

**NOTICE OF EXEMPTION**

To:  Office of Planning & Research  
1400 Tenth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: San Juan Water District  
9935 Auburn-Folsom Road  
Granite Bay, CA 95746

County Clerk  
County of Placer  
2954 Richardson Drive  
Auburn, CA 95603  
(530) 886-5600

Project Title: Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project

Project Applicant: San Juan Water District (SJWD)

Project Location - Specific: The Project is located on San Juan Water District project in Placer County. APN(s) 046-050-007 and 046-050-009.

Project Location - Cities: Granite Bay Project Location - Counties: Placer

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project: The Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project includes the replacement of the existing reservoir with no increase in service/capacity. The replacement would add fire suppression and account for necessary system redundancy. See additional pages attached.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: San Juan Water District

Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: San Juan Water District

Exempt Status: (check one)

- Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
- Categorical Exemption (State type and section number); Replacement/Reconstruction & Minor Alterations to Land; 15301 (c), 15302 (c), 15304 (c)
- Statutory Exemption (State code number);


Reasons why project is exempt: Project is a replacement/reconstruction of an existing reservoir with minor alterations to the project site.

Lead Agency: San Juan Water District

Contact Person: Andrew Pierson (916) 791-6912  
Area Code / Telephone / Extension

If filed by applicant:

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project?  Yes  No

Signature:  Date: 4/1/2022 Title: Engineering Services Manager

Signed by Lead Agency  Signed by Applicant

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resources Code.  
Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public Resources Code.

Date Received for filing at OPR: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project applicant is proposing the replacement of the existing Kokila Reservoir with no increase in system capacity/service. The project would replace the existing 4.56 million-gallon (MG) membrane system with a new 4 MG partially buried, prestressed concrete water reservoir to increase public safety through additional fire suppression and to provide system redundancy. The tank/inlet would be 17 feet higher (507 feet) than the existing reservoir (490 feet), and the maximum operating water surface (MOWS) would be 521 feet.

## PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on San Juan Water District (District) property within a residential area in the community of Granite Bay, Placer County. The project site consists of two APNs: 046-050-007 and 046-050-009, which total 3.24 acres. The project site is generally bordered by residential parcels to the north, Granite Bay Hilltop Seventh-day Adventist Church/Amazing Facts Ministries to the west, a Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) sub-station to the east, and undeveloped oak woodland to the south. The project site is located in Mount Diablo Meridian Township 11 North, Range 7 East, Section 28 of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute Rocklin, California quadrangle map.

The proposed project is 3.24 acres, and the limits of disturbance and tank footprint are fully within this project boundary. The project site is located on relatively flat terrain on the southside of Sierra College Boulevard between Ridge Park Drive to the northeast, and Nightwatch Drive to the west. The project site is accessed through an existing easement in the neighboring church parking lot that has a driveway off of Sierra College Boulevard. The property is located on a slightly raised plateau off of Sierra College Boulevard. The project site is flat in the northern portion where the existing reservoir is located, and slopes steeply downward to the south at the edge of the reservoir. Elevation of the project site ranges from approximately 445-505 feet above mean sea level, with a steep and abrupt downward slope from north to south. The undeveloped oak woodland to the south has been maintained for fire suppression and is disturbed to some degree. A chain link currently surrounds the existing reservoir, and an emergency overflow pipe is located directly south of the reservoir.

The project components would be located in Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard, outside the 100-year flood zone mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2012). The project site is not in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The General Plan land use designation for the project area is Rural Estate (RE), 4.6-20 acre minimum. The zoning designation for the project area is Farm Building Site Density (F-B-X), 20 acre minimum.

The project is not located on tribal or federal land. As discussed in the Cultural Resources Assessment (HELIX 2021) prepared for the project, a search of the Sacred Lands File by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) did not indicate that sensitive Native American resources are located in the area, although one tribe, Wilton Rancheria, requested formal tribal consultation under Assembly Bill 52. The formal consultation is included as Attachment B in the Cultural Resources Assessment, included as Appendix C to the Environmental Package.

## ENVIRONMENTAL ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

This section supplements the Environmental Package component of the Financial Assistance Application for the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund to analyze alternatives to the proposed Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project (project). The analysis is based primarily on the technical studies and Categorical Exemption (CE) prepared for the project.

This analysis includes the following:

- Range of feasible project alternatives that each meet the project needs and objectives, as well as a “no project/no action” alternative;
- Comparative environmental analysis among the project alternatives that includes discussions of beneficial and adverse environmental impacts on the existing environment, future environment, and individual sensitive environmental issues identified through project management or public participation;
- Analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on sensitive environmental resources, if applicable, for each project alternative considered;
- Potential reasonably foreseeable future environmental impacts, if applicable, for each project alternative considered;
- Appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives, if appropriate, to mitigate adverse environmental impacts; and,
- Discussion of the environmental reasoning for selection of the chosen alternative for the project.

### Environmental Impacts Analysis of Alternatives

Specific key objectives of the project include the following:

1. Increase public safety through additional fire suppression.
2. Provide water system redundancy.

For the purposes of this Environmental Alternative Analysis, the following alternatives are analyzed:

- **Alternative 1: Replace Existing Reservoir with Prestressed Concrete Tank (Proposed Project).** In this alternative, the existing reservoir would be replaced with a prestressed concrete tank in approximately the same footprint. The stored volume would not change. This alternative appears to be feasible.
- **Alternative 2: Relocate Storage.** In this alternative, the District would store water at another location in the northern part of the Zone. This alternative is infeasible because the District does not own another site at the desired elevation to provide a large enough storage tank to meet the storage requirements shown to be necessary in the Master Plan.
- **Alternative 3: No Project.** Under this alternative, the proposed water system replacement would not be constructed, and the District could continue to use the existing reservoir by repairing the reservoir materials as they fail. The existing liner and cover material at the reservoir is no longer available. There are alternative materials that may be used. This

alternative is not acceptable because the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir are all the same age and would likely all fail within a relatively short time frame. Water storage in the northern part of the Bacon Pressure Zone (Zone) is critical for system operation and would not sustain a prolonged unplanned outage. Alternative 3 would also fail to provide for system redundancy and fire suppression services.

Table 1, *Beneficial/Adverse Environmental Impacts and Sensitive Environmental Issues*, describes the beneficial and adverse environmental impacts on the existing and future environment of the project alternatives as well as sensitive environmental issues identified through project management.

The alternatives analyzed have a range of potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on sensitive environmental resources as described in Table 2, *Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts on Sensitive Environmental Resources*.

**Table 1**  
**Beneficial/Adverse Environmental Impacts and Sensitive Environmental Issues**

Alternative	Beneficial Environmental Impacts on Existing Environment	Beneficial Environmental Impacts on Future Environment	Adverse Environmental Impacts on Existing Environment	Adverse Environmental Impacts on Future Environment	Individual Sensitive Environmental Issues Identified Through Project Management or Public Participation, if applicable
Alternative 1: Proposed Project	Addresses degradation of the existing system that has come to the end of its life; provides water system redundancy; provides an additional source of fire suppression.	Resolve the existing water quality issues and potentially unsafe conditions of the existing reservoir that could lead to future emergencies including the likelihood that the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir could all fail within a relatively short time frame.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts such as biological resources.</li> <li>• Potential to encounter cultural resources, or human remains during construction.</li> </ul> <p>All adverse impacts are reduced with implementation of mitigation measures.</p>	None expected.	Not applicable with implementation of identified mitigation measures.
Alternative 2: Relocate Storage	No beneficial change from existing condition. Water would be stored on alternate vacant land in the northern part of the Zone.	Same as existing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts such as biological resources.</li> <li>• Potential to encounter cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, or human remains during construction.</li> <li>• Impacts relating to aesthetics, geology/soils, hydrology/ water quality, land</li> </ul>	The existing water system would continue to deteriorate, contributing to future emergencies including system failure. The new reservoir would disturb vacant land in an alternate location in the Zone, contributing to impacts to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources, aesthetics, geology/ soils, hydrology/ water quality, land	Unknown, depending on the location of the to be determined alternative location.

			<p>use/ planning and utilities and service systems.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would result in greater levels of impact when compared to Alternative 1, as Alternative 2 would need to acquire and disturb vacant land in another part of the Zone to relocate the water storage. This alternative is infeasible because the District does not own another piece of land at the desired elevation to provide a large enough storage tank to meet the storage requirements.</p>	<p>use/ planning and utilities and service systems.</p>	
<p>Alternative 3: No Project</p>	<p>No beneficial change from existing condition. Does not provide the benefits of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Same as existing.</p>	<p>The existing reservoir would continue to lack water system redundancy and would not provide additional fire suppression.</p>	<p>The existing water system would continue to deteriorate, contributing to future emergencies including the likelihood that the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir would all fail within a short time frame.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

**Table 2**  
**Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts on Sensitive Environmental Resources**

Alternative	Environmental Issues Identified, if applicable <sup>1</sup>	Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	Cumulative Impacts <sup>2</sup>
Alternative 1: Proposed Project	Biological Resources	Potential impacts to Migratory birds and raptors and protected trees. Fully mitigated with implementation of BIO-01 and BIO-02.	Indirect impacts associated with noise, vibration, and presence of construction equipment and personnel to nesting birds and raptors.	No adverse impacts expected with implementation of BIO-1 and BIO-2.
	Cultural Resources	Potential impacts regarding inadvertent cultural discoveries and treatment of human remains. Fully mitigated with implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2.	None expected.	No adverse impacts expected with implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2.
Alternative 2: Relocate Storage	Aesthetics	Alternative 2 would require the construction of a new reservoir in an alternative location in the northern part of the Zone. Construction of the reservoir may degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to aesthetic impacts from degradation of the existing visual character due to construction of a new reservoir. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
	Biological Resources	The construction of the new reservoir in Alternative 2 would have the potential to impact biological resources in the project area. A new Biological Resources Inventory Report would be required with this new alternative.	Indirect impacts associated with noise, vibration, and presence of construction equipment and personnel to biological resources.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to biological impacts during construction due to the addition of a new reservoir on vacant land. A new Biological Resources Inventory Report would be required to address any mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level.

	Cultural Resources	The new location of the reservoir associated with Alternative 2 would have a potentially inadvertent disturbance during construction to cultural resources or human remains. A Cultural Resources Assessment Letter Report would be required with this new alternative.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to cultural resource and human remains impacts during construction of a new reservoir on vacant land. A new Cultural Resources Assessment Letter Report would be required to address any mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.
	Geology/ Soils	Potential impacts related to Geology/ Soils may occur as this alternative could plan to construct a new reservoir on/ near a known earthquake fault, and on unstable or expansive soil that would be susceptible to soil erosion. The construction may also destroy a unique paleontological resource in the project area due to construction.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to geology/ soils if the new reservoir is built on unstable topography. Construction of the project may also destroy a unique paleontological resource in the project area. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.
	Hydrology/ Water Quality	Potential impacts related to Hydrology/ Water Quality may occur as this alternative could be constructed on land with a jurisdictional water feature or wetland.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to hydrology/ water quality if the new reservoir is built on land with an existing jurisdictional water feature. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.
	Land Use and Planning	Potential impacts related to Land Use/ Planning may occur if the topography of the project area requires the construction of ancillary buildings in order to support the new reservoir. The infrastructural requirements due to topography may not be suitable with the land use.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to land use/ planning if the new reservoir is built on inadequate topography that requires infrastructure that is unsuitable with the land use. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.



	Tribal Cultural Resources	The new location of the reservoir associated with Alternative 2 would have a potentially inadvertent disturbance during construction to tribal cultural resources. A Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment Letter Report would be required with this new alternative.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to tribal cultural resource impacts during construction of a new reservoir on vacant land. A new Tribal Cultural Resource Assessment Letter Report would be required to address any mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.
	Utilities and Service Systems	Potential impacts to water availability may occur as this project would require the construction of a new reservoir on land large enough to meet the storage requirements. However, Alternative 2 is infeasible as the District does not own alternative land with the desired elevation and storage requirements.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to water availability impacts due to the infeasibility of the land owned by the District to meet the storage requirements. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.
Alternative 3: No Project	Utilities and Service Systems	Potential impacts related to water availability may occur as this alternative would not replace an existing reservoir that is expected to fail in a short period of time due to the age of the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to water availability due to the exclusion of necessary improvements to the existing failing water infrastructure. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.
	Wildfire	Potential impacts related to wildfire may occur as this alternative does not involve the replacement of the reservoir that would provide adequate fire suppression infrastructure.	None expected.	This alternative has the potential to cumulatively contribute to fire hazard impacts due to the non-replacement of the existing failing water infrastructure. Without the replacement of the reservoir, the water infrastructure would not provide adequate fire suppression. Impacts would be significant and unmitigable.

	All other environmental issues	Avoids direct environmental impacts associated with the proposed project (i.e., biological resources, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources).	None expected.	This alternative would avoid the significant but mitigable impacts to biological resources and cultural resources that would result from implementation of the proposed project.
--	--------------------------------	---	----------------	--

<sup>1</sup> The environmental issues identified are based on the Biological Resources Inventory Report and Cultural Resources Assessment Letter Report for the project.

<sup>2</sup> Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

## Appropriate Mitigation Measures

### Alternative 1: Proposed Project

Table 3 lists the mitigation measures that are detailed in Biological Resources Inventory Report (HELIX 2021) and Cultural Resources Assessment Report (HELIX 2022a) for the proposed project.

**Table 3.**  
**Mitigation Measures Identified**

BIO-1	Migratory Bird and Raptors.
BIO-2	Protected Trees
CUL-1	Inadvertent Discoveries
CUL-2	Treatment of Human Remains

### Alternative 2: Relocate Storage

Alternative 2 would likely result in a greater level of impact for most environmental issues when compared to Alternative 1, due to the construction of a new reservoir in an alternate location in the northern part of the Zone. This alternative would need the District to acquire vacant land that is at the desired elevation to provide a large enough storage tank to meet the necessary storage requirements. Currently, the District does not own land with these requirements and therefore, this project would be infeasible. Mitigation measures would be required to minimize potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative, although impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, utilities and service systems, and wildfire would have the potential to be significant and unmitigable. Therefore, this alternative would potentially result in greater environmental impacts than the proposed project. A Biological Resources Inventory Report, a Cultural Resources Assessment Letter Report, and a Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment Report would be required with Alternative 2 to address any mitigation measures associated with the project.

### Alternative 3: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would avoid the potentially significant but mitigable impacts to biological Resources and cultural resources that would result from the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not include the necessary improvements to the existing failing water system due to the age of the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir. Additionally, without upgrades to the existing system, sufficient water supply would not be available as the reservoir is predicted to fail within a relatively short time frame. The existing reservoir would, therefore, not be able to be used as adequate fire suppression services. The implementation of the No Project Alternative may result in a new significant and unmitigable impacts related to utilities and service systems, and wildfire.

## Selection of the Chosen Alternative for the Project

A summary of how each alternative fulfills each of the proposed action’s key objectives is provided in Table 4, *Comparison of Fulfillment of Proposed Action Objectives*.

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of Fulfillment of Proposed Action Objectives**

Project Objectives	Alternatives		
	Alt. 1: Proposed Project	Alt 2: Relocate Storage	Alt. 3: No Project
1. Increase public safety through additional fire suppression.	Yes	No	No
2. Provide water system redundancy.	Yes	No	No

Alternative 1, the proposed project, would accomplish the needs/ objectives of the District by providing water system redundancy; and increasing public safety through additional fire suppression infrastructure. Additionally, the potential environmental impacts resulting from Alternative 1 would be able to be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Alternative 2 would not fulfill any of the two objectives as the alternative is infeasible. Alternative 2 would need the District to acquire vacant land that is at the desired elevation to provide a large enough storage tank to meet the necessary storage requirements. Currently, the District does not own land with these requirements. As no owned land meets the requirements, there would be no reservoir under Alternative 2 that would provide water redundancy and adequate fire suppression.

Alternative 3 would not meet the objectives identified for the project. Under Alternative 3, the proposed water system replacement would not be constructed, and the liner and cover materials that comprise the reservoir would likely fail within a relatively short time frame due to age. Therefore, under Alternative 3 there would be no water system redundancy or additional fire suppression infrastructure.

Given the considerations described above for the alternatives, Alternative 1 is the recommended project not only because it has environmental impacts that can be reasonably mitigated, but it also fulfills the goals of providing water system redundancy and adequate fire suppression. Additionally, Alternative 1 would avoid the potential environmental impacts related to aesthetics, geology/ soils, hydrology/ water quality, land use/ planning, utilities and service systems, and wildfire associated with Alternatives 2 and 3.

## REFERENCE

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2012. FEMA Flood Map. Accessed on March 6, 2022 from: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery>

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2021. Biological Resources Inventory Report for the San Juan Water District Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project in Placer County, CA.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2022a. Cultural Resource Assessment Report for the San Juan Water District Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project in Placer County, CA.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2022b. San Juan Water District, Kokila Reservoir Replacement Project Air Quality Conformance Analysis.