Chapter 24
Hazards and Hazardous Materials

24.1 Summary Comparison of Proposed Project

A summary comparison of a number of important hazards-related impacts is provided in Figure 24-0. This figure provides information on the magnitude of adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that are expected to result from the proposed project compared with the approved 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 NEPA and CEQA impact significance findings. The incremental analysis addresses whether the proposed project, compared with the approved project, would lead to any new significant environmental effects or to any substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. The incremental difference between the original impacts and the newly anticipated impacts is then considered against the backdrop of the original significance determinations for the underlying impacts as described in the Final EIR/EIS.

Figure 24-0. Comparison of Impacts on Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Chapter 24 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Approved Project	Proposed Project (Total)	Proposed Project (Increment)
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	3 sites	0 sites	-3 sites
	No impact/ no effect	Remains no impact/ no effect. No change from the approved project.	

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. This chapter contains the information necessary to make the Final EIR/EIS adequate for the approved project as revised.

24.2 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

24.2.1 Affected Environment

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.

On January 15, 2018, the California Public Utilities Commission approved a statewide fire-threat map, including fire threat levels for the previously analyzed project area. The Tier 2 and Tier 3 layers of the map showing elevated risk or extreme risk, respectively, of wildfires associated with overhead utilities do not overlap or come in close proximity to any of the conveyance alignments. Potential wildfire hazards are analyzed in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 24, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and the data presented in the California Public Utilities Commission fire threat map do not provide new information that requires additional analysis.

24.3 Environmental Consequences

This section describes the potential effects of hazards and hazardous materials that could result from implementation of the proposed project. The focus of this assessment is on determining the incremental effect on hazards and hazardous materials that is attributable to these modifications. With the exception of focusing on the incremental effects, the methods of analysis and determination of effects is the same as indicated in the Final EIR/EIS.

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.

This analysis discusses potential impacts resulting from construction of the water conveyance facilities. Some impact topics addressed in the Final EIR/EIS are not addressed herein because the change in the footprint of the water conveyance facilities would not result in a changed impact. Topics not addressed in this chapter include exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous materials, safety hazards associated with airports and wildland fires, and implementation of Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–12, 15, and 16. These impacts are fully disclosed in the Final EIR/EIS and would not change if the footprint changes described for the proposed project are constructed.

The methods applied to the analysis of impacts of hazards and hazardous materials are the same as indicated in Section 24.3.1 of the Final EIR/EIS.

24.3.1 Effects and Mitigation Approaches

24.3.1.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the new Byron Tract Forebay, reusable tunnel material (RTM) storage, and other footprint changes described for the proposed project would not occur. For the purposes of this Supplemental EIR/EIS, the No Action Alternative, against which this proposed project is compared, is consistent with the No Action Alternative Early Long-Term in the Final EIR/EIS. No differing effects resulting from hazards and hazardous materials would occur along the proposed project alignment from what was previously described in the No Action Alternative Early Long-Term in the Final EIR/EIS if the No Action Alternative were to occur.

24.3.1.2 Proposed Project

Impact HAZ-1: Create a Substantial Hazard to the Public or the Environment through the Release of Hazardous Materials or by Other Means during Construction of the Water Conveyance Facilities

RTM Storage and Other Footprint Changes

Constituents in Reusable Tunnel Material

Under the proposed project, RTM hazards and mitigation measures regarding soil conditioners, soil contamination, and other constituents would be similar to the hazards and procedures for the approved project described in the Final EIR/EIS. However, the locations and extent of these hazards would be different than under the approved project. For example, RTM would consist of materials excavated from the tunnel bores and inverted siphons where the canal alignment intersects river and slough crossings. There would be approximately 25 million cubic yards of RTM under the proposed project, approximately the same as under the approved project. RTM management practices and environmental commitments would minimize the potential hazards from RTM.

Electrical Transmission Lines

Hazards associated with electrical transmission lines within the study area of the proposed project would be similar to those described in the Final EIR/EIS for the approved project. However, the proposed project would slightly increase potential for hazardous contact. The increase can be attributed to the change from 230-kilovolt (kV) lines to 69-kV lines along the northern part of the work area. Generally, lower-voltage lines are considered more risky because of the height of the conductors. There are 6 overhead power/electrical transmission lines crossing the proposed project water conveyance facilities alignment (Table 24-1 and Figure 24-4). All procedures developed to minimize the hazards of electrical transmission lines would be identical to those of the approved project from the Final EIR/EIS. Accordingly, the transmission lines (temporary and permanent) would not create an adverse effect related to the release of hazardous materials.

Table 24-1. Number and Type of Pipelines and Electrical Transmission Lines Crossing the Approved Project Alignment and the Proposed Project Alignment

Utility Operator and Type	Approved Project	Proposed Project
Western Area Power Administration 69 kV	1	1
Western Area Power Administration 230 kV	2	1
Pacific Gas & Electric 115 kV	2	2
Pacific Gas & Electric 230 kV	0	0
Pacific Gas & Electric 500 kV	3	1
Transmission Agency of Northern California/Western Area Power Administration for the California-Oregon Transmission Project 500 kV	1	1
Sacramento Municipal Utility District 230 kV	3	0
Pacific Gas & Electric (size unspecified) Natural Gas	6	5
Chevron Texaco (7-inch diameter) Petroleum Product	1	0
Chevron Texaco (8-inch diameter) Petroleum Product	0	1
Chevron Texaco (8-inch/10-inch diameter)	0	1
Kinder Morgan Pacific Region (10-inch) Petroleum Product	1	1

kV = kilovolt.

Infrastructure Containing Hazardous Materials

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 of 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.

To the extent that excavation, dewatering, and other activities are associated with the construction of conveyance facilities, the extent of these potential hazards would be less under the proposed project than with the approved project. The proposed project involves less excavation despite the new conveyance segment from Byron Tract Forebay to the California Aqueduct and Delta-Mendota Canal, and Clifton Court Forebay would not be dredged. 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 an adverse effect on the physical environment. Potential effects include routine use of hazardous materials, possible natural gas accumulation in tunnels, contact with or release of existing contaminants, 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 these 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.

The amount of material excavated would be less under the proposed project than under the approved project because, although a conveyance facility would be constructed from the new Byron Tract Forebay to the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, Clifton Court Forebay would no longer be dredged. The decreased excavation would result in a slightly decreased possibility of impact from potentially contaminated sediment, which could adversely affect soil, groundwater, or

surface water. However, the proposed project would cross a greater number of electrical transmission lines and other structures that may contain hazardous materials.

However, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a and HAZ-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.

Incremental Impact: Changing the footprint of water conveyance facilities would result in the excavation of less material than under the approved project because, despite the conveyance facility construction at Byron Tract Forebay, Clifton Court Forebay would no longer be dredged under the proposed project. This decreased excavation would result in a slightly decreased possibility of impact from potentially contaminated sediment. However, the proposed project would cross a greater number of electrical transmission lines and other structures that may contain hazardous materials than would the approved project. However, implementation of the mitigation measures and environmental commitments discussed above would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a: Perform Preconstruction Surveys, Including Soil and Groundwater Testing, at Known or Suspected Contaminated Areas within the Construction Footprint, and Remediate and/or Contain Contamination

Please refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a under Impact HAZ-1, in Chapter 24, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b: Perform Pre-Demolition Surveys for Structures to Be Demolished within the Construction Footprint, Characterize Hazardous Materials and Dispose of Them in Accordance with Applicable Regulations

Please refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b under Impact HAZ-1, in Chapter 24, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measure UT-6a: Verify Locations of Utility Infrastructure

Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6a under Impact UT-6 in Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities* of the Final EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measure UT-6c: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety

Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6c under Impact UT-6 in Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities* of the Final EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a: Implement Site-Specific Construction Traffic Management Plan

Please see Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a under Impact TRANS-1 in Chapter 19, *Transportation* of the Final EIR/EIS.

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.*

Incremental Impact: The potential for exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous substances or conditions under the proposed project would be similar to the potential of the approved project. There would be no impact. No mitigation is required.

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 three 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 facilities, 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.

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 Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. Because there are no "Cortese List"[1] sites 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 is 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.

Impact HAZ-4: Result in a Safety Hazard Associated with an Airport or Private Airstrip within 2 Miles of the Water Conveyance Facilities Footprint for People Residing or Working in the Study Area during Construction of the Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: Similar to what was discussed in the Final EIR/EIS, there is potential for construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in a safety hazard associated with activities within 2 miles of an airport or private airstrip. However, under the proposed project there would be only two airports and airstrips within 2 miles of the conveyance facilities (Figure 24-6), which is three fewer than the five airports and airstrips within 2 miles of the approved project's conveyance facilities. Because of the fewer airports within close proximity to the proposed project footprint, the adverse safety hazards associated with the airports would decrease under the proposed project.

To help ensure protection of airspace, DWR would comply with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements under 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77, as discussed for Alternative 4 in Section 24.3.3.9 of the Final EIR/EIS. DWR would coordinate with Caltrans' Division of Aeronautics prior to initiating construction and would comply with its recommendations based on its investigation(s), as well as complying with the recommendations of the Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis for Byron. These recommendations, which could include limitations necessary to minimize potential problems, such as the use of temporary construction equipment, supplemental notice requirements, and marking and lighting high-profile structures would reduce the potential for impacts on air safety. This effect would not be adverse.

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in a safety hazard associated with activities within 2 miles of an airport or private airstrip would be similar to impacts described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. The use of helicopters for stringing the proposed 230-kV transmission lines high-profile construction equipment (200 feet or taller), such as cranes, for installation of pipelines, and potentially pile drivers during the construction of the intakes would have the potential to result in

[1] 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.

safety hazards to aircraft during takeoff and landing if the equipment is operated too close to runways.

As described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs*, as part of an environmental commitment pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, DWR would coordinate with Caltrans' Division of Aeronautics prior to initiating construction and comply with its recommendations based on its investigations and compliance with the recommendations of the Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis for Byron Airport. These recommendations, which could include limitations necessary to minimize potential problems such as the use of temporary construction equipment, supplemental notice requirements, and marking and lighting high-profile structures, would reduce potential impacts on air safety. This impact would be less than significant because recommendations to avoid conflicts with existing airports located near construction areas would be implemented by DWR prior to construction as required by Caltrans. No mitigation is required.

Incremental Impact: The potential for the construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in a safety hazard associated with activities within 2 miles of an airport or private airstrip would be similar that of the approved project. The impact under the proposed project would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact HAZ-5: Expose People or Structures to a Substantial Risk of Property Loss, Personal Injury or Death Involving Wildland Fires, Including Where Wildlands are Adjacent to Urbanized Areas or Where Residences are Intermixed with Wildlands, as a Result of Construction, and Operation and Maintenance of the Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: The potential for construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in exposure of people or structures to risks associated with wildfire would be identical to the potential described in Final EIS/EIR Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. This potential effect is not adverse because no portion of the proposed project would be located in or near an area designated as a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Additionally, measures to prevent and control wildland fires would be implemented by DWR during construction, operation, and maintenance of the water conveyance facilities in full compliance with the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) standards for fire safety and prevention.

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in exposure of people or structures to risks associated with wildfire would be similar to the potential described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. People or structures would not be subject to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires during construction or operation and maintenance of the water conveyance facilities because the proposed project would comply with Cal-OSHA fire prevention and safety standards; DWR would implement standard fire safety and prevention measures as part of a Fire Prevention and Control Plan (described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs*); and because the water conveyance facilities would not be located in a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. This impact would be less than significant because conditions do not exist near construction areas that would result in exposure of people or structures to significant risk of exposure to wildfire and DWR would implement standard fire safety and prevention measures. No mitigation is required.

Incremental Impact: The potential for the construction of proposed project conveyance facilities to result in exposure of people or structures to risks associated with wildfire would be similar to that of the approved project. The impact under the proposed project would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact HAZ-6: Create a Substantial Hazard to the Public or the Environment through the Release of Hazardous Materials or by Other Means during Operation and Maintenance of the Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: The potential for operation and maintenance of the water conveyance facilities (excluding water supply operations) under the proposed project to result in a substantial hazard to the public or environment would be the same as described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project. However, as shown in Figure 24-6, there would be fewer airports within 2 miles of the proposed project's construction footprint when compared with the approved project's footprint, resulting in a slightly decreased potential for adverse effects. Implementation of the best management practices and other activities required by SWPPPs, HMMPs, SAPs, SPCCPs, as well as adherence to all applicable FAA regulations (14 CFR Part 77) and, as part of an environmental commitment pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, coordination/compliance with Caltrans' Division of Aeronautics when performing work with high-profile equipment within 2 miles of an airport would ensure that impacts are reduced. Contaminated solids could pose a hazard to the environment if improperly disposed of, and would be considered adverse, because of the large volume of sediment/solids that would be handled and the potential for improper disposal. However, Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 has been adopted to reduce these effects.

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for operation and maintenance of conveyance facilities under the proposed project to result in a substantial hazard to the public or environment would be slightly less than described in Final EIR/EIS Section 24.3.4.2 for the approved project due to the changed footprint under the proposed project. The accidental release of hazardous materials (including contaminated solids and sediment) to the environment during operation and maintenance of the water conveyance facilities and the potential interference with air safety through the use of high-profile equipment for maintenance of proposed transmission lines could result in significant impacts on the public and environment because of the large scale of construction and the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during construction. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring sampling and characterizing solids from the solids lagoons to evaluate options to dispose of material at an appropriate, licensed facility.

Incremental Impact: The potential for the construction of proposed project conveyance facilities to result in a substantial hazard to the public or environment would be slightly less than that of the approved project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-6: Test Dewatered Solids from Solids Lagoons Prior to Reuse and/or Disposal

Please refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 under Impact HAZ-6, in Chapter 24, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

24.3.2 Cumulative Analysis

The Final EIR/EIS found that the approved project could result in a cumulatively significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. The incremental hazards and hazardous material impact contribution from the approved project would also be cumulatively considerable, but with the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a, HAZ-1b, HAZ-6 UT-6a, UT-6c, TRANS-1a, and the applicable environmental commitments discussed previously and in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs*, cumulative impacts of the action alternatives would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The analysis for cumulative effects of the proposed project for hazards and hazardous materials remains the same as described in the Final EIR/EIS, and with implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed project's cumulative impact would be less than significant.

24.4 References Cited

None.