South of the project are industrial facilities associated with the Topock Compressor Station. Other prominent visual features in the project vicinity include development at Moabi Regional Park northwest of the project, the four lined evaporation ponds associated with the Topock Compressor Station southwest of the project, and the Topock Marina across the Colorado River east of the project.

Impacts

Renewal of the existing WDRs would allow for the continued injection of water treated by the IM No. 3 water treatment plant. No additional facilities are proposed, and no change to the existing visual environment would result from renewal of the WDRs. No aesthetic impacts would result from ongoing operations.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

The project area is comprised primarily of open space, along with a mix of recreational and industrial land uses, including the existing IM No. 3 facilities. No agricultural lands or activities occur at the project area. Based on information provided by the County of San Bernardino planning staff (S. Hall 2004), the project is not located within an area of prime, unique, or important farmland.

Impacts

No agricultural resources occur at the project site or nearby vicinity. No impact will result.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

The project area is characterized by arid conditions and high temperature. Precipitation averages less than 5 inches per year at the project site and mainly comes during winter months, and occasionally during the summer. The California Air Resources Board regulates air quality in California and has divided the state into air basins according to topographic and air-related characteristics. Each District is responsible for regulating stationary sources of air pollution and the implementation of air quality programs per state and federal mandates. The project area falls within the jurisdiction of Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD). Prior to construction of the IM No. 3 facilities, the MDAQMD issued the Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate the IM No. 3 facilities. In addition, the onsite portable generator used for backup electrical power was registered with the California Air Resources Board under the portable equipment registration program.

The project is located in an area designated as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}). The project falls within a federal non-attainment area for both PM_{10} and ozone (1-hour and 8-hour standards). In addition, the project is located in a State of California non-attainment area for both PM_{10} and ozone. No sensitive receptors (e.g., hospital, school, etc.) are located at the project site or nearby vicinity.

The MDAQMD has prepared the *Federal Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) Attainment Plan* to address the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) moderate non-attainment classification for PM_{10}. However, the project is not located within the planning area; therefore, project activities are not subject to the PM_{10} attainment plan. Activities at the project site are typically implemented in accordance with MDAQMD Rule 403, which provides reasonable precautions to minimize fugitive dust emissions. Operations at the project area include the watering of access roads several times per week to minimize dust and PM_{10} emissions resulting from vehicle traffic.

MDAQMD has also adopted the *2004 Ozone Attainment Plan (State and Federal)*. As noted in the plan, MDAQMD does not propose any additional measures beyond the existing Reasonably Available Control Technology requirements applicable to new sources (i.e., with emissions greater than 25 tons per year). This does not apply to activities associated with the IM No. 3 operations.

Existing IM No. 3 air emissions include those from delivery and maintenance vehicles, pickup truck, and ATV operation during the Compliance Monitoring Program and Performance Monitoring Program activities and the off-site transport of brine waste from IM No. 3 operations (approximately 26 trucks per week). In addition, IM No. 3 operations involve the periodic use of an onsite generator when electrical power from the electrical utility is unavailable.

Impacts

Air emission levels following renewal of the WDRs would not change from existing emission levels. Ongoing IM No. 3 operations following renewal of the WDRs would involve the periodic use of an onsite generator when electrical power from the electrical utility is unavailable. Air emissions associated with generator usage would be short term and would not constitute a substantial portion of any criteria pollutant, including ozone. As noted above, the backup IM No. 3 generator is authorized to operate under the California Air Resources Board portable equipment registration program. Dust control measures, such as the watering of IM No. 3 access roads, would minimize dust and associated PM_{10} emissions resulting from ongoing IM No. 3 operations. Mobile emission sources include the approximately 26 truckloads per week associated with the off-site hauling of brine waste. Air emissions from this activity and other IM No. 3 operations (e.g., delivery and maintenance vehicles) would not represent a substantial contribution to regulated air emissions.

No air quality impacts would result from renewal of the WDRs.[4]

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any 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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

[4] It should also be noted that a decision not to renew the WDRs would require implementing some other means for disposing of the treated water from the IM No. 3 water treatment plant. The likely means of doing this would be to truck the treated water to a permitted offsite disposal facility. Up to 300 truckloads per week of treated water might be required to be hauled offsite if the existing WDRs are not renewed. The vehicle emissions from these trucking operations would be significantly greater than existing air emission levels, as well as the emission levels associated with renewal of the WDRs.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

Prior to the construction of the IM No. 3 facilities, biological investigations were conducted at the project area, as documented in the *Final Biological Resources Investigations for Interim Measures No. 3: Topock Compressor Station Expanded Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System* (CH2M HILL 2004b). Subsequent biological surveys at the project site are documented in the *Biological Resources Survey Report for the Area of Potential Effect (APE) Topock Compressor Station Expanded Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System Needles* (CH2M HILL 2005a). The following information summarizes the biological conditions at the project site and in the vicinity of the existing IM No. 3 facilities, as documented in these reports.

The Colorado River is the primary aquatic habitat located approximately 1,300 feet east of the Topock Compressor Station. The river is approximately 700 to 900 feet wide and 8 to 15 feet deep at this location. Little to no submergent vegetation exists within the river. Small patches of emergent vegetation along the banks consist of common reed (*Phragmites communis*), cattails (*Typha* sp.), sedges (*Carex* sp.), and bulrush (*Scirpus* sp.). Several of these wetland patches are located at the confluence of Bat Cave Wash and near Moabi Regional Park. Larger wetlands and marshes exist along the eastern bank of the peninsula near the Topock Marina. The Topock

Marsh, located northeast of the project within the HNWR, provides important aquatic marsh and riparian habitat in the project vicinity.

Terrestrial habitats near the project consist of creosote bush scrub, Mojave wash, desert riparian, and tamarisk thicket. The dominant upland plant community is creosote bush scrub. The area is sparsely vegetated with widely-distributed creosote bushes (*Larrea tridentata*). Other plant species that occur within this plant community include burrobush (*Ambrosia dumosa*), allscale (*Atriplex polycarpa*), split grass (*Schismus* sp.), spineflower (*Chorizanthe* sp.), desert trumpet (*Eriogonum inflatum*), beavertail cactus (*Opuntia basilaris*), golden cholla (*Opuntia echinocarpa*), brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), cheesebush (*Hymenoclea salsola*), dalea (*Dalea mollisima*), red barrel cactus (*Ferocactus pilosus*), sweetbush (*Bebbia juncea*), and ratany (*Krameria erecta*).

Mojave Wash is comprised of Bat Cave Wash and other unnamed washes in the area. Bat Cave Wash is an ephemeral drainage that extends from the Chemehuevi Mountains to the Colorado River approximately 3,500 feet north of the Topock Compressor Station. Although this wash may periodically flood during stormwater runoff events, it remains dry throughout most of the year due to arid desert conditions. The wash floor is relatively barren of vegetation and consists of sand, gravel, and cobblestone substrate. Although the drainages occur within the creosote bush scrub plant community, several native tree species are associated with the washes including palo verde (*Cercidium* sp.), acacia (*Acacia greggii*), mesquite (*Prosopis* sp.), and smoke tree (*Dalea spinosa*).

Desert riparian vegetation is present at the confluence of Bat Cave Wash and the Colorado River. This plant community consists of scattered mesquite, palo verde, and tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.).

Tamarisk thicket is the dominant plant community along the Colorado River floodplain. This invasive, exotic plant species has displaced native plant species. This plant community consists of dense monotypic stands of tamarisk with an understory of arrowweed (*Pluchea sericea*). In general, tamarisk does not provide optimal wildlife habitat, but it does provide a roosting structure for several avian species.

Avian species commonly associated with the river include American coot (*Fulica americana*), mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), pied-billed grebe (*Podilymbus podiceps*), great egret (*Casmerodius albus*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), northern rough-winged swallow (*Stegidopteryx serripennis*), and belted kingfisher (*Ceryle alcyon*). Other avian species found in the upland areas include red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamencensis*), Gambel's quail (*Callipepla gambelii*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), Canyon wren (*Catherpes mexicanus*), brewer's blackbird (*Euphagus cyanocephalus*), great-tailed grackle (*Quiscalus mexicanus*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), lesser nighthawk (*Chordeiles acutipennis*), and rock dove (*Columba livia*).

Mammals that may occur at the project area include deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus*), Merriam kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami*), whitetail antelope squirrel (*Ammospermophilus leucurus*), desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida*), California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*),

desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), and black-tailed hare (*Lepus californicus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), desert kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), beaver (*Castor canadensis*), and raccoon (*Procyon lotor*).

Reptiles that may occur in the area include chuckwalla (*Sauromalus obesus*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), western whiptail lizard (*Cnemidophorus tigris*), zebra-tailed lizard (*Callisaurus draconoides*), coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum*), gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), and western diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus atrox*).

Impacts

Renewal of the WDRs would allow for the continued injection of treated water into the groundwater aquifer. No physical changes will occur. Thus, no impact to biological resources is anticipated to result from renewal of the WDRs.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

The project site and surrounding area has been the subject of several cultural resource investigations, including most recently the *Cultural Resources Investigations, Third Addendum: Survey of the Original and Expanded APE: Volume I, for Topock Compressor Station Site Vicinity, San Bernardino County, California* (Applied Earthworks 2005). Prior to construction of the IM No. 3 facilities, the *Cultural Resources Investigations for Interim Measures No. 3 Topock Compressor Station Expanded Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System* was prepared (CH2M HILL 2004c) and was used for the consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). As a result of the SHPO consultation, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the BLM and SHPO, with concurrence provided by PG&E. The Memorandum of Agreement provided for the preparation

and implementation of a Cultural Resources Management Plan during construction and operation of the IM No. 3 facilities. The *Cultural Resources Management Plan for the Topock Compressor Station Expanded Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System* (Applied Earthworks 2004) was prepared in September 2004 and remains in effect.

Archeological resources in the project vicinity include the Topock Maze. The Maze was created by modifying the desert landscape through creation of long parallel rows of stacked or piled dark colored desert-varnished rocks. These dark lines alternate with light bands formed where the varnished desert pavement was removed. The resultant pattern, also called the "Mystic Maze," carries cultural and spiritual significance for the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe. One of the three manifestations of the Maze was included in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1978 for its unique scale and design and for its potential to provide data on geoglyph (ground markings) construction and use. Along with this portion of the Maze, 136 lithic scatters and other prehistoric remnants have been recorded in the project vicinity.

As previously mentioned, the Maze and the project are within an area of extreme importance to the local Native American community. The project area lies within the traditional territory of the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe or Aha Makav. While the material remains of the past are of import to them, this area of traditional and spiritual use knows no boundaries for the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe.

Historic resources in the area include two segments of historic Route 66, which was listed in the NRHP in 1990. The first segment is a 1.3-mile section of road extending from Park Moabi Road to the BNSF railway, which was designated Route 66 between 1926 and 1947. Several features such as flagstone drainages, gutters, right-of-way marker posts, and a stacked concrete bag revetment also are a part of this segment. Along with the physical elements of the roadway itself, historical debris and other features may be associated with the roadway and may have characteristics that contribute to its significance. This segment of historic Route 66 is intersected by two abandoned graveled road sections, which may represent portions of National Old Trails Road, the predecessor to Route 66.

The second segment of Route 66 in the area follows the former alignment of a railway constructed by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company in 1883. This segment passes through the southeastern portion of the project area and is currently operated as National Trails Highway. Between 1947 and 1966, Route 66 followed this alignment. The former railroad right-of-way is eligible for the NRHP.

Prior to the construction of IM No. 3 facilities, historic Route 66 between Park Moabi Road and the BNSF railway was provided with structural protection to minimize any potential impact to the roadway fabric. Specifically, a geotextile membrane and approximately 5 inches of road base were placed on the road to protect the historic roadway fabric between Park Moabi Road and the IM No. 3 treatment plant. This protection remains in place and will be removed when no longer needed.

In addition to Route 66, there are 12 other historic sites that occur near the project, as documented in the CH2M HILL report (2004c) and Applied Earthworks report (2005).

No known paleontological or unique geologic features are present at or in proximity to the project.

Impacts

Approval of the renewal of the WDRs would allow for the continuation of injection operations. Continued injection will not involve any change from existing operations. Further, all IM No. 3 operations are currently subject to an existing Cultural Resources Management Plan that provides for the protection of Route 66, as well as other historic and archeological resources near the project. This plan will continue to apply to continued operations. No construction activity is proposed. Therefore, no potential for direct impacts to archeological sites, historic resources, or human remains is expected. Paleontological resources or unique geologic features do not occur at the project site. No impact to cultural resources would result from renewal of the WDRs.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	☑
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☑
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☑

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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

Geology in the vicinity of the project consists of recent and older river deposits progressing westward to older alluvial deposits associated with the local mountains. Sand, gravel, and cobblestone dominate these deposits, comprising the principal groundwater aquifer at the site. The landscape is considerably eroded by natural processes that include wind and water erosion. Land forms are characterized by alluvial terraces and incised drainage channels. One of the largest incised channels is Bat Cave Wash, which runs from the Chemehuevi Mountains in the south toward the Colorado River in the north. Terraces occurring nearby are homogeneous, comprising rocky soils with very sparse vegetation. Elevations in the project vicinity range from just over 800 feet msl south of the Topock Compressor Station to 450 feet msl at the Colorado River floodplain.

There are no known recent active faults identified by California Division of Mines and Geology (1994). Older faults greater than 10,000 years from the Late Quaternary or Tertiary age exist within 6 miles.

The project area varies topographically. Much of the area soils are unconsolidated sedimentary alluvium (sandy gravel and finer grained sand). The nearby floodplain of the Colorado River consists of a shifting sand-dune system. The project area does not consist of expansive soils. The design of the existing IM No. 3 facilities conforms to the County Building Code and Uniform Building Code standards, which serve to minimize potential geologic hazards.

Sewers are not available in the project area. Wastewater generated from existing IM No. 3 operations is managed with a sewage holding tank, in accordance with existing building and land use permits issued by San Bernardino County. The sewage holding tank is a zero-discharge facility that is regularly pumped-out for disposal at a permitted offsite facility.

The injection of treated groundwater is subject to existing WDRs Order No. R7-2004-0103 adopted by the Regional Board on October 13, 2004. The WDRs apply to the re-injection of treated groundwater into the injection well field. Brine waste and sludge produced as a by-product of the water treatment process are hauled off-site for disposal at permitted facilities. The injection of treated water has operated in full compliance with the WDR requirements since startup in July 2005.

Impacts

Renewal of the WDRs would allow for the continued injection of treated water from the IM No. 3 facilities. No new facilities would be constructed as a result of WDR renewal. Future operation of the IM No. 3 facilities would not differ from existing operations. Existing facilities, including those involving human occupancy, have been designed and constructed in accordance with County of San Bernardino building standards, which account for potential seismic activity in the project vicinity.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑

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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

On-going operation of the existing IM No. 3 facilities involves the extraction, conveyance, and treatment of chromium in groundwater. Chromium levels in groundwater extracted for treatment do not typically exceed the toxicity characterization threshold concentrations for hazardous waste of 5.0 parts per million. The typical toxicity characteristics of sludge generated from the water treatment plant are not subject to regulation under the federal Resource Conservation and Recover Act (RCRA). However, the sludge is a state-regulated hazardous waste under Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and, as such, is transported to a permitted, offsite, hazardous waste disposal facility. Reverse osmosis concentrate (brine) generated from the water treatment plant does not contain elevated levels of chromium but does contain dissolved solids at elevated concentrations. The brine is also transported offsite to a permitted disposal facility.

Operations at the IM No. 3 facilities involve the use, storage, and transport of relatively small amounts of regulated compounds, which are stored within containment structures and managed in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. These compounds include ferrous chloride, sodium hydroxide, sulfuric acid, and various fuels, lubricants, and solvents. Any spill associated with IM No. 3 operations is subject to immediate cleanup and reporting in

accordance with the *Emergency Notification Binder* (CH2M HILL 2005b) and *Hazardous Materials Business Plan* (PG&E 2006).

No schools or other sensitive receptors are located within one-quarter mile of the project. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No private or municipal airports are located in the nearby vicinity of the project.

Impacts

Future operations resulting from renewal of the WDRs would not differ from existing operations. All hazardous chemicals are stored within containment structures and managed in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. IM No. 3 operations are subject to the *Emergency Notification Binder* and *Hazardous Materials Business Plan*, which would serve to limit any impact resulting from the spill of a regulated compound. Sparse vegetation at the project area limits the potential for wildfires. Because no change in IM No. 3 operations would result from WDR renewal, no impacts are anticipated.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☑

d) Substantially alter the 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 would result 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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☑
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☑
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Setting

Precipitation in the project area averages less than 5 inches per year. Precipitation at the project site evaporates, soaks into the surface soils, or drains to the Colorado River, Bat Cave Wash, and other unnamed washes to the west end at the Colorado River. These ephemeral desert washes are dry most of the year, but during heavy precipitation events the washes can have surface flow. Storm water facilities are primarily limited to roadway culverts and ditches. Recent improvements along the existing IM No. 3 access routes included the installation of additional and/or expanded culverts and ditches to minimize roadway erosion. Groundwater at the

project site is part of an alluvial aquifer at depths of 40 to 350 feet below ground surface. Depth to groundwater is controlled topographically.

The 100-year floodplain at the project site is limited to portions of the floodplain adjacent to the channel of the Colorado River. The PE-1 extraction well facilities are partially located in the potential 100-year flood area but have been designed to avoid any adverse effect resulting from flooding of the facilities. No housing or other occupied structures are located within the 100-year floodplain at the project site.

The project is located within the jurisdiction of the Colorado River Basin Regional Board. Water quality objectives for groundwater and surface water in the region are contained in the *Water Quality Control Plan, Colorado River Basin – Region 7* (including amendments adopted through October 2005). WDR Order No. R7-2004-103 was adopted by the Regional Board on October 13, 2004 and applies to the re-injection of treated water from the IM No. 3 water treatment plant into the groundwater aquifer. These WDRs contain effluent limitations for Cr(VI), total chromium, and pH. Additionally, IM No. 3 effluent must not contain heavy metals, chemicals, pesticides, or other constituents in concentrations toxic to human health.

Impacts

Continued injection of treated water from the IM No. 3 facilities is subject to the renewal of WDR Order No. R7-2004-0103, which expires on January 31, 2007. Future IM No. 3 operations are expected to be subject to requirements substantially similar to those in the existing WDRs. These requirements include effluent limitations, regular sampling of treated water, and monitoring of groundwater in the vicinity of the injection field. To date, no violation of the parameters provided in the WDRs has occurred. Continued IM No. 3 operations are not expected to result in any violation of the anticipated water quality standards applied by the Regional Board.

No new facilities are proposed for construction as a result of the renewal of the WDRs. Existing drainage patterns would not change. No occupied structures would be subject to flooding or other water-related hazards. No adverse impact to hydrology and water quality would occur as a result of renewal of the WDRs.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☑