

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

# INTRODUCTION

---

The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR and Appendices in Volumes 1 through 5, and the Comments, Responses to Comments, and Replacement Pages for the Draft EIR.

The comments include written comments received during or shortly after the public review period and oral comments made at the public hearing on April 17, 2008. The Replacement Pages include changes to the Draft EIR made in response to written and oral comments as well as changes initiated by the City of Santa Rosa as Lead Agency.

## CERTIFICATION AND PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities will hold a meeting on October 16, 2008 at 5:00 p.m. at the Santa Rosa City Council Chamber, City Hall, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, to consider certification of the Final EIR. In order to certify the Final EIR, the Council must find that:

- 1) the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; and
- 2) the Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090).

At the time of Project approval, the decision-making body must consider the information presented in the Final EIR. A public agency may not decide to approve a project unless the agency has: a) eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment; and b) determined that any remaining significant effects are acceptable due to overriding concerns. If the City makes such a decision, it must support the action by identifying the specific reasons for approval; this is called a Statement of Overriding Considerations and it must be included in the record of Project approval (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093).

## PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DURING THE FINAL EIR PHASE

The public comment period for the Draft EIR began on March 25, 2008 with the distribution of the Draft EIR by the City of Santa Rosa to public agencies and individuals who had expressed an interest. On April 17, 2008, a public hearing on the Draft EIR was held before the Board of Public Utilities. The public comment period closed on May 28, 2008.

A Notice of Availability of the Final EIR was mailed to various federal, state and local agencies and interested groups. Copies of the Draft and Final EIR were distributed to federal and state agencies, local governments, elected officials, and libraries. Copies of the Draft and Final EIR were also made available at the City of Santa Rosa and on-line at the project website: [www.SRCity.org/IRWP](http://www.SRCity.org/IRWP).

The Final EIR, including appendices, is being published on a CD as well as printed hard copy and is also available in downloadable Adobe Acrobat format on the IRWP web site at: [www.SRCity.org/IRWP](http://www.SRCity.org/IRWP). The Final EIR, including the Draft EIR, appendices and reference material cited in the EIR, is available for review at the Laguna Plant Library, located at 4300

Llano Road, Santa Rosa. The Draft EIR and appendices will be available for review at City Hall and the following libraries.

- Laguna Plant Library; and
- Branches of the Sonoma County Library at: Santa Rosa (Central Branch, Northwest Branch Coddington, and Rincon Valley), Sebastopol, Rohnert Park/Cotati, and Windsor.

## **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSE**

During the 65-day public comment period, the City of Santa Rosa received 26 comment letters, which included 169 comments on the Draft EIR. Two State Agency comment letters were received after the close of the public comment period. Two members of the public presented 6 additional comments during the public hearing. Every comment was counted regardless of whether it duplicated a comment made in a previous comment letter or at the public hearings. The comments made at the public hearing were summarized from the transcript of the hearing. The comment letters and associated comments were received from individuals, agencies, and organizations as shown in Table 1-1.

Letters received from federal, state, and local agencies were assigned a number in the 100, 200 and 300 series, respectively. Letters from individuals were assigned a number in the 400 series. Oral comments received at the public hearing were assigned a number in the 500 series.

## **USE OF COMMENT SUMMARIES**

The full text of all written comments as well as those from the transcript of the public hearing is included in Chapters 2 and 3 of this Final EIR. In addition, to facilitate reading the Response to Comments, a summary of each comment is inserted in italics just prior to each response. This summary does not substitute for the actual comment; the reader is urged to read the full original text of all comments. The responses are prepared in answer to the full text of the original comment, and not to the abbreviated summary.

## **CONSIDERATION OF RECIRCULATION**

If significant new information is added to an EIR after public review, the lead agency is required to recirculate the revised document (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5). “Significant new information” includes, for example, a new significant environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of an impact. New information is not considered significant unless the document is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the proponent has declined to implement. No new information has been submitted to indicate a new significant impact or substantially more severe impact. Therefore, there is no need to recirculate a revised Draft EIR.

## **ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR**

The Final EIR consists of six chapters:

Chapter 1 – Introduction. This chapter provides an introduction, the CEQA requirements for certification of the EIR and project approval, and the Draft EIR Summary Table with updates from the Final EIR shown in strike out and underline mode.

Chapter 2 – Response to Comments. This chapter includes Master Responses that address issues that were frequently cited in the comments on the Draft EIR. In addition, the responses to specific comments received during the comment period are addressed in this chapter. The range of possible responses includes requiring specific mitigation measures, modifying alternatives, supplementing analyses, making factual corrections, and explaining why comments do not warrant further response.

Chapter 3 – Lead Agency Changes. Editorial revisions to the Draft EIR made by the EIR authors are identified to correct typographical errors or internal inconsistencies within the document. Minor revisions to the Project Description and environmental analysis chapter are provided.

Chapter 4 - Comment Letters and Oral Comments. This chapter provides an introduction and a table of commentors, as well as copies of the comment letters and a transcript of the April 17, 2008 public hearing.

Chapter 5 – List of Preparers and References.

Chapter 6 – Replacement Pages. This chapter provides an introduction and replacement pages for the Draft EIR. Replacement pages represent the edits to the Draft EIR caused by the response to comments or revisions by the Lead Agency. The pages have been designed for insertion into the Draft EIR making the revised Draft EIR a stand-alone document. Replacement pages are formatted in revision fashion: strikeouts indicate deleted text and underlines indicate additional text.

## LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

A list of the comments received is shown below in Table 1-1.

**TABLE 1-1**  
**Comment Letters Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter	Name Title (if Applicable)	Agency/Organization	Letter Date
<b>Federal Agencies</b>			
100	Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief	Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region IX.	April 10, 2008
<b>State Agencies</b>			
200	Janice M. Oakley, Sonoma District Engineer	California Department of Public Health	April 29, 2008
201	Parker Thaler, Technical Environmental Assistant	State Water Resources Control Board	May 27, 2008
202	Charles Armor, Regional Manager	California Department of Fish and Game	May 29, 2008
203	Terry Roberts, Director	State Clearinghouse	May 29, 2008
204	Terry Roberts, Director	State Clearinghouse	May 29, 2008
<b>Local Agencies</b>			
300	Jim McCray, Park Manager	Sonoma County Regional Parks	May 28, 2008
301	Maria J. Cipriani, Assistant General Manager	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	May 28, 2008
<b>Individuals/Groups</b>			
400	Dan Schurman	Laguna de Santa Rosa Foundation	April 23, 2008
401	Residents along Ver-Ni Road, Duer Road and Hart Lane: Jim & Janice Searles Chester & Susan Lyon Mark & Pamela Calahan Walter & Carol Peterson Bob & Gail Hight Efton Holben Glenn Nemhauser James Neider Mrs. Emma Beck Claude Piehof Steve Carver & Jo Anne Allen Bill Amatneek Art Trinei Maxine Hlavac Jay Levine-Goldberg		May 7, 2008

**TABLE 1-1**  
**Comment Letters Received on the Draft EIR**

<b>Letter</b>	<b>Name Title (if Applicable)</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>Letter Date</b>
402	James and Janice Searles		May 6, 2008
403	Chester and Susan Lyon		April 30, 2008
404	Mark and Pamela Calahan		April 30, 2008
405	Walter G. Peterson and Carolyn S. Peterson		April 22, 2008
406	Bob and Gail Hight		May 5, 2008
407	Efton Holben		April 22, 2008
408	Glenn Nemhauser		May 7, 2008
409	James Neider		May 7, 2008
410	Emma J. Beck		May 7, 2008
411	Claude Piehof		May 7, 2008
412	Steve Carver and Jo Anne Allen		May 1, 2008
413	Bill Amatneek		May 7, 2008
414	Art Trinei		May 5, 2008
415	Ronald Hlavac, Maxine Hlavac, and Jerry Hlavac		April 24, 2008
416	Jay Levine-Goldberg and Anita Levine-Goldberg		May 3, 2008
417	Keith Kaulum	Sierra Club	Duplicate of letter dated April 19, 2007
418	Keith Kaulum	Sierra Club	May 26, 2008
<b>Oral Commentors (April 17, 2008 Public Hearing)</b>			
500	Keith Kaulum		April 17, 2008
501	Brenda Adelman		April 17, 2008

## **ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative, but does not define the meaning of the term. The City interprets this term to mean the alternative that has no significant effect or, if there is no such alternative, the alternative that has the fewest or least severe significant effects on the environment.

Based upon the analysis provided in Chapter 4 Environmental Analysis, the environmental superior alternative is the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative requires no construction or operation and so does not have direct effects. However, without additional seasonal storage capacity, indirect effects may occur to the Subregional System's ability to

comply with discharge regulations and continue successful wastewater treatment. The determination of whether or not such indirect effects will occur is largely speculative and depends upon future decisions by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Santa Rosa about which Discharge Compliance Project alternative will be implemented.

The environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives is the BF2 Alternative. This alternative is identified as environmentally superior, because it would have fewer significant and unavoidable impacts than identified for the KF1, KF2 and AF alternatives, and although it would have the same number of significant and avoidable impacts identified for the BF1 alternative (specifically loss of status farmland, energy use and greenhouse gas emissions, construction traffic congestion and noise, and potential for impacts to cultural resources), in most cases the impacts would be less severe. This decreased severity is due in large part to the pond's size -- it is the smallest of the five alternatives with a storage capacity of 105 MG.

Based upon the analysis in Chapter 5 Impacts of Combinations of Alternatives, the combination of the BF1 and BF2 alternatives would have the least number of significant unavoidable environmental impacts after mitigation, but their combined storage capacity is only 331 MG. Therefore, the BF1 and BF2 combination would also need to include the next least damaging alternative, which is KF1. However, the combination of BF1 and KF1 can achieve the project objectives of approximately 500 MG of storage with just two ponds, rather than three. Therefore, the environmentally superior combination of alternatives is found to be BF1 and KF1.

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 1-2 identifies, by environmental topic, the Project impacts. Additional information about the impacts and mitigation measures can be found in the Draft EIR, as referenced for each topic. The following symbols are used in the tables to denote levels of significance. Changes in the level of significance made in the Final EIR are indicated by strikeouts, underlines, and shading.

- Significant impact before and after mitigation
- == No impact
- Less than significant impact; no mitigation proposed
- ⊙ Significant impact; less than significant after mitigation

**TABLE 1-2**  
**Summary of Impacts of Alternatives by Environmental Topic**

Environmental Topic	Kelly Farm 1	Kelly Farm 2	Brown Farm 1	Brown Farm 2	Alpha Farm	No Project
Land Use	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	==
Agriculture	●	●	●	●	●	==
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	○	○	○	○	○	==
Surface Water Hydrology	○	○	○	○	○	==

**TABLE 1-2**  
**Summary of Impacts of Alternatives by Environmental Topic**

<b>Environmental Topic</b>	<b>Kelly Farm 1</b>	<b>Kelly Farm 2</b>	<b>Brown Farm 1</b>	<b>Brown Farm 2</b>	<b>Alpha Farm</b>	<b>No Project</b>
Groundwater	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	==
Surface Water Quality	○	○	○	○	○	==
Public Health and Safety	○	○	○	○	○	==
Biological Resources	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	==
Jurisdictional Wetlands	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	==
Transportation	●	●	●	●	●	==
Air Quality	●	●	●	●	●	==
Noise	●	●	●	●	●	==
Cultural Resources	●	●	●	●	●	==
Visual Resources	●	●	●	⊙	●	==
Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation	○	○	○	○	○	==
Energy	○	○	○	○	○	==

Table 1-3 identifies the significant environmental impacts by project alternative and the measures that are proposed to mitigate these impacts and whether or not the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to less than significant. The numbering of the impacts corresponds to the numbering within each section in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

Impact	KF1	KF2	BF1	BF2	AF	No Project	Mitigation Measure
<b>Land Use</b>							
1.4. The Storage Component may increase the potential for conflict as a result of incompatible land uses.			⊙				3.3.19. Compatibility of Pond Design and Trails Plan
1.6. The Storage Component may convert public open space for uses not in accordance with restrictions on use of the open space.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.2. Replacement of Open Space 3.3.10. Avoid Loss of Endangered Biological Resources and Their Habitats 3.3.12. Avoid Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Trees and Plant Communities 3.3.13. Avoid Blocking Major Wildlife Migration or Travel Corridors 3.3.14. Avoid Loss of Aquatic Habitat Due to Storage Reservoirs 3.3.15. Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands 3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening 3.4.1. Protect Active Raptor Nests 3.4.2. Avoid Loss of Fully Protected Species, Federal Candidate Species, and Species of Special Concern 3.4.5. Invasive Plant Species

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
1.6. The Pump Station Component may convert public open space for uses not in accordance with restrictions on use of the open space.	⊙		⊙				3.3.2. Replacement of Open Space 3.3.10. Avoid Loss of Endangered Biological Resources and Their Habitats 3.3.12. Avoid Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Trees and Plant Communities 3.3.13. Avoid Blocking Major Wildlife Migration or Travel Corridors 3.3.14. Avoid Loss of Aquatic Habitat Due to Storage Reservoirs 3.3.15. Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands 3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening 3.4.1. Protect Active Raptor Nests 3.4.2. Avoid Loss of Fully Protected Species, Federal Candidate Species, and Species of Special Concern 3.4.5. Invasive Plant Species
<b>Agriculture</b>							
2.1. The Storage Component may cause loss of Farmland.	●	●	●	●	●		No feasible measures have been identified
2.1. The Pump Station Component may cause loss of Farmland.	●	●	●				No feasible measures have been identified
<b>Groundwater</b>							
5.2. The Storage Component may cause groundwater mounding or increase groundwater levels that cause surface water discharge?			⊙	⊙	⊙		3.5.2 Septic System Replacement

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
5.3. The Storage Component may lower groundwater levels at existing wells.	⊙	⊙					3.3.9 Well Protection Program
5.4. The Storage Component may lower groundwater levels in areas that could have been developed for future water supply.	⊙	⊙					3.3.9 Well Protection Program
<b>Surface Water Quality</b>							
6.1, 6.2, and 6.4. Will the No Project alternative cause surface water quality impacts based on evaluation criteria 1, 2, and 4?						●	Not applicable
<b>Biological Resources</b>							
8.1. The Storage Component may cause loss of individuals, or loss of critical habitat, or loss of occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or rare species of plants and animals.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.10 Avoid Loss of Endangered Biological Resources and Their Habitats
8.1. The Pump Station Component may cause loss of individuals, or loss of critical habitat, or loss of occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or rare species of plants and animals.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.10 Avoid Loss of Endangered Biological Resources and Their Habitats
8.3. The Storage Component may cause loss of active raptor nest sites.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.1 Protect active Raptor Nests
8.3. The Pump Station Component may cause loss of active raptor nest sites.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.1 Protect Active Raptor Nests

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
8.4. The Storage Component may cause loss of animals designated as a federal candidate species, a California fully protected species, or a California species of special concern.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.2. Avoid Loss of Fully Protected Species, Federal Candidate Species, and Species of Special Concern
8.4. The Pump Station Component may cause loss of animals designated as a federal candidate species, a California fully protected species, or a California species of special concern.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.2. Avoid Loss of Fully Protected Species, Federal Candidate Species, and Species of Special Concern
8.5. The Storage Component may cause permanent loss of native special-status plant communities, such as those designated in the California Natural Diversity Database as “rare” or in local tree ordinances.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.12 Avoid Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Trees and Plant Communities
8.5. The Pump Station Component may cause permanent loss of native special-status plant communities, such as those designated in the California Natural Diversity Database as “rare” or in local tree ordinances.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.12 Avoid Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Trees and Plant Communities
8.6. The Storage Component may substantially block or disrupt major migration or travel corridors between essential resource areas for native.	⊙	⊙					3.3.13 Avoid Blocking Major Wildlife Migration or Travel Corridors

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
8.8. The Storage Component may cause a decrease in stream flows, affecting aquatic habitat or aquatic life downstream from proposed dam sites.					⊙		3.3.14 Avoid Loss of Aquatic Habitat Due to Storage Reservoirs
8.9. The Storage Component may result in the introduction of a new invasive plant species or the stimulation of an existing invasive plant species	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.5 Invasive Plant Species
8.9. The Pump Station Component may result in the introduction of a new invasive plant species or the stimulation of an existing invasive plant species	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.5 Invasive Plant Species
8.1C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause loss of individuals, or loss of critical habitat, or loss of occupied habitat of endangered, threatened, or rare species of plants and animals.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.10 Avoid Loss of Endangered Biological Resources and Their Habitats
8.3C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause loss of active raptor nest sites.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.1 Protect Active Raptor Nests
8.4C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause loss of animals designated as a federal candidate species, a California fully protected species, or a California species of special concern.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.2. Avoid Loss of Fully Protected Species, Federal Candidate Species, and Species of Special Concern

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
8.5C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause permanent loss of native special-status plant communities.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.12 Avoid Permanent Impacts to Sensitive Trees and Plant Communities
8.6C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may substantially block or disrupt major migration or travel corridors between essential resource areas for native animals.	⊙	⊙					3.3.13 Avoid Blocking Major Wildlife Migration or Travel Corridors
8.8C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause a decrease in stream flows, affecting aquatic habitat or aquatic life downstream from the proposed reservoir site.					⊙		3.3.14 Avoid Loss of Aquatic Habitat Due to Storage Reservoirs
8.9C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may result in the introduction of a new invasive plant species or the stimulation of an existing invasive plant species.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.5 Invasive Plant Species
<b>Jurisdictional Wetlands</b>							
9.1 The Storage Component may fill or alter wetlands or other waters of the U.S. or of the State of California.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.15 Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands
9.1 The Pump Station Component may fill or alter wetlands or other waters of the U.S. or of the State of California.	⊙	⊙					3.3.15 Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands
9.2 The Storage Component may alter the bed and banks or adjacent riparian habitat of a State stream, lake, or other wetland.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.15 Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
9.2 The Pump Station Component may alter the bed and banks or adjacent riparian habitat of a State stream, lake, or other wetland.	⊙	⊙					3.3.15 Avoid Fill of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands
<b>Transportation</b>							
10.1 Storage component construction traffic may cause congestion on local roadways.			●	●	●		No feasible mitigation has been identified
10.1 Pump station component construction traffic may cause congestion on local roadways.			●	●	●		No feasible mitigation has been identified
10.1C. The SSP plus cumulative projects may cause congestion on local roadways.	●	●	●	●	●		No feasible mitigation has been identified
<b>Air Quality</b>							
11.6. The pump station component would increase greenhouse gas emissions.	●	●	●	●	●		3.5.19 Avoid Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Implement Emission Reduction Program
11.6C. The pump station component plus cumulative projects have the potential to increase greenhouse gas emissions.	●	●	●	●	●		3.5.19 Avoid Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Implement Emission Reduction Program
<b>Noise</b>							
12.1 Construction of the storage component may generate noise levels in excess of standards.	●	●	●	●	●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures
12.1 Construction of the pump station component may generate noise levels in excess of standards.					●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
12.2 Storage component construction may result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration levels.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures
12.4 Construction activities and traffic required for the storage component may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	●	●	●	●	●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures
12.4 Construction activities and traffic required for the pump station component may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.					●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures
12.1C. Construction of the SSP and cumulative projects could generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	●	●	●	●	●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures
12.4C. Construction activities and traffic required for the SSP and cumulative projects could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels in the vicinity.	●	●	●	●	●		3.4.3 Construction Noise Control Measures

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

Impact	KF1	KF2	BF1	BF2	AF	No Project	Mitigation Measure
<b>Cultural Resources</b>							
13.1 and 13.2 The Storage Component may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or unique archaeological resource or an adverse effect on a historic property which is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.1 and 13.2 The Pump Station Component may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or unique archaeological resource or an adverse effect on a historic property which is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.3 and 13.4 The Storage Component may disturb human remains or associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony.	●	●	●	●	●		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.3 and 13.4 The Pump Station Component may disturb human remains or associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony.	●	●	●	●	●		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.5. The Storage Component may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
13.5. The Pump Station Component may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.1C and 13.2C. The SSP plus cumulative projects could impact cultural resources based on evaluation criteria 1 and 2.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.3C and 13.4C. The SSP plus cumulative projects could impact cultural resources based on evaluation criteria 3 and 4.	●	●	●	●	●		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
13.5C. The SSP plus cumulative projects could impact paleontological resources.	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.17 Evaluate and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
<b>Visual Resources</b>							
14.1 and 14.2 The Storage Component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the site.	●	●	⊙	⊙	⊙		3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening
14.1 and 14.2. The Pump Station Component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the site.	⊙	⊙	⊕	⊙	●		3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening

**TABLE 1-3**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>KF1</b>	<b>KF2</b>	<b>BF1</b>	<b>BF2</b>	<b>AF</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
14.1C and 14.2C. The SSP and cumulative projects could impact visual resources based on evaluation criteria 1 and 2.	●	●	●	●	●		3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening
<b>Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation</b>							
15.1. The No Project Alternative may impact public services, utilities, and recreation based on evaluation criteria 1.						●	Not applicable