

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P. O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
 For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH # _____

Project Title: Copper Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant, Phase 1 Expansion, Headworks & Surface Aerator Improvements

Lead Agency: Calaveras County Water District Contact Person: Charles Palmer

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 846 Phone: (209) 754-3543 x 39

City: San Andreas, California Zip: 95249 County: Calaveras County

Project Location: County: Calaveras County City/Nearest Community: Copperopolis / Copper Cove

Cross Streets: Little John Road and Kiva Drive Zip Code: 95228

Lat. / Long.: 37 ° 54 ' 29 " N / 120 ° 37 ' 01 " W Total Acres: _____

Assessor's Parcel No.: 065-032-001 Section: 26 Twp.: T1N Range: R12E Base: MDB&M

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: Route 4 (~ 4.5-miles) Waterways: Littlejohns Creek (~ 1-mile)

Airports: _____ Railways: _____ Schools: _____

Document Type:

- | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|
| CEQA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOP | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR | NEPA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOI | Other: <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR | <input type="checkbox"/> EA | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Document |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec | (Prior SCH No.) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mit Neg Dec | Other _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI | |

Local Action Type:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Prezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element | <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <u>Same Use</u> |

Development Type:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining: Mineral _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Power: Type _____ MW _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational _____ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment: Type <u>Sewer Plant</u> MGD <u>0.5-mgd</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste: Type _____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetic/Visual | <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation/Parks | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vegetation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Plain/Flooding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools/Universities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Land/Fire Hazard | <input type="checkbox"/> Septic Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Supply/Groundwater |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archeological/Historical | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geologic/Seismic | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Capacity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland/Riparian |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minerals | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Zone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drainage/Absorption | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing Balance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toxic/Hazardous | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic/Jobs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic/Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects |
- Other Above identified project issues discussed are based on the standard Environmental Checklist.

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

The site is zoned "public service" and surrounding parcels zoned "residential".

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

The project will replace aging facilities and electrical systems and expand the average sewer treatment capacity from 0.25 to 0.50-mgd. The project will include: (a) new headworks including flow metering, lift station and solids screen, (b) new 12-inch x 800-ft pipeline (replacement) between aeration basins, (c) additional surface aerators as needed to increase treatment capacity to 0.50-mgd, (d) upgrade for electrical controls, instrumentation, computer and radio equipment, (e) new 12' x 30' masonry building for housing electrical equipment, and (f) upgrade PG&E service and install a standby/backup power diesel generator.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning (Headquarters) | <input type="checkbox"/> Reclamation Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # <u>5</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers and Mtns Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # <u>2</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry & Fire Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Waste Management Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Emergency Services | |

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date April 22, 2008 Ending Date May 23, 2008

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>(not applicable)</u>	Applicant: <u>Calaveras County Water District</u>
Address: _____	Address: <u>P.O. Box 846</u>
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: <u>San Andreas, CA 95249</u>
Contact: _____	Phone: <u>(209) 754-3543</u>
Phone: _____	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: *Steve Hutchings* Date: 4-7-08

STEVE HUTCHINGS, DISTRICT ENGINEER

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

**Initial Study with Intent to Adopt a
Negative Declaration**

1. Project title: Copper Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant,
Phase 1 Expansion
Headworks and Surface Aerator Improvements

2. Lead agency name and address:
Calaveras County Water District
423 East St. Charles Street
P.O. Box 846
San Andreas, CA 95249

3. Contact person and phone number: Vicki Allshouse, (209) 754-3543 x 18

4. Project location: 5130 Kiva Place, Copper Cove, CA 95228

5. Project sponsor's name and address: (Same as above)

6. General plan designation: Low Density Residential 7. Zoning: Public Service

8. Description of project:

The project will replace aging facilities and electrical systems and expand the average sewer treatment capacity from 250,000 to 500,000-gallons/day. The project will include the following:

 - a. New headworks, influent lift station and solids screen.
 - b. New 12" diameter 800-ft pipeline between existing aeration basins (to replace existing pipeline).
 - c. Five (5) additional surface aerators.
 - d. Upgrade electrical controls, instrumentation, computer and radio equipment.
 - e. Erect 12'x30' masonry building for housing electrical equipment (to replace existing building).
 - f. Upgrade PG&E service for new electrical loads and install new 200kW standby/backup power diesel generator.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The site is located in the SE¼ of Section 26, T1NR12E MDB&M in the lower Sierra Foothills of Calaveras County. According to the County General Plan the surrounding land uses are designated as existing and future residential. The existing sewer treatment plant has been in operation at this location since the early 1970's when the surrounding ranch land was initially subdivided. The region is characterized by a mixture of developed residential areas surrounded by rolling terrain of grasslands and oak woodlands. Local runoff, from surrounding uplands and uphill residential areas, sheds to the southwest through several natural drainages into Ramsey Gulch and Little Johns Creek a tributary of the Stanislaus River. Drainages within Ramsey Gulch contain a variety of wetland vegetation. The project site is confined to previously graded areas and roads in the vicinity of the existing aeration ponds and avoids encroaching further upon grasslands, woodlands and drainages.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

- a. Applications for authority to construct and permit to operate the standby diesel engine generator will be filed with the local Air Pollution Control District.
- b. Any changes to the wastewater disposal permit will be submitted for approval by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis 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 an 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 that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Steve Hutchings, District Engineer

4-7-08

Date

Calaveras County Water District

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. 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 project falls 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).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) Explanation of each issue should identify significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce impact to less than significant.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	New electrical building will replace existing building of equal size and purpose. Other new facilities are consistent with existing uses.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	New facilities are located within previously graded and developed areas of the site. A few small 4" to 6" oaks will be removed but does not substantially damage oak woodlands.
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X	(Same as Above)
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X	The project will not be a source of substantial light or glare. No new light will be created.
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a) Convert prime or 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?				X	Although cattle grazing is common throughout the region, the subject site is not rangeland or farmland.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	The site is zoned public service and not subject to the Williamson Act.
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?				X	This project includes an expansion in wastewater treatment capacity that supports local growth and development according to the County General Plan and local Specific Plans. If regional development causes conversion of rangeland or farmland, it will be addressed by specific CEQA documents prepared for those projects.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X	Required applications will be filed with Calaveras Air Pollution Control District to obtain the necessary "authority to construct" and "permit to operate" the new 200kW standby power diesel engine generator.
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X	
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)?				X	The standby generator operates infrequently and is EPA certified for non-road diesel emissions standard. Calculated emissions for generator operating for 12-hrs power outage does not exceed 18.5-lbs/day CO, 35-lbs/day NMHC+NOx and 0.79-lbs/day PM and is not cumulatively considerable.
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X	Pollutant concentrations are not expected to be substantial. Peak emissions during construction for heavy equipment are estimated to be 105-lbs/day NOx and 6.0-lbs/day PM, and average emissions well below these levels. Graded and exposed soils will be sprayed with water to control fugitive dust during work.
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	Increased sewer flows to WWTP should not considerably increase odors perceptible to nearby residences. The current site has a 450-ft buffer to nearest residences. Under permit WDR-5-00-136 (or updates) by the Central Valley RWQCB, CCWD complies with limits set on odor emissions and the new expansion will also be in compliance. CCWD investigates all odor complaints to determine source and action to be taken.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
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?				X	The site has been previously disturbed and graded and offers little or no habitat.
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?				X	The site has been previously disturbed and graded and offers little or no habitat.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (e.g. marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X	The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a federally protected wetlands.
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?				X	The site has no involvement in the movement of fish or wildlife, wildlife corridors or nursery sites.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	The project does not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
f) Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	The project does not conflict with conservation plans.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				X	No historical resources are known to exist at the project site.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				X	An archaeological survey conducted by QUAD in 1994 found no evidence of archaeological resources at the site.
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique site or paleontological resource or unique geologic feature?				X	No unique paleontological resources or geologic features are known to exist at the site.
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X	Human remains are not expected at the site. If found, the coroner will be notified to remove the remains. The Native American Heritage Commission will be contacted if remains are found to be Native American.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
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 a known earthquake fault, as delineated on most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				X	There are no active earthquake faults in proximity to the site.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X	The project will not induce strong seismic ground shaking.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction?				X	The project will not cause a seismic ground failure or liquefaction.
iv) Landslides?				X	There is no potential for landslides.
b) Result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil?				X	Project will not cause substantial erosion or loss of topsoil; routine best management practices (BMPs) will be used to protect soil from erosion during construction.
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?				X	Local soils are founded on bedrock and not susceptible to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X	The project is not located on expansive soils.
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?				X	Public sewer is available.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to environment or public through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		The project will increase storage and use of diesel fuel and sodium hypochlorite (i.e. bleach) above existing amounts. These materials are in common use throughout the State and do not create a significant hazard to environment or public with routine/proper handling.
b) Create a significant hazard to environment or public through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances or waste within ¼ mile of existing or proposed school?				X	No acutely hazardous emissions, materials, substances or wastes result from this project.
d) Be located on a site of listed hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?				X	The site is not a listed site.
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?				X	There are no public/public use airports within two miles.
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?				X	There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of this project.
g) Impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	The project will not impair or interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan.
h) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or intermixed with residences?				X	Although the area has potential for wildland fires, the project is not expected to expose people or structures to a significantly higher risk above normal conditions.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		CCWD operates under waste discharge permit WDR-5-00-136 and is updating permit with Central Valley RWQCB.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge?				X	It will not deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge.
c) Substantially alter existing site or area drainage patterns, such as the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which results in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X	Minor site grading will not alter existing drainage patterns or result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
d) Substantially alter 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 which results in flooding on- or off-site?				X	The project does not substantially alter existing site or area drainage resulting in flooding on-or off-site.
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X	No increase in runoff is created by this project.
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		Water quality regularly monitored as required by approved waste discharge permit WDR-5-00-136; permit is being updated with Central Valley RWQCB.
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?				X	No housing on this project.
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which impede or redirect flood flows?				X	Project is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.
i) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of failure of levee or dam?			X		Existing dam constructed & maintained under Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) Permit #1024-009.
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X	These types of natural hazards are not encountered at this location.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	The project will not 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?				X	It will comply with applicable plans, policies and regulations of agencies having jurisdiction over the project. Zoned PS "public service".
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	The project will comply with applicable conservation plans adopted by government agencies.
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?				X	The project will not result in loss of availability of mineral resources.
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?				X	Not delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
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?			X		General Plan Update, Chapter 11, Figure 11-2, Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment states that a community noise exposure of 50-60 dB is normally acceptable for residential areas. The project is estimated to be within the "normally acceptable level".
b) Generate or expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise?				X	The 450' setback from nearest residence will prevent exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or noise.
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		Each surface aerator generates 75-dBA at 19-ft. Distance to nearest residence is 450' resulting in sound attenuation to 50-60 dB "normally acceptable level" according to General Plan Update, Figure 11-2.
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		Heavy equipment generating temporary construction noise will only be operated during daytime working hours and fitted with appropriate mufflers. A 450' setback limits noise level to 70 dBA or less at nearest residence during majority of excavation work.
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 area to excessive noise levels?				X	Not within an airport land use plan.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?				X	Not in vicinity of private airstrip.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth either directly (e.g. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		The project is in response to previously approve growth according to the County General Plan and local specific plans and does not itself, directly or indirectly, induce growth. Separate CEQA documents prepared under supervision of the County, as lead agency, address growth impacts resulting from new developments.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	The project will not displace existing housing.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	The project will not displace people.
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:					
a) 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 performance objectives for public services:					
Fire protection?				X	This project does not directly result in these impacts. The project supports the existing community and future growth in the region. The County General Plan, Community Plan, Specific Plans and related CEQA documents adequately address issues of fire and police protection, schools and parks in the region.
Police protection?				X	
Schools?				X	
Parks?				X	
Other public facilities?				X	

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
XIV. RECREATION –					
a) Would project increase use of existing regional or neighborhood parks or recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would occur or be accelerated?				X	The project does not directly cause these impacts. Developers have addressed growth impacts by adding new parks and recreational facilities within developments. CEQA documents prepared for these new developments consider potentially adverse physical effects on the environment resulting from construction of proposed parks and recreational facilities.
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?				X	
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC –					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of streets (i.e. result in a substantial increase in number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X	The project does not directly result in transportation/traffic impacts. Developers contribute to the Copperopolis Area Benefit fee program to mitigate growth induced traffic and congestion impacts such as issues associated with the SR-120/108 and O'Byrnes Ferry Road intersection.
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X	The project has no bearing on air traffic patterns.
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature such as a dangerous intersection or sharp curve or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X	The project will not substantially increase traffic hazards due to design feature or incompatible uses.
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	Does not change emergency access.
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X	Does not change parking capacity.
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X	Does not conflict with policies, plans or programs for alternative transportation.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X	CCWD operates under waste discharge permit <u>WDR-5-00-136</u> and is updating permit with Central Valley RWQCB.
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	Construction is within previously disturbed areas and consistent with existing uses and does not have 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?				X	Has no impact on drainage facilities.
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X	The project does not have significant water use.
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?				X	The project will serve projected demands and existing commitments. The project complies with the Copper Cove Wastewater System Facilities Master Plan as approved and adopted by Calaveras County Water District Board of Directors on May 25, 2005.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X	Yes, any solid waste generated by construction or operation of the project will be disposed of at the County of Calaveras, Rock Creek Solid Waste Facility in Milton.
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X	Yes, the project will be constructed and operated according to applicable statutes and regulations.

Potential Problem / Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Discussion
XVII. 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, 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?				X	Project does not have significant potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
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)?				X	Considering all environmental factor (aesthetic, agriculture, air quality, biological, cultural, geologic, hazardous materials, hydrology, water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, traffic and public utilities), this project does not have impacts that are considerable and, therefore, are not of cumulative importance.
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X	Project will not have substantial adverse effects on human beings.