Environmental Checklist - Initial Study

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 11-08

SOUTHERN SEWER PUMP STATION
102 EAST DANENBERG DRIVE
APN 054-050-008

Prepared By:

DUDEK
605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024
Contact: Carey Fernandes
760.479.4299
1. **Project title:** Southern Sewer Pump Station

2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of El Centro, Public Works Department, 307 West Brighton Avenue, El Centro, CA 92243

3. **Contact person and phone number:** Randy Hines – (760) 337-4522

4. **Project location:** 102 East Danenberg Drive, El Centro, CA 92243 (APN 054-050-008)

5. **Project sponsor’s name and address:** Randy Hines, 307 W. Brighton Avenue, El Centro, CA 92243

6. **General plan designation:** General Industrial

7. **Zoning:** ML, Light Manufacturing

8. **Description of project:** The project proposes the construction of approximately 18,865 linear feet of pipeline and a new sewer pump station at 102 E. Danenberg Drive in the City of El Centro (see Figure 1, Regional Map and Figure 2, Vicinity Map).

The new sewer pump station and associated sewer lines would collect and pump sewage to the waste water treatment plant for processing. The proposed pump station site encompasses approximately 0.25 acre of vacant land, while the associated sewer lines encompass approximately 0.35 acre. A steel fence with masonry pilasters would be constructed along the perimeter of the project site. Two 16-foot long wrought iron gates would be provided for ingress and egress to the project site, along the northern and southern boundary of the project site. Permanent street access to the pump station site would be provided off Danenberg Drive. The pump station site and associated access road encompass approximately 15,500 square feet (see Figure 3, Project Components and Figure 4, Southern Pump Station Site Plan).

The project includes installation of a Romtec prefabricated pump station or an approved equivalent prefabricated wastewater pump station and valve vault, control buildings, associated electrical and controls, 8 to 21-inch gravity sewers, and a 20-inch force main. The prefabricated electrical/controls building would be constructed of reinforced 8-inch by 16-inch split face block concrete masonry units, with a metal roof. The height of the proposed building would be approximately 9 feet 4 inches tall to 13 feet 6 inches at the roof’s peak. Additionally, landscaping of the pump station site is proposed as shown in Figure 5, Landscape Plan.

The sewer pipelines would extend offsite along Danenberg Drive, Beverly Lane, Willow Bend Drive, Farnsworth Road, in the Desert Trails RV Park, Wake Avenue, at the City of El Centro Countryside Pump Station (located along Highway 86 [4th Street]) and Wake Pump Station (located at the northeastern corner of Highway 86 [4th Street] and Wake Avenue), and connect to existing pipelines. Due to the alignments crossing through Desert Trails RV Park, a portion of this site would be obtained through eminent domain. As shown in Figure 2, the proposed pipelines that would extend south of Danenberg Drive would occur in the City of El Centro’s Sphere of
Influence, but the Imperial County’s jurisdictional area. The pipelines would be constructed within existing roadways, which are generally flat in elevation. Pipelines along manholes would be constructed along the new pipeline route in accordance with City and County standards.

All pavement, sidewalks, curbs, drainage ditches, etc. impacted during construction of the proposed project would be replaced according to City and County standards.

Prior to commencement of construction activities, the contractor would prepare a Dust Control Plan (DCP) to be implemented during all construction activities per ICAPCD Rule 801 Section F.2, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer and ICAPCD. All construction is expected to be completed within 270 calendar days after commencement date.

The following discretionary actions are required for the proposed project: approval of a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change for the proposed pump station site.

Appendix A to this Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) includes discussion of the project alternatives considered and rejected in the environmental review process. The proposed project provides the least eminent domain and most economic feasibility of the potential alternatives considered. Therefore, this alternative is analyzed in detail as the proposed project.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is located within a predominantly agricultural area, interspersed with residential, municipal and commercial uses.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** Caltrans, Imperial Irrigation District, County of Imperial, and Southern Pacific Railroad.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [ ] 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 and Traffic
- [ ] Utilities and Service Systems
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance
(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have "potentially significant impact(s)" on the environment, but at least one potentially significant impact 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. A Negative Declaration is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. Therefore, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

12/23/14

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general
standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 150631(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

### Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AESTHETICS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**No Impact.** According to the City’s General Plan Conservation/Open Space Element, no scenic vistas are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the Imperial County General Plan Open Space Conservation Element indicates that no designated scenic vistas are located within the vicinity of the project areas that extend into the County’s jurisdictional area (Imperial County 1993). Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

**b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No Impact.** There are no state scenic highways within the vicinity of the proposed project (Caltrans 2010). Therefore, no impacts to state scenic highways would occur.

**c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** While the project site is currently vacant, it is disturbed from past development and demolition of the previous land use. Surrounding land uses consist of a trailer RV park, residential, agricultural, and industrial uses. The development of a sewer pump station would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.
d) **Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed sewer pump station and sewer pipelines would not create a new source of light or glare, as the pipelines would be constructed within existing roadways and the proposed pump station would not be constructed of highly reflective materials. Additionally, substantial outdoor lighting is not proposed as part of the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### Agriculture and Forest Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Would the project 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City of El Centro’s Conservation and Open Space Element and the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping
and Monitoring Program (City of El Centro 2000); the project site is designated as urban and built-up land. While agricultural uses are located within a one mile radius of the project site, which are designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance and Farmland of Local Importance, all proposed construction activities would occur within the existing right-of-way for Danenberg Drive or within the project site and no disturbance would occur to the adjacent parcels of land. The additional pipelines proposed as a part of the project would allow for growth due to the increased capacity and reach of the sewer pipelines. Expansion of the sewer pipelines would have the potential to increase pressure to convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use. However, all associated future projects would be reviewed for conformance with CEQA and potential impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to a non-agricultural use, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The project site is located in an area zoned for light manufacturing. Agricultural designations do not occur on the project site (City of El Centro 2011). In addition, no Williamson Act contracts apply to the project site (County of Imperial 2010). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The project site is located in the desert, and therefore, there are no areas identified as timberland within the project vicinity. No impact would occur.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The project site is located in a desert area; there are no forest lands in the project vicinity; therefore, the loss or conversion of forest land would not occur.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would result in the construction of a sewer pump station and associated pipelines. While agricultural uses are currently located in the project vicinity, the proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Farmland or forest land to non-
agricultural or non-forest uses. The additional pipelines proposed as a part of the project would allow for growth due to the increased capacity and reach of the sewer pipelines. Expansion of the sewer pipelines would have the potential to increase pressure to convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use. However, all associated future project would be reviewed for conformance with CEQA and potential impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not alter or introduce new conflicts with the surrounding land uses. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of a general industrial use, which is a more intensive designation than the public use designation proposed for the project. The project does not include development of new homes or businesses, and therefore, would not induce population growth in the Salton Sea Air Basin. During construction, a moderate increase in traffic would occur along Highway 86/4th Street, Danenberg Drive, Beverly Lane, Willow Bend Drive, Farnsworth Road, and Wake Avenue. Construction of the proposed project would follow established guidelines. Prior to commencement of construction activities, the contractor would prepare a Dust Control Plan (DCP) to be implemented during all construction activities per ICAPCD Rule 801 Section F.2, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer and ICAPCD. No significant increases in traffic would be generated by the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be
less than significant. b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During the construction phase, the project may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation for the City of El Centro and County of Imperial. However, due to the size of the proposed project, this temporary short-term impact would be less than significant.

c) *Would the project 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)?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects in the surrounding area, may potentially contribute to a temporary short-term increase in the existing non-attainment status of particular criteria pollutants in the Imperial Valley. However, due to the size of the proposed project, and the temporary, short-term nature of the construction activities, its cumulative effect would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes to remove debris from the project site prior to the construction of the proposed pump station and sewer pipelines. Sensitive land uses located adjacent to the project site include residential uses. Construction of the project would result in emissions of diesel particulate matter from construction equipment. Long-term exposure to diesel particulate matter has been identified by the State of California as having the potential for adverse health effects, including increased risk of cancer and respiratory effects. Since construction is a short-term event and adverse health effects are only predicted for long-term exposure, impacts due to emission of diesel particulate during construction would be less than significant.

e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During the construction period, potential odors associated with the proposed project would result from construction activities including the application of asphalt and from diesel and gas fumes. Adjacent residents at the Desert Trails RV Park may be impacted by these odors. However, due to the temporary nature of construction and associated odors, impacts are expected to be less than significant.
### Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a) Would the project 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? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project site consists of a disturbed vacant lot, and no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are located within the project area. In addition, agricultural uses are located within a one mile radius of the project site. One species of special concern, the burrowing owl, has adapted to conditions found on agricultural fields. Due to the project’s vicinity to existing agricultural lands, construction of the proposed project may result in a potentially significant impact to this species if mitigation is not incorporated.
Mitigation Measure

**BIO-1:** A pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbing activity, to ensure the absence of burrowing owls. If burrowing owls are present, passive relocation shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) to ensure active nests are not lost as a result of owl relocation. The following mitigation protocol, taken from the CDFG Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation shall be followed for passive relocation with one-way doors: “Owls should be excluded from burrows in the immediate impact zone and within a 50-meter (approximately 160-foot) buffer zone by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances. One-way doors (e.g., modified dryer vents) should be left in place 48 hours to insure owls have left the burrow before excavation. Two natural or artificial burrows should be provided for each burrow in the project area that will be rendered biologically unsuitable. The project area should be monitored daily for one week to confirm owl use of burrows before excavating burrows in the immediate impact zone. Whenever possible, burrows should be excavated by hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation. Sections of flexible plastic pipe should be inserted into the tunnel during excavation to maintain an escape route for any animals inside the burrow.” If burrowing owls become state listed as threatened or endangered prior to development, permits from and consultations with the CDFG would be required. A focused survey shall also be conducted during the nesting season to assist in determining the exact number of pairs and solitary animals that use the site. This owl census shall be used to determine appropriate mitigation for project impacts.

b) **Would the project 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. The project site consists of disturbed vacant land, and no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are located within the project area. Therefore, all landscaping proposed as a part of the landscaping plan shown in Figure 5 would not impact on-site communities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) **Would the project 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?**

No Impact. The project site is located in a desert region, and is highly disturbed from existing uses and development. There are no sensitive natural communities or wetlands on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
d) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Refer to item a, above. The project site was previously developed and disturbed. The project proposes to construct a sewer pump station within this disturbed site and the proposed pipelines would be constructed from the site along existing roadways. Since, agricultural uses are located within a one mile radius of the project site and adjacent to a portion of the proposed pipeline alignment; preconstruction surveys are required to ensure the absence of burrowing owls prior to the commencement of construction. Compliance with the recommendations of the burrowing owl preconstruction survey report would reduce impacts to less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**No Impact.** There are no identified Multiple Habitat Conservation Programs, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other adopted or approved habitat conservation plans within or near the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**

*No Impact.* The project site is currently vacant, and is disturbed from past development and demolition of the previous land use. Land uses surrounding the project site consist of residential, commercial, and civic uses. There are no historical resources located within or adjacent to the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

b) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

*No Impact.* The project proposes to construct a new pump station and sewer pipelines. Since the project site has been previously disturbed from past development, significant impacts to archeological resources would not occur.

c) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

*No Impact.* See response b, above. No impacts to unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features would occur.

d) **Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

*No Impact.* The project site has previously been developed; therefore, impacts from the disturbance of human remains are not anticipated.

**Geology and Soils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project 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.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within seismically active southern California, an area where several faults and fault zones are considered active by the California Division of Mines and Geology. Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones have been established for the majority of these faults and fault zones. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones is to prohibit the location of structures on the traces of active faults, thereby mitigating potential damage due to fault surface rupture. According to the California Department of Conservation Geological Survey, the City of El Centro is not listed as being affected by an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is not located within a known earthquake fault zone, as defined by the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. However, the project site, as with most of southern California, would be subject to moderate to severe ground shaking during a major earthquake. The Imperial Fault Zone is the closest known active fault to the project site (CDC 2007). Since no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone exists within the City of El Centro, there are no restrictions on development related to Alquist-Priolo requirements. The proposed project would adhere to the Uniform Building Codes.
(UBCs) for the latest seismic standards for structure construction. Since the project does not involve any residential structures and the UBC standards will be implemented into the project design features, less than significant impacts to people or structures would occur as a result of seismic shaking.

### iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction generally occurs in saturated soils when a site is subject to strong seismic shaking. According to the Safety Element of the City of El Centro’s General Plan, the Imperial Valley area is subject to liquefaction. However, due to project design features such as construction adhering to UBC standards, impacts from seismic related ground failure would be less than significant.

### iv) Landslides?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil, and deeper rotational or transitional movement of soil or rock. According to the City of El Centro’s General Plan, the Imperial Valley area is subject to landslides. However, since the City is generally flat, including the project site, landslides are not considered a major hazard. Since the project would be constructed in accordance with the UBC standards, impacts associated with the movement of soil or rock would be less than significant.

#### b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site currently consists of a disturbed vacant lot. During construction it is likely that soil erosion could occur; however, implementation of BMPs would reduce the amount of erosion that would occur. During the operational phase of the project the project site would consist of a sewer pump station, which would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### c) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to items a.ii-a.v, above. The project site is susceptible to unstable soils; however, adherence to the UBC would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

#### d) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is underlain by Holtville silty clay, Imperial-Glenbar silty clay loam, Imperial silty clay, and Indio loam soils. According to
Table 18-1-B, the project site has a high potential for expansive soils. The project site was previously constructed and supported structures. The project proposes the construction of a sewer pump station and associated sewer pipelines, which would be constructed in accordance with the UBC. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) * Would the project 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?*

*No Impact.* The project does not propose the use of septic tanks; therefore, impacts would not result.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes the construction of a sewer pump station and associated sewer pipelines. While construction emissions would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions, these emissions would be temporary and short-term, and would not change or impede AB 32. Greenhouse gas emissions generated during the operational phase of the sewer pump station would be generated from the fuel source used for the pump. The associated pumps will be electric and are submersible, and will run on natural gas. Therefore, the amount of fuel required to run one pump station would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse emissions to have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

*b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the GHG emission reduction goal for the State of California. The law requires that by 2020, state emissions
must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

SB 375 was passed in 2008. This bill links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the Air Resource Board to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing, and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA.

To implement state mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. Until local plans are developed to address GHG emissions, such as local sustainable communities strategies and updated General Plan policies, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response a) above, the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** On-site use and storage of hazardous materials will be limited to common solvents such as defoliant, soil sterilant, herbicide, pesticide, disinfectant, polymer and reactants, which would be stored in accordance with all federal, state and local regulations. During the construction period, standard BMPs would be applied to ensure that all hazardous materials (i.e., construction equipment fuel) are stored properly and that no hazards occur during this phase of the project. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of standard BMPs would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

b) **Would the project 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local regulations regarding the handling, use and storage of hazardous materials. In addition, during the construction phase, standard BMPs would be applied to ensure that all hazardous materials are handled properly and that no hazards occur during this phase of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would result.
d) **Would the project be located on a site that 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?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not included on a list of sites containing hazardous materials, and therefore, would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment (State of California 2010).

e) **Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impacts would result.

f) **Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

g) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction of a sewer pump station and off-site pipelines is not anticipated to result in any construction related road closures that will impact implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

h) **Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located within the desert, and is not located near existing wildlands. Therefore, no impact would result.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Than Significant Impact.</strong> Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in wind and water erosion leading to sediment laden discharges. Similarly, fuels, oils, lubricants, and other hazardous substances used during construction could be released and impact surface and groundwater. The project would be required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of El Centro’s construction stormwater requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Would the project 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 (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes the construction of a sewer pump station and associated facilities. The construction of the pump station would reduce the amount of pervious surface by approximately 500 square feet; however, the pipelines would be constructed below existing roadways and would not change the amount of impervious surface area. Therefore, although implementation of the pump station would increase impervious surface in the area by 500 feet, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to item b above. The project site would increase the amount of impervious surface area by approximately 500 square feet. The amount of stormwater runoff generated by the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, nor would it result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase erosion or siltation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to items b and c above. The project would not involve the alteration of an existing stream or river, nor would it alter the existing drainage pattern on or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes to construct a sewer pump station, which would encompass approximately 500 square feet of land. This increased area of impervious surface would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or result in a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. The proposed sewer pipelines would be constructed along existing roadways and once
constructed these project areas would return to their existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**f)** *Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No elements of the project are anticipated to degrade water quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**g)** *Would the project 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?*

**No Impact.** The project does not propose the placement of housing. In addition, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2008); therefore, no impacts would result.

**h)** *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impacts would result.

**i)** *Would the project 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?*

**No Impact.** No portion of the proposed project would involve the construction of a levee or dam which could potentially place downstream people or structures at risk. In addition, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**j)** *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located inland, with the nearest body of water being the Salton Sea located approximately 34 miles north of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would result.

**Land Use and Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is located in areas that have previously been or are currently developed and would not result in impacts to any habitats or natural communities. In addition, the City of El Centro has identified the project site as being within an urban development area. Development of the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community plan.

Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The project proposes the development of a sewer pump station and pipelines within areas that have been previously developed or that are currently developed as roadways and parking lots. In addition, no locally important mineral resource recovery sites have been identified in the project areas on the City or County general plans. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a known mineral resource.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No Impact. Refer to response to item a. The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.
Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Imperial County Noise Ordinance Section 90702.A states that the County’s sound level limits shall not apply to any activity performed by a city or the county in the discharge of a governmental function or responsibility provided that such city or county has applied reasonable noise mitigation (County of Imperial 1998). Therefore, the City of El Centro’s Noise Ordinance was applied for the analysis of all project areas.

Construction and operation of the pump station would result in the generation of noise. The project site is surrounded by residential uses, vacant land, industrial uses and agricultural uses. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 88 feet to the west (RV park).

During the construction phase, the project would comply with the City’s noise ordinance, which limits construction activities to the hours of 6 am to 7 pm. Construction equipment
shall not exceed 75 dB for more than 8 hours during any 24-hour period when measured at or within the property lines of any sensitive receptor. Since all construction activities would occur during hours permitted by the City’s noise ordinance, the proposed project would not exceed established noise standards for construction.

During the operational phase of the project, noise would be generated from the pumps and generator. However, the generator will only operate bi weekly for maintenance and during emergencies. The project proposes to construct a prefabricated concrete structure to house the pump station, electrical controls and generator. The City’s noise threshold is 45 dBA from the nearest sensitive receptor’s property line. The nearest sensitive receptor property line (i.e., residential uses to the west) are located approximately 88 feet from the outside of the proposed pump station building. Based on preliminary review, operational noise levels may reach approximately 45 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors property line. However, due to the close proximity of the sensitive receptors to the proposed pump station, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to ensure operational noise levels would be consistent with the City’s noise threshold.

**Mitigation Measure**

**NOI-1** During construction, the contractor shall install acoustical sound attenuators; or acoustical louvers and sound absorbing materials. The City of El Centro shall conduct noise measurements during initial operations to ensure that these materials reduce the operational noise level to meet the City’s threshold of 45 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor’s property line.

\[b)\] *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not require blasting, therefore, people would not be exposed to excessive groundbourne vibration or noise levels.

\[c)\] *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** See response to item a above. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of a sewer pump station located approximately 88 feet from the nearest residential sensitive receptor, which may result in a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise levels. However, implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1 would ensure the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.
d) **Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, given the temporary nature of noise disturbances and the incorporation of the noise control measures provided in the City Municipal noise ordinance impacts to construction noise would be less than significant. During the operational phase of the project, the noise levels would be increased from the existing noise level, however implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1 would reduce potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

e) **Would the project for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) **Would the project for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

### Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a)  Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed sewer infrastructure would provide immediate relief to the existing sewer service needs and the future buildout needs of the City. No additional expansion is proposed; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b)  Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The proposed project would not require the removal of existing housing, and therefore, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c)  Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project would not result in the displacement of people; therefore, no replacement housing would be required.

Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

No Impact. The proposed sewer pump station project would not increase the needs of fire protection services or increase the response times of such services.

Police protection?

No Impact. The project proposes to construct a sewer pump station and sewer pipelines; therefore, the project would not increase the needs of police protection services.

Schools?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in an increase in students or affect existing or proposed schools. Since the project does not propose housing, impacts to existing schools or the need for additional schools would not result.

Parks?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in an increase in use of existing parks. No impacts would result.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. No additional public facilities would be impacted by the proposed project. No impacts would result.

Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. RECREATION –</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in an increase in the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would result.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts would result.

Transportation and Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle baths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle baths, and mass transit?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During the construction phase of the proposed project, traffic would be generated by construction crews and equipment traveling to and from the project site. Due to the size of the project, a relatively small number of vehicles would be required. Therefore, increased traffic levels from the construction phase of the project would be short-term and less than significant. During the operational phase of the project, periodic maintenance would not result in a change from the existing conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service (LOS) standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Short-term and limited construction-related traffic would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes nor change traffic patterns in such a way as to affect the LOS or vehicle to congestion ratio on study area roadways. Long-term traffic associated with operation and maintenance would not change from the existing conditions, and therefore, would have no impact to the LOS on study area roadways. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

**No Impact.** The project does not propose any use which would result in a change in air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impacts would result.

d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

**No Impact.** The project does not include the development or redesign of any roadways that would impose a hazardous threat due to a design feature. No impacts would occur.

e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A traffic control plan would be implemented as part of the proposed project. The project specific traffic control plan will ensure that adequate emergency access is provided to first aid responders. Therefore, impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.
f) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. According to the City’s Conservation Elements Transit and Bicycle Route map, the project site is not located in an area that is serviced by an existing or planned bike route, transit route or bus station. While the project may result in temporary impacts to these facilities, a project specific traffic control plan would be implemented.

Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. During the construction phase of the project, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s and the City of El Centro’s construction stormwater requirements. No wastewater would be generated during the operational phase of the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
b) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction of a new sewer pump station and associated facilities would not result in the need for new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of a storm water drainage facility. Therefore, no impacts would result.

d) **Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A minimal amount of water may be required during the construction phase of the project; however, this would not result in a significant water consumption. No water use would be required from the operational phase of the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) **Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to response to item a above. The City of El Centro is the wastewater treatment provider for the project site, and the project would not require additional discretion regarding capacity.

f) **Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction debris would be brought to the local landfill; however, this would be a short-term increase to the landfill. No solid waste would be generated during the operational phase of the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g) **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste during the construction phase of
the project. No solid waste would be generated during the operational phase of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mandatory Findings of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a)** *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project site was previously disturbed from past development and demolition activities associated with previous land uses. However, agricultural uses are within a one mile radius of the project site, and adjacent to the proposed pipeline alignments. Due to the potential for burrowing owls within agricultural lands, mitigation measures have been implemented to ensure potential impacts to burrowing owls would not result. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in direct or indirect adverse effects. Impacts to the environment would have a minimal effect, and therefore, are not foreseen to contribute to a cumulative impact. No additional impacts would occur.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed project would have the potential to result in environmental impacts, however, implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1, would reduce potential noise impacts that could cause adverse effects on sensitive receptors such as human beings. Based on the analysis of the above questions, it has been determined that there would be no significant direct or indirect effect on human beings. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.
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APPENDIX A

Alternative Project Analysis
INTRODUCTION

The proposed Southern Pump Station and associated sewer lines would collect and pump sewage to the El Centro waste water treatment plant for processing. The proposed pump station site encompasses approximately 0.25 acre of vacant land on the eastern side of East Danenberg Drive, while the associated sewer gravity pipelines encompass approximately 0.35 acre. A portion of the site access for the pump station is owned by the adjacent Desert Trails RV Park and would be obtained through eminent domain for access of the proposed pump station. Due to the potential for eminent domain required to implement the proposed project, several additional alternative alignments were considered.

ALTERNATIVES PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED FOR ANALYSIS

Prior to preparation of this Mitigated Negative Declaration, three additional alternatives were considered in addition to the proposed project, as outlined in detail below: No Action Alternative, Imperial County Social Services Building Parking Lot, and the Elongated West Danenberg Drive and Highway 86 Alignment.

No Action Alternative

In the existing condition, the Countryside pump station is overloaded due to the adjacent Countryside development. The City of El Centro permitted this development’s connection to this Countryside pump station with development of an additional temporary pump station. This temporary pump station was not designed to the City’s standards with the understanding that an additional permanent pump station would be designed and completed within three to five years. This existing Countryside pump station is currently over ten years old and creating problems with connection to the waste water treatment plant due to consistent maintenance requirements. If the current pump station network of the Countryside and temporary pump stations were to remain the main source for connection to the waste water treatment plant, wastewater spills may occur from both sites.

Imperial County Social Services Building Parking Lot

Under this alternative, the Southern Pump Station site was proposed within the Imperial County Social Services building parking lot, located along Highway 86, at 2995 South 4th Street. This parking lot, approximately 0.5 mile west of the proposed project site, includes several existing utilities that would require relocation and bypass, as well as breaking up of the existing mix of concrete and asphalt in this area. Relocation of these utilities and removal of asphalt and concrete would require significant expenditures associated with implementation. In addition, this alignment would cause traffic issues to the surrounding roadways, and construction in this area
would make the County building access difficult to the public. Several of the buildings would lose access entirely, while others access would be severely restricted. Finally, site security would be difficult with adjacent parking and public access.

**Elongated West Danenberg Drive and Highway 86 Alignment**

Under this alternative, the Southern Pump Station Site was proposed in a similar location to the proposed project, on the northern side of East Danenberg Drive. However, this alternative includes sewer gravity pipeline connections from the waste water treatment plant to the Southern Pump Station site that require significant eminent domain. This includes an extension west on West Danenberg Drive past Highway 86 to connect to existing pipelines within West Lancaster Road, along the western edge of Highway 86 approximately 0.5 mile, and an extension of the pipeline along East Danenberg Drive approximately 0.5 mile toward East Chick Road.

**CONCLUSION**

In order to avoid the potential wastewater spills associated with the existing Countryside pump station and temporary pump station, the proposed project provides the least eminent domain and most economic feasibility of the potential alternatives considered. Therefore, this alternative is analyzed in detail within the body of this MND.
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