## **Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal**

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2022050	0436	
Project Title: Ca	argill Mixed Sea Salts Processing and Brine Dis	scharge Project
Lead Agency: Ea	ast Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA)	
Contact Name: _Jacqueline Zipkin		
Email: JZipkin@		Phone Number: (510) 206-3820
Project Location:	City	d the Community of San Lorenzo, Alameda County  County

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

The proposed project would enable the enhanced processing and removal of mixed sea salts (MSS) in existing ponds at the Cargill Solar Salt Facility in Newark, CA by harvesting additional liquid bittern from the MSS matrices in these ponds as commercial product, dissolving the residual MSS solids in the ponds using San Francisco Bay water, and transferring the resulting brine to EBDA's combined effluent pipeline for discharge into the Bay under EBDA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. It is anticipated that the MSS brine would be discharged to the EBDA system at a rate of up to 2.0 million gallons per day over an approximate 10-year timeframe. The proposed project has an onsite component of pipelines and pumping facilities within the existing Solar Salt Facility and an offsite component that would involve construction of approximately 15.6 miles of new underground pipeline primarily within roadway rights-of-way to connect the Solar Salt Facility into EBDA's system just downstream of the Oro Loma Sanitary District/Castro Valley Sanitary District Water Pollution Control Plant in San Lorenzo.

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

The Draft EIR identified significant or potentially significant effects associated with air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and recreation. Most of the significant or potentially significant impacts from the project can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through mitigation. Mitigation measures include funding off-site mitigation programs for air pollutant emissions; implementing various avoidance/minimization measures to protect biological resources, including species, habitats, and wetlands/waters; following procedures in the event of unanticipated archaeological discoveries; conducting investigations for contamination and appropriate coordination and remediation; minimizing groundwater loss; locating staging areas outside of flood zones; implementing construction noise reduction measures; and implementing detour plans for recreational areas. The potential to expose existing receptors to short-term construction noise would remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures.

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

In response to the Notice of Preparation, EBDA received comment letters from the Alameda County Water District, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, California Department of Transportation, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, East Bay Regional Park District, Native American Heritage Commission, and California State Lands Commission. During the public scoping meeting, comments were received from the Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency and the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission. The commenters raised concerns related to the following environmental resource areas: Aesthetics (scenic views)

Biological Resources (species and habitats, regulations/procedures)

Climate Change/Sea Level Rise

Environmental Justice/Public Outreach

Geology and Soils (soil and seismic stability)

Land Use and Planning (consistency with regulations, plans, and policies; ROW conflicts; permitting)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (contamination)

Hydrology and Water Quality (pollutants, floodplains/flooding, groundwater)

Noise (construction-related noise)

Recreation (public access and use)

Transportation (permitting, construction-related access disruptions/road closures)

Tribal Cultural Resources (regulatory requirements)

Utilties and Service Systems (utility conflicts)

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

Permits or approvals would be required from the following agencies:

US Army Corps of Engineers

US Fish and Wildlife Service

National Marine Fisheries Service

San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Department of Transportation

California State Lands Commission

Office of Historic Preservation

Alameda County

Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

Cities of Newark, Fremont, Union City, and Hayward

East Bay Dischargers Authority

East Bay Regional Park District

Hayward Regional Shoreline Planning Agency

San Mateo County Transit District

Union Pacific Railroad Company

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission