

APPENDIX B

INITIAL STUDY

City of Vacaville
Initial Study
Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant
Tertiary Project
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Vacaville
Public Works Department
650 Merchant St.
Vacaville, CA 95688
3. Contact person and phone number: Deborah Faaborg, Environmental
Project Manager
Public Works Department
(707) 449-5140
dfaaborg@cityofvacaville.com

4. Project location: The project area is located within the boundaries of a 182.62-acre City owned property, of which approximately 30 acres is developed with EWWTP facilities. The property is located approximately 4.5 miles east of central Vacaville and 35 miles southwest of Sacramento (Figure 1 - Regional Location & Figure 2 - Site and Vicinity). The property is situated south of Interstate 80 and southeast of the unincorporated community of Elmira, and is bordered by Old Alamo Creek to the north, Vaca Station Road to the west, Fry Road to the south, and Lewis Road to the east. The property is surrounded on the east, south and west by unincorporated, agricultural land.

Project Address: 6040 Vaca Station Road, Elmira, California 95625

County: Solano County

APNs: 142-110-050, -040; 142-200-040

USGS Quad: Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Section 30
Elmira USGS 7.5-minute topo quadrangle (1980).

Long./Lat.: Centroid of the study area: 121° 92' 88.6" N., 38° 36' 10.5" W

5. General plan designation: Public/Institutional (P*)
6. Zoning: Community Facilities (CF)

7. Description of project:

The Proposed Project would result in a number of improvements to the City's Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant (EWWTP) necessary to respond to regulatory and permit requirements, including compliance with numerical ammonia limits, nitrate limits, elimination of blending, and dry weather filtration / Title 22 reclamation. These plant upgrades are collectively referred to as the "Tertiary Project." The current need for improvements to the EWWTP is not capacity driven, but rather associated with permit compliance. The recommended major improvements to the North Plant and South Plant, respectively, are summarized below.

North Plant

The following modifications would be provided in the North Plant:

- Demolition. The existing tankage in the North Plant currently utilized for influent pumping, preliminary treatment, primary sedimentation, aeration basins, secondary clarifiers, and one of the two flotation thickeners would be demolished. Support equipment for these facilities would be removed from the equipment building to provide space for future plant services.
- Miscellaneous Rehabilitation and Improvements. The second flotation thickener would be reconditioned and modified to continue to provide sludge thickening service for the solids produced in the plant secondary treatment process.
- Electrical and Instrumentation Improvements. Electrical and instrumentation systems serving the remaining North Plant processes would be replaced with new wiring and equipment to provide the desired reliability and to bring the installation into compliance with current codes.

South Plant

The following improvements would be provided in the South Plant:

- Influent Pump Station. The station would be expanded to include one additional influent pump, thereby giving the facility sufficient pumping capacity to handle the projected peak wet weather flows.
- Influent Screens. A third mechanically-cleaned screen would replace a manually cleaned screen in an existing channel to give the facility sufficient screening capacity to handle projected peak wet weather flows.
- Grit Tanks and Primary Sedimentation System. One additional grit tank and primary sedimentation basin would be constructed to provide the needed hydraulic capacity at peak wet weather flows.
- Aeration Basins Expansion/Conversion. Two additional aeration basins would be constructed, and modifications made to the existing four basins, to replace the capacity that had been provided in the North Plant, and to convert the process to denitrify as well as nitrify. The provision of denitrification would require the addition of recycle pumping and larger mixed-only zones to support the process.
- Aeration Blower System. Two additional blowers would be provided in the space available in the existing blower building to increase the air supply

resulting from the need to accommodate the loads previously handled in the North Plant.

- Secondary Clarifiers. One additional secondary clarifier would be constructed to provide the hydraulic capacity needed to replace capacity that had been provided in the North Plant, and to accommodate peak wet weather flows that are not equalized.
- RAS/WAS Pump Station Expansion. Additional pumps and piping would be provided in the existing station to support the additional secondary clarifier.
- RAS/WAS Pump Station Enclosure. Walls would be provided around the existing mechanical area at the RAS/WAS pump station to better protect the equipment from the elements.
- Filter Feed Pump Station. A new pump station would be constructed in the South Plant to lift the secondary effluent, thereby providing the hydraulic grade necessary to accommodate effluent filtration.
- Effluent Filtration System. A new granular-media effluent filtration system would be added with sufficient capacity to filter the flows during the dry season, when tertiary treatment is required by the permit.
- Chlorine Contact Tanks. Two additional chlorine contact tanks would be added to the existing facility to increase the contact time to the degree required by the permit during the dry season.
- Primary/Secondary Effluent Flow Equalization Basins. Flow equalization basins will be constructed in the west pond area. These basins will be used for: 1) occasional equalization of secondary effluent when dry weather flows exceed the capacity of the effluent filtration and disinfection system; 2) occasional equalization of primary effluent when wet weather flow conditions exceed the capacity of the plant secondary treatment system; and 3) occasional use as operational storage of primary or secondary effluent when maintenance or repairs are required.
- Emergency Storage Basin Liner. A concrete liner would be provided in the existing emergency storage basin to reduce the percolation of the plant effluent into the groundwater and to improve maintenance of the facility.
- South Plant Headworks Solids Handling Improvements. A second screenings washer/compactor would be provided at the headworks to provide continuous service when the existing unit must be taken off-line for maintenance. Storage facilities for grit and screenings would be expanded to lengthen the period of time that these materials can be stored on site.
- Biosolids Lagoons & Filter Improvements. Existing biosolid lagoons would be re-configured and systems added to improve efficiency of operations and cleaning practices in this area in an effort to reduce odor.
- Plant Laboratory Building Expansion. The existing laboratory would be expanded to provide the room needed to conduct the additional testing required by the new permit, and to perform the additional process control testing that will be needed as a result of the provision of denitrification and effluent filtration in the treatment processes.
- Effluent Analyzer Buildings. Two remote analyzer buildings would be constructed to house sampling and analytical equipment. The first building

would be located along the outfall, and would contain the systems associated with the permit compliance monitoring of the effluent. The second building would be located near the northeast corner of the chlorine contact tanks, and would contain sulfite residual monitoring equipment needed to properly control the dechlorination system at the plant.

- Mobile Equipment Storage Building. A canopy structure would be provided to protect City-owned mobile equipment stored at the plant site.
- Perimeter Landscaping. The existing perimeter landscaping would be extended around the perimeter of the City-owned property to provide a more effective visual screen of the plant, and to reduce the amount of plant lighting visible beyond the plant boundaries.
- Standby Power System Expansion. The existing standby power system would be expanded to serve the additional equipment being added in the South Plant.

8. Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Properties immediately surrounding the project site are not within the City limits of Vacaville. Solano County land use designations surrounding the project site consist of agriculture to the immediate north, south, east, and west; traditional community-mixed use to the northeast; and public/quasi-public use approximately 0.22 miles to the north, which includes the Elmira Elementary School (Solano County, 2008). Parcels immediately adjacent to the project site are zoned for Exclusive Agriculture (A-40). The community of Elmira contains areas zoned for Rural Residential (RR-2.5), Estate Residential (RE-1/3), Neighborhood Commercial (CN), and General Manufacturing (MG-3). The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) runs through the community of Elmira approximately 0.3 miles northeast of the project site.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

City Of Vacaville Approvals

- Certification of this EIR for the Tertiary Project under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.
- Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Proposed Project that incorporates the mitigation measures identified in this EIR.
- Approval of a Use Permit from the City's Community Development Department for construction of the Proposed Project.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

- General Construction Storm Water NPDES Permit: Because the project would disturb more than five acres of land, a NPDES Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity must be obtained from the CVRWQCB.

- 2008 NPDES Permit - Waste Discharge Requirements: The CVRWQCB has the authority to enforce the waste discharge requirements of the 2008 NPDES Permit for the discharge of effluent treated at the EWWTP to Old Alamo Creek. The City must submit various reports to the CVRWQCB to demonstrate that operation of the Proposed Project would be in compliance with the 2008 NPDES Permit.
- General Storm Water NPDES Permit: The CVRWQCB has the authority to ensure compliance with the EWWTP's General Storm Water Permit (Water Quality Order No. 91-13-DWQ) for discharge of storm water associated with industrial activities. The EWWTP renews this permit annually and has historically implemented best management practices contained in its stormwater pollution prevention plan.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

- Section 404 Permit under the Federal Clean Water Act should the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determine that potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and/or wetlands be located within the project site.

CEQA Plus Requirements

Because the City has applied for the State Revolving Funds (SRF) Loan Program, which is administered by the State Water Resources Control Board and partially funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the Proposed Project is subject to federal environmental regulations, including regulations guiding the General Conformity Rule for the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). USEPA has allowed a modified CEQA document, called CEQA-PLUS, to be the compliance base for projects applying for SRF monies. To meet CEQA-PLUS requirements, the SWRCB may determine that the following tasks are necessary:

- Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106 of the NHPA regarding potential effects to special status species
- Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under Section 7 of the ESA regarding potential effects to federally listed special status species.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On behalf of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in a 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 the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Planner’s Signature

Date

Deborah Faaborg, Environmental Project Manager
Planner’s Printed name

City of West Sacramento
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, a brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the projects outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A and B: There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources located within the project area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage a scenic resource. No further evaluation of these issue areas is required.

Questions C and D: The Proposed Project would result in the development of wastewater treatment facilities and a landscape buffer around the site, which is located in a rural agricultural area. This would significantly alter the visual character of the site. The project would also create a new source of light and glare. These issues will be addressed in the Visual Resources chapter of the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the Project:				
a) Convert Prime farmland, Unique farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-C: A portion of the project site is leased by the City for agricultural purposes. This area is designated as Prime Farmland. A complete analysis of impacts to agricultural resources will be included in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY- Where applicable, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable neat 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-E: Construction activities and related traffic would result in air quality emissions that may exceed established standards. Sensitive receptors may be impacted and objectionable odors may be created. A complete analysis of impacts to air quality will be included in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native residents or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-F: Construction of the Proposed Project would result in potential habitat loss and impacts to riparian and/or wetland areas. Impacts to biological resources will be addressed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-D: During site construction, there is the potential to uncover significant cultural resources. Impacts to cultural resources will be addressed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
▪ Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map as issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
▪ Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
▪ Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
▪ Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-E: The site is not located within an area susceptible to landslides. Additionally, the project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater treatment systems. Further analysis of these issues is not required. Potential impacts associated with seismic hazards and soil erosion will be addressed within the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handles hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-H: The project would not emit hazardous emissions. Further analysis of this issue area is not required. Impacts relating to hazards and hazardous materials could occur during construction or operation of the Proposed Project. An analysis of impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials will be included in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 levee or dam?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-I: Implementation of the Proposed Project would introduce impervious surfaces and alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site. Construction activities and operation on the project would create the potential to impact water quality. Impacts associated with hydrology and water quality will be analyzed within the EIR.

Question J: The project site is not subject to inundation by seiches, tsunamis or mudflows. Further analysis of these issue areas is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE & PLANNING -- Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question A: The Proposed Project would not divide an established community. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

Question B: Consistency with local planning documents and compatibility with surrounding land uses will be discussed in the EIR.

Question C: The project site is located within an area covered under the Draft Solano Habitat Conservation Plan. A final administrative draft of this document was released in August 2009; however, the plan has not been adopted. Consistency with the recommendations and conservation strategies within the administrative draft plan will be discussed in the biological resources chapter of the DEIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-B: No known mineral resources occur on the project site. The project would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resource that would be of value to the region. This issue will not be discussed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-D: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project may result in significant temporary and long-term increases in noise. These impacts will be addressed in the EIR.

Questions E-F: The project site is located within the boundaries of the Travis Air Force Base (AFB) Land Use Compatibility Plan (LUCP). The project is consistent with acceptable uses within the land use plan for the zone that it is located in and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-C: The Proposed Project would not increase the treatment capacity of the EWWTP, and therefore would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. The project would not displace existing housing or people. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES- 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 rations, response time or other performance				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-E: Development of the Proposed Project would not increase the demand for public services, including law enforcement, fire protection, schools, and parks. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have been ad adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-B: Development of the project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase on either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-B, and E: The Proposed Project would increase traffic during construction, which may result in congestion and decreased levels of service, or inadequate emergency access. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

Questions C-D, and F-G: The Proposed Project is not located near an airport and would not impact air traffic patterns. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Parking for construction workers would be provided within construction staging areas located within the EWWTP. The existing parking facilities on the EWWTP site would accommodate the increase of 1-5 employees at the EWWTP. The Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Further analysis of these issue areas is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions A-B: The project would construct improvements to the EWWTP to meet requirements of the CVRWQCB. Potential impacts associated with proposed wastewater treatment facilities will be addressed in the applicable issue area sections of the DEIR.

Question C: Potential effects associated with storm water run-off and drainage facilities will be addressed within the hydrology and water quality section of the DEIR.

Question D-E: The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for water supply infrastructure, or increase the demand for wastewater treatment. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

Questions F-G: Construction waste and exported materials would be disposed of at the Hay Road Landfill. This landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate construction related waste generated by the Proposed Project. Construction contractors would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Operation and maintenance of the project would not increase waste generation above existing levels at the EWWTP. Further analysis of this issue area is not required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</u>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environment effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>