utilized as a new well site for a public water system to provide service to the Community of Woodville. (The Woodville Public Utility District's address is 16716 Road 168, Tulare CA 93274. Agent Dennis Keller's address is PO Box 911, Visalia CA 93279-0911.)

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 65402 and Public Resources Code Section 21151.2, the Planning Director reviewed the written report prepared by the Resource Management Agency Staff in connection with General Plan Referral No. GPR 17-004; and

WHEREAS, APN 233-190-021 is zoned R-1-M (Single Family Residential-Special Mobilehome), which allows public water systems and other public utility structures, upon approval of a special use permit; and

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 53091(e) states, Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water...; therefore, the state (including a water district) supersedes the County's zoning ordinance and no special use permit would be required in this instance; and

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 66428(a) (2) exempts a public entity from the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act Government Code Section 66411; and

WHEREAS, the proposed site is located within the Urban Development Boundary of Woodville, which does not have an adopted Community Plan. Until such time as a Community Plan is adopted, the land use designation shall be Mixed Use as per General Plan Policy PF 2.6: Land Use Consistency. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan Policy PFS-2.5: New Systems or Individual Wells and the Resource Land Use Designation: Mixed Use, which typically allows necessary public utility structures; and

WHEREAS, the Woodville Public Utility District is in the process of preparing application to the State Water Resources Control Board to fund the construction of a new drinking water well and appurtenances. The well site was previously deeded to the District for the development of a municipal drinking water well.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

The Planning Director of the County of Tulare hereby adopts the report made by Resource Management Agency (RMA) Staff in Case No. GPR 18-007, development of the previously deeded well site is consistent with the adopted plans and policies of the County of Tulare.

TULARE COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Reed Schenke, P.E. Director
By: _ Cai N Do
Aaron Bock, Interim Assistant Director, Economic Development and Planning Branch
Date Approved: /2.08.16
By: Withe Phal
Michael Washam, Associate Director Resource Management Agency
Date Approved: 12/5/16



