CEQA Environmental Checklist

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Extraction Well No. 2
Lead agency name,	Stockton East Water District
address,	6767 East Main Street
contact person,	Stockton, California 95215
and phone number:	P.O. Box 5157
	Stockton, California 95205
	Justin M. Hopkins
	General Manager
	(209) 948-0333 phone
	Devensen@sewd.net
Project Location:	The proposed project site is in the County of San Joaquin, State of California, Section 75, Township 1 North, Range 7 East, on the Assessor's Parcel Number 101-050-040.
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	This project involves the construction of a new groundwater well on the premises of the Dr. Joe Waidhofer Drinking Water Treatment Plant (WTP). The construction involves drilling a well approximately 460 feet deep, with an estimated production rate of 3,000 GPM. The project also includes constructing a 10x18 foot concrete slab. The well will serve as a dry year supplemental supply of raw water to the WTP. The discharge of this well will be into the North Raw Water Reservoir and all water pumped will be treated prior to delivery to the Urban Contractors distribution systems.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	State Water Quality Control Board, San Joaquin County

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/Water Quality
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population/Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	ERMINATION: e basis of this initial evaluation	:			
	a NEGATIVE DECLARATION	l wil			
	there will not be a significant	effe	project could have a significant e et in this case because revisions ect proponent. A MITIGATED NE	in the	project have been
	I find that the proposed project ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT		AY have a significant effect on the PORT is required.	e env	ironment, and an
	significant unless mitigated" in adequately analyzed in an ea been addressed by mitigation	mpa rlier me L IM	AY have a "potentially significant on the environment, but at lea document pursuant to applicable asures based on the earlier analy IPACT REPORT is required, but ed.	st one e lega ysis a	e effect 1) has been I standards, and 2) has s described on attached
	because all potentially signific or NEGATIVE DECLARATIO or mitigated pursuant to that e	cant N pu earlic	project could have a significant e effects (a) have been analyzed a rrsuant to applicable standards, a er EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARA aposed upon the proposed projec	adequ and (b TION,	ately in an earlier EIR) have been avoided including revisions
Sig	nature:				Date:
Pri	nted Name: Justin M. He	opk	ins		For: District

CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\boxtimes
<u>Discussion:</u>				
The project is located in a rural agricultural setting on the campus blend in this setting and not impact aesthetics of the site.	of a water treat	ment plant; the	erefore the projec	ct will
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Ag (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an opti and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the Ca regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest a Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodo California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	gricultural Land onal model to u including timbe alifornia Departr and Range Ass	Evaluation and use in assessing all are sign ment of Forestressment Proje	d Site Assessme g impacts on ag ifficant environm y and Fire Prote ct and the Fores	ent Model riculture ental ction t Legacy
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?				\boxtimes

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
<u>Discussion</u> :				
Forest land or prime Farm land will not be converted with this projection	ect.			
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria estable pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following of				nt or air
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
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)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
<u>Discussion</u> :				
a-e) In accordance with the Central Valley Air Pollution Control Project falls below the threshold of requiring an Ambient A than Significant impact.				
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?				
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
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?				
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?				
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?				
Discussion				
The proposed well site is located within the Dr. Joe Waidhofer Wa the removal of any trees. Therefore, the impacts of the Project wo			This work will no	ot require
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
Discussion				

There are no known prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources at the site location. This is a water treatment plant campus with 24 hour operations. Construction activities are drilling a well, and installing supporting piping and electrical service, all within the treatment plant property. With these actions, the Project will have **no cultural impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to 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?				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
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 Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial 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?				
<u>Discussion</u>				
This Project consists of drilling a well, and installing supporting pip property. With these actions, the Project will have no geologic in		cal service, all	within the treatm	ent plant
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
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?				\boxtimes

Discussion

Construction greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would include both direct and indirect sources. Combustion of the refined petroleum products needed to operate construction equipment would be part of the direct GHG. The GHG emissions through mining and extraction of raw materials, manufacturing, and transportation to produce the building materials used in Project construction would be a part of the indirect GHG. Construction energy consumption would be a one-time impact and GHG emissions by the construction activities would be less than a month in duration, therefore, the Project will have **no impact**.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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? 				\boxtimes
 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? 				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
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?				\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?				
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?				\boxtimes
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes

iscussion

- a-c) Neither the construction nor operation of the well will involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the petroleum and diesel fuel used to operate machinery and vehicles. The potential impact from the release of hazardous substances is **less than significant**.
- c-g) The site is located in a rural area. The Project location is such that it will not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans nor is it situated by any airstrips. There are **no impacts**.
- h)The Project will not increase the fire hazard in the area. There are no impacts.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge equirements?				
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)?				
Substantially after 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?				\boxtimes
3) 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 unoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				\boxtimes
 create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the apacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? 				
) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\boxtimes
 Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood nsurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? 				
)) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the ailure of a levee or dam?				
) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow				
<u> Discussion:</u>				

- a.f) Operation of the well will be during dry years as a supplement to other raw water supplies. Wet years will recharge the groundwater supply. Discharge will be directly into the South Raw Water Reservoir for subsequent treatment. Therefore, the project will have **no impact.** Additionally the project will submit a permit and adhere to permit requirements of the State Water Quality Control Board which will contain water quality monitoring and additional mitigation criteria.
- b) The purpose of the Project is to extract ground water that has been previously recharged. Therefore, the construction of Project would draw on ground water reserves only and would have less than significant impact on the groundwater quantity, quality. The well will only be used during drought years. During wet years the District will recharge water in to the groundwater table.
- c-e) The project will not alter natural drainage of the site therefore there will be **no impact** on the increase of erosion potential or storm water quantity of the existing site.
- g-j) No housing will constructed with this project. No Impact.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				
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?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
Discussion				
The project is consistent with its land designation, as a water supp	ly to a water tre	atment plant,	no impact.	
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
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?				
Discussion				
The proposed Project will not result in the loss or reduction any min	neral resources	, no impact.		
XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
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?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
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?				
d) 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?				

<u>Discussion</u>:

The construction site is located quite some distance from any existing residence and 10 miles from the nearest public airport. The only noise increase would be during construction. San Joaquin County provides exemption from noise ordinance standards for construction activities during set hours and days of the week. Construction activities for the proposed Project will be limited to the hours and days specified by San Joaquin County, 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. Given the exemption and the location of the construction, the noise increase is less than significant in the short term and **no impact** in the long term.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
<u>Discussion</u> The proposed Project will have no impact on Population and Hou	sing.			
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:				
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?				
Police protection?				
Schools?				\boxtimes
Parks?				\boxtimes
Other public facilities?				\boxtimes

Discussion

The proposed Project is located on the Dr. Joe Waidhofer Water Treatment Plant campus; with have no impact on public services.

XV. RECREATION:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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?				
 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? 				
<u>Discussion</u> The proposed Project is sited on private land which will not increase or decrease any public recreational activities therefore the project has no impact on recreation.	se or decrease	any public recr	eational activiti	es
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				\boxtimes
 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? 				\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?				\boxtimes
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				\boxtimes
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				\boxtimes
Discussion:				
The Project site is located within a private property. There will be ample parking for the construction crews, as well as emergency access. These access ways also allow the construction activities to be located far enough from the public road that it will not conflict with existing modes of transportation. Therefore there would be no impacts to parking, emergency access, or any existing modes of transportation.	ample parking on activities to t Therefore there	for the construction to the construction of th	There will be ample parking for the construction crews, as well as, the construction activities to be located far enough from the public insportation. Therefore there would be no impacts to parking, ortation.	well as, public ing,
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
 b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? 				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
 d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? 				
e) 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?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
<u>Discussion:</u> It is anticipated that construction would not require the use of, or alter in any way, these utility and service systems; therefore, the proposed Project would have no impact .	alter in any wa	ay, these utilit	y and service sy	/stems;
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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, substantially 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				
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)?				
 c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? 				

Discussion:

The Project will provide a supplemental water supply to an existing water treatment plant and will be constructed within the private property of the treatment plant. Therefore, the Project will have **no impact** on the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife species or habitat, or California history or prehistory.