ADDENDUM TO INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (SCH No. 2013092049)

CASCADE SHORES COMMUNITY LEACH FIELD PROJECT

March 13, 2015

Prepared by:
Nevada County Department of Public Works
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Introduction

This environmental document is an Addendum to the Cascade Shores Community Leach Field Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), State Clearinghouse No. 20130902049, adopted in March 2014 by the Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 Board of Directors. The requirements for State Revolving Fund (SRF) application for funding this project have necessitated further environmental review. As demonstrated in this Addendum, the IS/MND continues to serve as the appropriate document addressing the environmental impacts of these improvements pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 BACKGROUND

The IS/MND was prepared to address construction-level and operational impacts of the proposed changes to the Cascade Shores wastewater treatment plant system (Approved Project). The IS/MND evaluated potential environmental effects on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, and mandatory findings of significance. All impacts in the IS/MND have been mitigated to below a level of significance through implementation of mitigation measures.

The Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 is the lead agency under CEQA.

1.2 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM TO THE IS/MND

When a proposed project is changed, there are changes in environmental setting, or additional analysis is required, a determination must be made by the Lead Agency as to whether an Addendum or Subsequent EIR or MND is prepared. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 set forth criteria to assess which environmental document is appropriate. The criteria for determining whether an Addendum or Subsequent MND is prepared are outlined below. If the criteria below are true, then an Addendum is the appropriate document:

- No new significant impacts will result from the project or from new mitigation measures.
- No substantial increase in the severity of environmental impact will occur.
- No new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts previously found not to be feasible have, in fact, been found to be feasible.

Based upon the information provided in Section 3.0 of this document, the changes to the Approved Project will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the IS/MND, and there are no previously infeasible alternatives that are now feasible. None of the other factors set forth in Section 15162(a)(3) are present. Therefore, an

Addendum is appropriate, and this Addendum has been prepared to address the environmental effects of the refinements to the project.

1.3 CONCLUSIONS

This Addendum provides additional environmental analysis for requirements of the SRF application that have been identified since adoption of the IS/MND. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the IS/MND. **No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the IS/MND.**

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The project site consists of the existing Cascade Shores Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and the proposed wastewater treatment area, both of which are located in western Nevada County approximately 5.5 miles east of Nevada City in the Cascade Shores subdivision on Scotts Flat Reservoir. The project site is located off Pasquale Road at 13491 Pacific Close, Nevada City, CA, on Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 38-570-04.

The Cascade Shores WWTP is in one of ten zones within Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1. The District owns and operates the Cascade Shores WWTP, which provides sewerage service for a small community of approximately 200 people through 87 sewer connections in Nevada County. Of the 87 dischargers to the WWTP's sewer collection system, one is a fire station, one is a market, one is a restroom at a recreational area and the remaining discharges are residences. The plant treats an average dry weather flow of approximately 14,000 gallons per day.

The surrounding character of the site is rural residential, and vegetation consists of mixed conifer forest. The upper portion of the property where the leach field alternatives are proposed consists of a south sloping face with disturbed undulating topography. Pasquale Road is located to the north of the project site, and the property is surrounded by residential properties to the north and west. Additionally, the Cascade Shores WWTP is located directly to the east of the new wastewater project site, and the Gas Canyon hydraulic mine site is located to the south.

2.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

The project has not changed and remains the same as described in the IS/MND. The project as consisting of two primary components: 1) partially decommissioning the current WWTP and 2) constructing new wastewater treatment facilities to allow for a land-based community leach field. New facilities consist of a sewer lift station, conveyance force main, leachate tanks, leach field pipes,

motor control center and emergency generator. The leach field is anticipated to consist of buried pipe approximately 18 inches below ground level. Up to 7,700 linear feet of pipe may be needed.

While the structures and ponds at the existing WWTP would remain as a backup facility for any potential future emergency needs, under normal conditions the WWTP will no longer process waste water, and therefore effluent will no longer be discharged into Gas Canyon Creek. Staging areas, parking, and storage would be located on APN 38-570-04, outside of sensitive resource areas. All stockpiled materials, parking areas, and equipment storage areas would be located to avoid interference with private property and to prevent hazards to the public. The contract documents and construction plans would require the contractor to conduct the work to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic and inconvenience to the public and residents in the vicinity of the construction activities, and to ensure the protection of public safety and property.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

As explained in Section 1.0, this Addendum has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the District with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the IS/MND was certified require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent MND or EIR to the IS/MND previously prepared.

The environmental analysis provided in the IS/MND remains current and applicable to the proposed project in all areas listed below:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Because there are no changes to the proposed project, the Hydrology and Water Quality analysis in the IS/MND remains valid. However, as part of the State Revolving Fund (SRF) application for the

IS/MND, the District is required to evaluate not only downstream water quality impacts (as done in the Hydrology section of the IS/MND) but also impacts to downstream water users in terms of water flow and supply. The following discussion is hereby added to the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the IS/MND.

Hydrology and Water Quality:

The proposed project would eliminate existing treated wastewater effluent discharge into Gas Canyon Creek. Gas Canyon Creek is a seasonal drainage and is a tributary to Greenhorn Creek and Bear River. Bear River feeds Nevada Irrigation District's (NID) Rollins Reservoir and Combie Reservoir. NID is a local municipal and irrigation water purveyor, and their water rights cover the Bear River watershed and all its tributaries, which include Gas Canyon Creek. Additionally, a search of eWRIMS, the SWRCB's water rights database, revealed two additional water rights holders on the Bear River: Green Vista Holdings, LLC and the SWRCB.[1]

Currently, treated effluent from Cascade Shores WWTP is discharged to Gas Canyon Creek at the outfall location (39.15.40N; 120.54.20W) just south of Scotts Flat Reservoir. This effluent is the sole source of surface water in the drainage except during extreme precipitation events. In 2014, effluent flowed in the quantities shown in the table below (shown in gallons):

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
17,800	9,500	19,200	17,200	14,700	13,900	11,300	11,700	10,100	8,900	9,900	9,300

The combined annual flow is thus 153,500 gallons, or 0.47 acre-feet. For comparison purposes, the storage capacity of Rollins Reservoir is 65,988 acre-feet, and Combie Reservoir is 48,547 acre-feet. Recent discussions with NID's Water Operations Manager, Chip Close[2], indicate that NID does not have any concerns with the reduction in water flow into Gas Canyon Creek.

Groundwater and surface water have a dynamic and interconnected relationship whereby surface water recharges groundwater sources, and groundwater seeps into surface water sources, both feeding each other in a cyclical system. Although the closest leach field lines of the proposed project would be approximately 1,000 feet from Gas Canyon Creek and the likelihood of leached effluent moving from the groundwater system to Gas Canyon Creek is remote, the effluent is not being removed from the local environment but will recharge the groundwater system through the proposed leach lines. Furthermore, it is very likely that at least some of the effluent is currently lost prior to reaching the first reservoir (Rollins), to 1) seepage to the groundwater system, 2) transpiration via vegetation uptake, and 3) evaporation, especially during the dry season.[3]

[1] State Water Resources Control Board. eWRIMS. Accessed March 10, 2015. www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/ewrims

[2] Close, Chip. Water Operations Manager, Nevada Irrigation District. Phone communication with Jessica Hankins, Interim Transportation Planner, March 10, 2015.

[3] USGS. "Natural Processes of Ground-Water and Surface-Water Interaction," USGS Circular 1139. January 11, 2013. pubs.usgs.gov/circ/circ1139/htdocs/natural_processes_of_ground.htm#interact

For the reasons outlined above, the minor reduction in water flow to the NID reservoirs and other water rights along the Bear River listed above is not anticipated to be substantial, and this impact would be less than significant.

As noted in the adopted IS/MND for this project, the project would result in a beneficial impact on downstream water quality. Because the current plant operations have led to violations of permit limits for copper effluent, the elimination of the discharge from the treatment plant will reduce the amount of pollutants into Gas Canyon Creek while meeting discharge requirements for land application. Water quality impacts to downstream users such NID – a water purveyor – and the public – a beneficiary of that water supply – would therefore be positive, improving the quality of the public's water supply.

3.1 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information provided above, the newly evaluated impacts to downstream water users would not result in a measurable increase in new environmental impacts. No new significant impacts have been identified, nor is the severity of newly identified impacts substantially greater than the conclusions of the IS/MND.

Based upon the evidence included in the above analysis, the proposed project as described in Section 2.0 would not result in a substantial change in the conclusions and analysis included in the IS/MND.