

Figure 24-0:

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Potential to Conflict with a Known Hazardous Materials Site and, as a Result, Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment – 3 Sites

Summary of Comparison of Proposed Project

“...The incremental value indicates the change in number of sites attributable to the proposed project. The incremental value, together with consideration of the severity of the underlying impacts as set forth in the Final EIR/EIS, are the basis for making both NEP and CEQA impact significance findings.As depicted in Figure 24-0, the proposed project would not result in new impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials.

Approved Project – 3 Sites. Proposed Project - 0 Sites. Increment -3 sites.

Affected Setting (24-1)

“The Existing Conditions for hazards and hazardous materials that would be affected by construction and operation of the proposed project are the same as described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 24, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 24.1 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment. The Final EIR/EIS provides a discussion of naturally occurring hazards and anthropogenic hazards (from historic and current agricultural, industrial and urban/recreational activities, as well as existing infrastructure such as crude oil and natural gas pipelines) in the study area. The modifications to the approved project would be located entirely within the previously analyzed project area and, thus, Existing Conditions have not changed.”

Environmental Consequences (24-2)

“Effects are evaluated for severity and, where appropriate, mitigation measures are identified. Where mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR/EIS remain sufficient, such sufficiency is noted.”

Infrastructure Containing Hazardous Materials (24-4)

There are 5 natural gas pipelines (Table 24-1), 4 petroleum product lines (Table 24-1 and Figure 24-1), and 17 inactive (plugged) oil or gas wells (Figure 24-3) within the water conveyance facilities construction footprint of the proposed project. The precise location of pipelines would be identified prior to construction to avoid conflicts with construction. Abandoned wells would be tested to confirm that they have been abandoned according to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources well abandonment requirements. Those wells not abandoned according to these requirements would be improved to meet California Department Conservation (DOC) well abandonment requirements. In addition, to avoid the potential conflicts with shaft construction

and disposal areas, the utility and infrastructure relocation would be coordinated with local agencies and owners. Implementation of pre-construction surveys, and utility avoidance or relocation, if necessary, would minimize any potential disruption and hazardous effects due to disruption. Implementation of Mitigation Measures UT-6a: Verify Locations of Utility Infrastructure, and UT-6c: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety (described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities) would address these effects.”

Byron Tract Forebay and Conveyance - Existing Contaminants in Soil, Groundwater, or Sediment

As under the approved project, construction of the water conveyance facilities for the proposed project would potentially conflict with existing contaminants in soil, sediment and/or groundwater. Oil and gas processing facilities that exist near the construction footprint are shown in Figure 24-3. **Locations of known oil and gas processing facilities (Figure 24-2) are considered a separate category of “Sites of Concern” (SOC) due to the potential for spills and leaks at these locations. The lateral and vertical extent of any existing contamination that may be present at these sites is unknown.” (Does this mean they are exempt?)**

...“To the extent feasible, design of the proposed project would minimize the need to acquire or traverse areas where the presence of hazardous materials is suspected or has been verified.”

“All procedures developed to counter effects of soil, groundwater, and sediment contamination would be identical to those of the approved project from the Final EIR/EIS.”

NEPA Effects: “The potential under the proposed project to create substantial hazards through release of hazardous materials during construction of conveyance facilities would be similar to that described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project and **would constitute and adverse effect on the physical environment.”** Potential effects include routine use of hazardous materials, **possible natural gas accumulation in tunnels**, contact with or lease of existing contaminant, constituents in RTM, effects of electrical transmission lines, conflicts with utilities containing hazardous materials, and routine transport of hazardous materials. The environmental commitments, avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs), Environmental Commitments, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans, (SWPPPs), Hazardous Materials Management Plans (HMMPs), and Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasure Plan (SPCCP) developed to minimize the effects of hazards and hazardous materials for the approved project, and as described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs, would also apply to the proposed project. Additionally, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a, HAZ-1b, UT-6a, UT-6c, and TRANS-1a have been adopted to reduce the severity of these effects. **These measures, as written in the Final EIR/EIS, remain adequate without change for dealing with the impacts of the proposed project. Accordingly, this would not be an adverse effect.”**

CEQA Conclusion: “During construction of the water conveyance facilities, the potential for direct impacts on construction personnel, the public and/or the environment associated with a variety of hazardous physical or chemical conditions would be similar to that described for the approved project. Such conditions may arise as a result of the intensity and duration of construction activities at the north

Delta intakes, forebays, and conveyance pipelines and tunnels, and the hazardous materials that would be needed in the areas during construction. Potential hazards include the routine use of hazardous materials (as defined by Title 22 CCR Division 4.5); natural gas accumulation in water conveyance tunnels; the inadvertent release of existing contaminants in soil, sediment, and groundwater, or release of hazardous materials from existing infrastructure; disturbance of electrical transmission lines; and hazardous constituents present in RTM. These impacts are considered significant because the potential exists for substantial hazard to the public or environment to occur related to conveyance facility construction.”

.....However, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1A and HZ-1b, UT-6a and UT-6c (described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities) and TRANS-1a (described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 19, Transportation), along with environmental commitments to prepare and implement SWPPPs, HMMPs, SPCCPs, Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAPs) and a Barge Operations Plan (described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs) would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level by identifying and describing potential sources of hazardous materials so that releases can be avoided and materials can be properly handled detailing practices to monitor pollutants and control erosion so that appropriate measures are taken; implementing onsite features to minimize the potential for hazardous materials to be released to the environment; minimizing risk associated with the relocation of utility infrastructure; and coordinating the transport of hazardous materials to reduce the risk of spills.”

Impact HAZ-2: Expose Sensitive Receptors Located within 0.25 Mile of a Construction Site to Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste during Construction of the Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: “The potential under the proposed project to expose sensitive receptors, such as parks, schools, and hospitals within 0.25 mile of hazardous materials, hazardous substances or waste during construction would be similar to the potential described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. The proposed project would not have an effect on sensitive receptors because no schools, parks or hospitals are located within 0.25 mile of the construction footprint of the water conveyance facility (Figure 24.5) There would be no effect.”

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous substances or conditions under the proposed project would be similar to the potential impacts described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. There are no schools, parks or hospitals located within 0.25 mile of the water conveyance facilities alignment. Therefore , no sensitive receptors would be exposed to hazardous materials, substances, or waste as a result of construction of the water conveyance facilities under the proposed project. Consequently, there would be no impact. Potential air quality effects on sensitive receptors are discussed in Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.

No mitigation is required. (What about Clarksburg Schools, and the children and elderly people in Hood?)

Impact HAZ-3: Potential to Conflict with a Known Hazardous Materials Site and, as a Result, Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment

NEPA Effects: The potential for conflicts with, or exposure to known hazardous material sites during conveyance facility construction under the proposed project would be similar to the potential identified in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. Under the proposed project, there are no SOCs within 0.5 mile of the construction footprint (Figure 24-2). This is a decrease from the 3 SOCs within 0.5 mile of the approved project **footprint** (Figure 24-2) and therefore would be a decrease in potential risks associated with SOCs. However, identical to the approved project, there are still no known hazardous material sites located within the construction footprint of the water conveyance i, and therefore there would be no conflict pertaining to a known hazardous materials site during construction of the water conveyance facilities, and thus, no related hazard to the public or the environment. For those hazardous materials sites identified within the 0.5-mile radius, but which are not within the construction footprint, there would be no potential for the construction of the water conveyance facilities to disturb those sites such that there would be a re-release of hazardous materials that would create a hazard for the public or environment. Therefore, as with the approved project, the proposed project would have no adverse effects on the public or the environment.

(Letter to Metropolitan Water District)

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for conflicts with or exposure to known hazardous material sites during conveyance facility construction under the proposed project would be identical to the potential identified in the final EIR/EIS i 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. Because there are no “Cortese List” sites (The California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (“Cortese List”) is compiled pursuant to California Government Code 65962.5 and makes up a subset of the mapped SOCs.) or known SOCs within the construction footprint of the water conveyance facility for the proposed project, there would be no conflict with known hazardous materials sites during construction of the water conveyance facilities, and, therefore, no related hazard to the public or the environment. Accordingly, there would be no impact. **No mitigation is required. The potential for encountering unknown hazardous materials sites during the course of construction I s discussed under Impact HAZ-1.**

Incremental Impact: There are no Cortese List sites or known SOCs within the construction footprint of the water conveyance facility for the proposed project. Analysis of the approved project identified three SOCs within the project footprint. Therefore, the proposed project would have fewer potential conflicts with and less exposure to known hazardous material sites during conveyance facility construction than would the approved project. Accordingly, there would be no impact. **No mitigation is required.**

“Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 - Potential to conflict with a known hazardous materials site and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment

Per the Table on Level of Significance/Determination of Effects IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION -4A-NI – CEQA – No Impact

NEPA – IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION – 4A – NE – No Effect