

Chapter 10
Land Use

Affected Environment

The proposed pipeline alignments are within public rights-of-way, private easements, and roadways. Some pipeline alignments cross or extend onto private lands. Other proposed project facilities (e.g., intake facility, water treatment and pumping plants) are on public and/or private lands to be acquired. Land uses near the project facilities and pipeline alignments are listed below:

- Residential uses, including urban and suburban low- and medium-density residential.
- Rural residential uses (i.e., low-density residential uses in nonurbanized settings).
- Agricultural, including farmland (e.g., irrigated crop production, and orchard and vineyard operations) and livestock grazing land.
- Open space, consisting of undeveloped land not currently in agricultural use.
- Urban commercial and industrial uses. In some areas, the various types of urban land uses cannot be readily differentiated and are referred to generically as “urban” land uses. General urbanized uses include a variety of mixed, largely nonresidential uses, such as commercial uses, industrial transportation corridors, public and quasi-public facilities, utilities, institutional facilities, and aggregate mining areas.
- Rural commercial and industrial uses. These uses include aggregate mining areas, animal feedlots, rural truck stops, and convenience stores.
- Recreational uses, including trails, camping and picnic areas, boat launches, parks, and recreational open space.

Freeport Intake Facility to Mokelumne Aqueducts

Existing Land Uses

Four alignments made up of different combinations of segments are being considered for Alternatives 2–5 (see Figures 2-1 and 2-2). All of these

alternatives would start at the Sacramento River in Sacramento County, run generally east and south through Sacramento County, and terminate at the Mokelumne Aqueducts in San Joaquin County. The project also includes specific or general sites for other project facilities including the intake facility, Zone 40 Surface WTP, canal pumping plant, and aqueduct pumping plant and pretreatment facility as described in Chapter 2.

Table 10-1 summarizes the pipeline segment and other project facility locations, the agency possessing land use jurisdiction, and existing land uses that would be traversed by each segment or facility. Land uses described in Table 10-1 are based on aerial photography (AirphotoUSA 2001), field reconnaissance visits, and DWR Land Use/Land Cover data (California Department of Water Resources 2000). To the extent possible, segments described in Table 10-1 are ordered from west to east (from the Sacramento River to the FSC) and from north to south (from the FSC to the Mokelumne Aqueducts). The proposed segments from the FSC to the Mokelumne Aqueducts (FSCC pipeline alignment) are also outlined at the end of Table 10-1.

Planned New Land Uses or Projects

At least nine new land uses or projects are planned for areas along the pipeline alignments and project facilities within Sacramento County, as shown in Table 10-2. Planned projects include sewer improvements, transportation system improvements, and community and specific plans. There are no identified planned new land uses in San Joaquin County.

General Plan Land Use Designations

City of Sacramento

The project components parallel or cross the following land use designations within the City of Sacramento:

- Low- and Medium-Density Residential
- County Mixed Residential
- Community/Neighborhood Commercial and Offices
- Regional Commercial and Offices
- Parks–Recreation–Open Space
- Public/Quasi-Public/Miscellaneous
- Transportation/Utilities
- Industrial Employee Intensive
- Special Planning District

Table 10-1. Land Uses by Pipeline Segment from the Freeport Intake Facility to Mokelumne Aqueducts

Pipeline Segments	Segment Alignments, Jurisdictional Coverage, and Existing Land Uses
Pipeline Alignments from Freeport Intake Facility to Zone 40 Surface Water Treatment Plant/Folsom South Canal	
A	The proposed intake facility location is on the east bank of the Sacramento River near Freeport. Segment A would traverse urbanized land uses north and east through the City of Sacramento to a location near the Freeport Blvd/I-5 overcrossing (intersection of Segments B and P).
B	Segment B would traverse rural residential land uses within the City of Sacramento north along Freeport Blvd. to a junction at the intersection of Freeport Blvd. and Meadowview Rd.
C	Segment C would travel along Meadowview Rd. and would pass through low- and medium-density residential and other urbanized land uses within the City of Sacramento.
D	Segment D would pass through urban and rural residential land uses within the City of Sacramento along Meadowview Rd. from the Morrison Creek Bridge to Mack Rd.
E	Segment E would travel east along Mack Rd., crossing over Franklin Blvd., SR 99, and the border of unincorporated Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento, to the intersection of Elsie Ave. and Power Inn Rd. Segment E would pass through low- and medium-density residential, rural residential, and other urbanized land uses within the City of Sacramento and unincorporated Sacramento County.
F	Segment F would travel east from the intersection of Elsie Ave. and Power Inn Rd along Elsie Ave. through low-density residential lands in Sacramento County. At the end of these residential uses, Segment F would make a sharp turn north and travel along Wilbur Way to Gerber Rd. through urbanized lands in Sacramento County.
G	Segment G would travel east on Gerber Rd. (roughly between the intersections of segments F and H) through urbanized land uses within Sacramento County.
H	Segment H would travel east on Gerber Rd. across the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the intersection of Elk Grove and Florin Rd. and would traverse medium-density residential, rural residential, and other urbanized land uses within Sacramento County.
I	Segment I would travel east on Gerber Rd. between Elk Grove-Florin Rd. and Bradshaw Rd. and would traverse rural residential, open space, and agricultural land uses within Sacramento County.
J	Segment J would extend north along Bradshaw Rd. between Gerber Rd. and Florin Rd. through grazing and urbanized land uses in unincorporated Sacramento County.
K	Segment K would extend east along Florin Rd. between Elk Grove-Florin Rd. and a north-south leg of the FSC and would pass through rural residential, open space, and agricultural lands in unincorporated Sacramento County.
L	Segment L would travel east on Gerber Rd. between Bradshaw Rd. and Vineyard Rd. and would traverse rural residential and agricultural lands within unincorporated Sacramento County.

Pipeline Segments	Segment Alignments, Jurisdictional Coverage, and Existing Land Uses
M	Segment M would travel east on Gerber Rd. from the edge of the area considered for the Zone 40 Surface WTP site and would traverse urbanized (golf course), rural residential, open space, and agricultural lands within unincorporated Sacramento County.
N	Segment N would travel east following the Gerber Rd. extension/right-of-way to the intersection with Grant Line Rd. and would traverse agricultural land uses within unincorporated Sacramento County.
O	Segment O would travel northeast on Grant Line Rd. from the intersection of Gerber Rd. extension/right-of-way to the beginning of the FSC and would pass through agricultural and open space lands within unincorporated Sacramento County.
P	Segment P would start near the intake facility site and head southeast, crossing I-5, and would traverse both urbanized and open space lands in the City of Sacramento.
Q	Segment Q would travel along the eastern side of I-5 in a southeasterly direction and would traverse agricultural lands in the City of Sacramento.
R	Segment R would begin at the eastern side of I-5 at the terminus of Segment Q and would extend generally southeast on a curvilinear path (following the proposed I-5/Cosumnes Blvd. extension) through agricultural lands in the City of Sacramento to the Western Pacific Railroad (WPRR) tracks.
S	Segment S travels from where Morrison Creek meets Cosumnes River Blvd. to the intersection of Franklin Blvd. and would travel east along the border between unincorporated Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento through open space lands (the SRWWTP Bufferlands).
T	Segment T would travel along Cosumnes River Blvd. southeast and east from the intersection of Franklin Blvd. to the intersection of Bruceville Rd. and would traverse urbanized and medium-density residential land (urban) uses in the City of Sacramento.
U	Segment U would begin at the intersection of Cosumnes River Blvd. and Bruceville Rd., proceeding northeast and crossing SR 99 and the border of unincorporated Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento to Power Inn Rd. (just north of the Stockton Rd. intersection), and turning north along Power Inn Rd. to the intersection of Elsie Ave. Segment U would pass through urbanized and medium-density residential land uses.
Option 1	Segment Option 1 would continue southeast along the eastern side of I-5 and would parallel open space and agricultural land uses in the City of Sacramento. Segment Option 1 would head east along the border between unincorporated Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento along the Morrison Creek north-side levee across agricultural land to the Western Pacific Railroad (WPRR) tracks. Adjacent to the SRWWTP, Segment Option 1 would pass through agricultural and open space land uses.
Option 2	Segment Option 2 would pass north on Power Inn Rd. from Elsie Ave. to the intersection of Gerber Rd. and would pass through medium-density urban residential and rural residential land uses within Sacramento County. Segment Option 2 would pass east on Gerber Rd. from the intersection of Power Inn Rd. through medium-density urban residential and other urbanized land uses.

Pipeline Segments	Segment Alignments, Jurisdictional Coverage, and Existing Land Uses
Pipeline Alignments from Folsom South Canal to Mokelumne Aqueducts	
V	Segment V, located within Sacramento County, would extend east to Clay Station Rd. through open space land uses from a new turnout near the southern end of the FSC. Segment V would then turn south and run along Clay Station Rd. through agricultural, rural residential, open space, and commercial lands to the intersection of Angrave Rd.
W	Segment W would begin from the end of Segment V at the intersection of Clay Station Rd. and Angrave Rd. in Sacramento County, heading south along Clay Station Rd., crossing the border of San Joaquin County, and then due east at the Liberty Rd. intersection to a location near the junction of Liberty Rd. and SR 88. Segment W would pass through agricultural, open space, commercial, and rural residential lands in Sacramento and San Joaquin counties and would proceed along roadway rights-of-ways or private easements along the roadway.
X	Segment X would begin at the end of Segments W and Option 3 near the intersection Liberty Rd. and SR 88 and continue southeast along the PG&E right-of-way to Buena Vista Rd., then continue along Buena Vista Rd. for approximately 1,000 feet and pass over the Mokelumne River, continuing southeast across SR12 to Cord Rd. Segment X would then travel south on Cord Rd. before veering southeast to the Mokelumne Aqueducts pumping plant site. Segment X would pass through agricultural, rural residential, commercial, and open space lands in San Joaquin County.
Option 3	Segment Option 3 would extend east along Angrave Rd. in Sacramento County from the end of Segment V at the intersection of Clay Station Rd. and Angrave Rd. to Dry Creek and the border of San Joaquin County. At Dry Creek, Segment Option 2 would turn southeast into San Joaquin County, generally following the Pacific Gas & Electric right-of-way, terminating near the intersection of Liberty Rd. and SR 88 (this corresponds to the endpoint as Segment W). Segment Option 3 would proceed through “cross-country” and pass through agricultural, commercial, and open space lands.
Pipeline Facilities from Freeport Intake to Mokelumne Aqueducts	
Freeport Intake Facility and On-Site Settling Basins	The intake facility would be 6,500 feet upstream of the Freeport Bridge on the left bank of the Sacramento River. The settling basins would be located at the bank intake facility. The intake facility and settling basins would occupy urban land uses.
Zone 40 Surface WTP	The general area for the WTP site is an 80- to 100-acre parcel within the area bounded by Elder Creek Road on the north, Gerber Road on the south, Bradshaw Road on the west, and Excelsior Road on the east. The facility would occupy rural residential and agricultural lands within Sacramento County.
Optional Terminal Facility Settling Basins, Grant Line option	The terminal settling basins would be approximately 30 feet off the side of the Gerber Road right-of-way at the intersection with Grant Line Road for Alternatives 3 and 5. The 16-acre facility would occupy agricultural lands within Sacramento County.

Pipeline Segments	Segment Alignments, Jurisdictional Coverage, and Existing Land Uses
Optional Terminal Facility Settling Basins, Florin Road option	The terminal settling basins would be approximately 30 feet off the side of the Florin Road right-of-way at the FSC for Alternatives 2 and 4. The 16-acre facility would occupy agricultural lands within Sacramento County.
Canal Pumping Plant	This facility would be located near the terminus of the existing FSC where it would connect with the new FSCC pipeline. The 3.2-acre facility would occupy undeveloped lands covered by native vegetation.
Aqueduct Pumping Plant and Pretreatment Facility, Camanche site	This facility would be located on agricultural and open space (native vegetation) lands just west of the Camanche Reservoir dike, on EBMUD property.
Aqueduct Pumping Plant and Pretreatment Facility, optional Brandt site	This facility would be located on agricultural and open space (native vegetation) lands at the terminus of the proposed FSCC pipeline alignment where it connects with the Mokelumne Aqueducts.

Sources: California Department of Water Resources 2000; Airphoto USA 2001, and field reconnaissance.

Table 10-2. Planned New Land Uses, Freeport Intake Facility to Mokelumne Aqueducts

Projects	Description	Approvals/Docume	Location
1 Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) Interceptor Master Plan and Lower Northwest Interceptor (LNWI) Project	SRCSD's Interceptor System Master Plan 2000 Update identifies modifications to the sewer conveyance system and SRCSD's service area. The project also includes specific construction plans for the LNWI, identified in Master Plan.	Notice of Preparation (NOP) issued 12/21/01	Q, R, Option 1
2 Interstate 5/Cosumnes River Boulevard Interchange (Cosumnes River Blvd. Extension)	The Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans are proposing to extend Cosumnes River Blvd. west of Franklin Blvd., with an interchange at I-5 and possible extension west to an at-grade intersection with Freeport Blvd.	NOP/Notice of Intent (NOI) released 2/02	Q, R, S, Option 1
3 Light Rail Extension, South Sacramento Phase II Corridor	Sacramento Regional Transit's proposal to extend the Sacramento Light Rail South Line approximately 5-miles from its current terminus. The extension would follow the WPRR right of way south of Meadowview Rd., turn east along the proposed Cosumnes River Blvd. extension to Bruceville Rd., turn south to Cosumnes River College, and turn east, crossing SR 99 and end at a new station at Calvine/Auberry.	NOP issued 3/14/02	C, S, T
4 Florin-Vineyard "Gap" Community Plan	Sacramento County's proposed plan covers approximately 3,450 acres within the Vineyard and South Sacramento communities. The term "gap" refers to the area's location between an existing urban area to the west of Elk Grove-Florin Rd. and a planned urban area to the east (North Vineyard Station and Vineyard Springs).	Plan Initiated 1999 Administrative Draft Development Guidelines for Plan 12/18/02	H, I, J
5 Bradshaw Interceptor	SRCSD's proposed 108-inch sewer line from the corner of Gerber/Elk Grove-Florin, crossing diagonally across to the Bradshaw/Florin intersection, under Elder Creek, with temporary closures of Gerber and Florin Roads.	EIR 4/96 Notice of Determination (NOD) issued	I, J
7 North Vineyard Station Specific Plan	A Sacramento County plan for 1,590 acres within the Vineyard Community Plan Area. Includes 6,339 developed acres, commercial, school, parks and open space.	EIR 7/22/97 NOD 11/10/98	H, I, J
8 Vineyard Springs Comprehensive Plan	Sacramento County's plan provides direction for plans and related General Plan and Community Plan amendments for the 2,560-acre Vineyard Springs Planning Area. Activities include construction of a storm drain outfall to Laguna Creek.	EIR 7/1/98 NOD 12/3/01	H, I, J
9 Dierks Ranch Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Special Development Permit	Sacramento County amendments to facilitate subdivision of 61.5 acres into 61 single-family homes.	Neg. Dec. 8/23/00 NOD 5/15/01	Excelsior Rd. between Gerber and Calvine*

* None of the proposed segments would pass through the Dierks Ranch Community Plan area, but buildout of the plan could affect access to the project area.

- Rural Estates
- School

Sacramento County

The project components parallel or cross the following Sacramento County land use designations:

- Low- and Medium-Density Residential
- Agricultural Residential
- Commercial and Office
- Intensive Industrial
- Public and Quasi-Public
- Urban Transit Oriented Development
- Development Area
- Recreation
- Natural Preserve
- General Agriculture (20-acre minimum parcel size)
- General Agriculture (80-acre minimum parcel size)

Land use designations in the area proposed for the Zone 40 Surface WTP locations (area bounded by Gerber Rd. to the south, Bradshaw Rd. to the west, Florin Rd. to the north, and Excelsior Rd. to the east) include Secondary Areas, Neighborhood Transit-Oriented Development, and Open Space. The portion of the Zone 40 Surface WTP site between Vineyard and Bradshaw Roads is located within the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan area. This area is designated primarily for single-family residential uses, with some commercial uses (at Bradshaw and Gerber), as well as stormwater detention basins and parks.

Uses other than agricultural production are not allowed within areas designated General Agriculture for Sacramento County (unless a use permit is granted). A conditional-use permit is required for projects involving utility corridors and related facilities. However, as stated in the Sacramento County Zoning Code, a use permit is not required for “County agency facilities which budgetary responsibility wholly or partly rests with the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, such as the County Water Agency, County Sanitation District, City/County Housing and Redevelopment Agency, and the facility has already been subject to public hearings for the purpose of allocating funds to purchase the property, to construct the facility, or to commit the property to specific use”. Also, as noted later in this chapter, Sections 53091 and 53096 of the California Government Code exempt public water supply and treatment facilities from regulation under local zoning ordinances.

San Joaquin County

The pipeline alignments within San Joaquin County would cross areas designated General Agriculture (40-acre and 80-acre) and Open Space/Resource Conservation (Riparian Habitat, Significant Vegetation, and Mineral Resources) on the General Plan 2010 map of northeast San Joaquin County. Development in areas designated General Agriculture is restricted to agricultural and related uses; other uses of these areas, such as for utility corridors, generally would require a conditional-use permit. However, public water supply and treatment facilities are exempt from these requirements as set forth in California Government Code Section 53091 (see below).

Chapter 9-1155 of the San Joaquin County Development Title has provisions regarding the underground placement of utilities regarding facility location. The title states that no public utility distribution facilities shall be located outside a public right-of-way or public utility easement except in providing service to the parcel on which they are located. However, as noted later in this chapter, Sections 53091 and 53096 of the California Government Code exempt public water supply and treatment facilities from regulation under local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the proposed project is not subject to the requirements of the Chapter 9 County Development Title, which serves as the County Zoning Code.

Other Relevant General Plan Policies

City of Sacramento

The Conservation and Open Space Element of the City of Sacramento General Plan has an overall goal of achieving and maintaining a balance among the conservation, development, and utilization of planned open space and natural resources. The City of Sacramento General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element has an overall goal of providing and maintaining a high quality of public facilities and services for all areas of the City. A specific goal outlined by the City of Sacramento General Plan relative to water supply states:

To provide and improve water supply facilities to meet future growth of the City and assure a continued supply of safe, potable water.

Sacramento County

The Sacramento County General Plan Public Facilities Element outlines objectives and policies regarding water treatment and distribution facilities. The Treatment and Distribution Facilities objective states:

Water treatment and distribution facilities are located to minimize environmental impact and maximize distribution efficiency with respect to point of withdrawal and area to be served.

A specific policy related to this objective states that new water facilities shall be planned to minimize impacts on instream water flow in the Sacramento and American Rivers (Policy PF-1).

The Conservation Element of the Sacramento County General Plan outlines goals and objectives that call for the conjunctive use of surface- and groundwater to provide long-term water supply for Sacramento residents and future residents of unincorporated areas while maintaining river flows and reservoir levels.

San Joaquin County

The Community Development Section (IV) of the San Joaquin County General Plan addresses protection of open space and natural resources. It identifies policies on utility corridors, including electrical transmission and major water lines. Section IV of the San Joaquin County General Plan, Policies 5.1–6, sets forth county objectives for protecting the public from hazards related to utility corridors and for protecting land uses from poorly sited utilities. Section VI of the San Joaquin County General Plan also addresses the protection of resources, including agricultural lands.

Enlarge Pardee Reservoir

Existing Land Uses

All properties below 614 feet msl immediately surrounding the edges of the existing Pardee Reservoir and in the Mokelumne River below the Electra Powerhouse and Dam may be affected by the enlargement of Pardee Reservoir. In addition, an area downstream of the existing dam would be affected by the construction of a new dam (see Figure 2-3).

The majority of the lands immediately adjacent to Pardee Reservoir and the Mokelumne River are owned by EBMUD. At maximum flood-control water level of 614 feet msl, approximately 3,316 acres of EBMUD land would be inundated. Other entities owning land around the reservoir include the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), JVID, PG&E, and private landowners. No BLM or PG&E land would be inundated at maximum flood-control level of 614 feet msl.

At maximum flood-control water level of 614 feet msl, land not owned by EBMUD that would be within the area of inundation would include:

- An area below the existing Pardee Dam, which is owned by the JVID. At maximum flood-control level, approximately 33 acres of JVID land would be inundated.
- The area east of SR 49, adjacent to the Mokelumne River, which is a mixture of private ownership. At maximum flood-control level, approximately 134 acres of privately owned land would be within the maximum flood control water level.

Existing land uses immediately surrounding the Pardee Reservoir consist mainly of grazing, which is carried out on EBMUD lands for fire suppression purposes. Because of the steep topography, grazing is also the primary land use on BLM, JVID, and privately owned lands adjacent to the reservoir. EBMUD maintains a 100- to 300-foot wide, fenced buffer between grazing activities and the reservoir banks.

Some recreational land uses are located at the northwestern edge of the Pardee Reservoir at the Pardee Reservoir Recreation Area, which includes a variety of recreational facilities, such as the Oaks Campground in Woodpile Gulch, a marina, and RV camping. These facilities are owned and operated by EBMUD, although a private concessionaire runs the facilities on a seasonal basis under long-term contract with EBMUD.

Planned Projects

Planned projects in the Pardee Reservoir area are listed in Table 10-3 and include a fish hatchery project and a fish passage improvement program. It should be noted that a variety of habitat improvement projects, mainly focusing on fisheries, are planned or ongoing in the Mokelumne River watershed, but these projects would not affect local land use.

Table 10-3. Planned New Land Uses, Enlarge Pardee Reservoir

Projects	Description	Approval/ Documents/ Sources	Location Relative to Enlarge Pardee Reservoir Component	
1	Rebuild Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery	Hatchery now functional. New fish raceways completed January 2002. First year class of fish raised in hatchery; majority were planted in Bay-Delta system.	Project ongoing.	On Mokelumne River, downstream of Pardee Reservoir
2	Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program EIR/EIS	The Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program is a fish passage improvement project. Features include a new fish passage weir, fish ladders and screens, and diversion pipes. A new dam will replace the existing dam.	EIR/EIS 5/16/00 NOD 5/20/02 NOD 7/12/02 NOD 7/15/02	On Mokelumne River, downstream of Pardee Reservoir

General Plan Land Use Designations

Amador County

The Amador County General Plan designates the areas north of the Pardee Reservoir as Agricultural-General, Mineral Resources Zone, and Open-Recreation. Several noncontiguous parcels of lakeside property adjacent to and east of the Pardee Reservoir SR 49 overcrossing, within the area proposed for inundation in Amador County, are owned by BLM (Hummel pers. comm.). The area immediately adjacent to the SR 49 overcrossing north of the reservoir is designated by the County as Open Forest (Grijalva pers. comm.).

Calaveras County

The Calaveras County General Plan Future Land Use Map designates the areas south of the Pardee Reservoir as Timberlands/Mineral Resource Area 2A/Dam Inundation Area; Future Single Family Residential (5–40 acres); and Wildlife Habitats/Botanical Areas. A portion of the project area surrounding the southeastern shore of the Pardee Reservoir is designated as a Bald Eagle Wintering Area.

The Mokelumne Hill Community Plan is incorporated by reference into the Calaveras County General Plan. A portion of the area covered in the Community Plan would be affected by the enlarge-Pardee-Reservoir component of Alternative 6. The Mokelumne Hill Community Plan designates the affected area adjacent to the Pardee Reservoir as Rural Residential and Recreation. The Rural Residential designation requires a minimum parcel size of 1–5 acres.

Other Relevant Policies

Amador County

The Amador County General Plan shows that SR 49 has been proposed for State Scenic Highway status, although it is not yet officially designated. The portion of SR 49 that would be affected by the proposed project in Amador County is included in the State Scenic Highway proposal (California Department of Transportation 1999). No additional Amador County General Plan policies are specifically relevant to the proposed project.

Calaveras County

SR 49 passes through the Mokelumne Hill Community Plan area adjacent to the Pardee Reservoir area. SR 49 has been proposed for State Scenic Highway status, although it is not yet officially designated. The portion of SR 49 that would be affected by the proposed project in Calaveras County is included in the

State Scenic Highway proposal (California Department of Transportation 1999). The Calaveras County General Plan Circulation Element outlines a policy to support identified scenic highway segments in the county for inclusion in the State Scenic Highway Program (Policy III-14A).

The Calaveras County General Plan Circulation Element includes a policy to permit pipelines in public rights-of-way under established conditions (Policy III-19A). The Calaveras County General Plan Conservation Element includes a policy that calls for supporting the development of water projects in the county for use within the county for domestic and irrigation purposes (Policy IV-9A).

Bureau of Land Management

BLM land use policies within Pardee Reservoir area are provided in the Sierra Planning Area Management Framework Plan Amendment (Bureau of Land Management 1988). This document contains only two policies applicable to the project area (Hummel pers. comm.). These policies apply to the Mokelumne River. The policies are to encourage and promote water-based recreation opportunities and to provide for developed recreation areas as warranted by demand for increased water-based recreation (Bureau of Land Management 1988).

Environmental Justice

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations." This Executive Order requires each federal agency to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minorities and low-income populations and communities. Reclamation policy requires that NEPA documents include a determination of whether a project will have any adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

The project components from the intake facility to the Mokelumne Aqueducts pass through the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, and San Joaquin County, while the enlarge Pardee Reservoir component is in Amador and Calaveras Counties. The project components cross a variety of land uses including residential, commercial, rural, and agriculture. Because of the extent of the project area and the types of land uses crossed, the evaluation was based on the review and comparison of demographic and income data collected during the 2000 U.S. Census and reported at the census tract level.

In 2000, the populations of Sacramento County and San Joaquin County were approximately 1,224,000 and 564,600 residents, respectively. Both counties are ethnically diverse, with the greatest diversity occurring in the urban areas. The median household incomes in Sacramento County and San Joaquin County were

\$43,816 and \$41,282, respectively (Table 10-4). Median household income tends to be higher in rural areas. Approximately 10% of the families living in Sacramento County and 14 % of the families living in San Joaquin County have incomes below the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau 2000a and 2000b). Amador and Calaveras Counties have populations of 35,100 and 40,554, respectively, and are not as ethnically diverse as Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. The median household income in Amador County is \$35,100 and in Calaveras County \$41,022. Approximately 6% of the families living in Amador County and 9% of the families living in Calaveras County have incomes below the poverty level. (U.S. Census Bureau 2000c and 2000d).

The ethnic composition of the census tracts crossed by the project components also tends to be more diverse in urban areas and less diverse in rural areas. In Sacramento County census tracts, the minority population, expressed as a percentage of total population within a census tract, ranged from a high of 88% in the urban tracts to a low of 16% in the rural tracts. Unlike in Sacramento County, the minority population in any of the census tracts crossed by the pipeline in San Joaquin County was nearly the same, ranging from a high of 30% to a low of 26%. As previously stated, Amador and Calaveras Counties have predominantly a white population. Minorities compose approximately 18% of Amador County and 12% of Calaveras County; demographics near Pardee Reservoir are virtually the same.

Table 10-4. Income and Ethnicity Data for Sacramento County, San Joaquin County, and City of Sacramento, and Census Tracts Crossed by the Project Components from the Freeport Intake Facility to the Mokelumne Aqueducts and the Enlarge Pardee Reservoir Component

Area/Census Tracts	Median Household Income (\$) ^s	% White	% African American	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	% Hispanic or Latino	% Other [#]	Relevant Project Alternative
Sacramento County Average	43,816	58	10	<1	11	<1	16	4	
42.01 (U)	39,280	32	30	<1	12	1	28	6	2,3
42.02 (U)	27,134	14	27	<1	24	3	25	5	2,3
42.03 (U)	26,835	15	23	<1	18	5	33	6	2,3
43 (U)	27,669	15	26	<1	27	3	23	6	2,3
49.03 (U)	28,687	12	37	<1	23	2	19	7	2,3
49.04 (U)	41,804	44	17	<1	14	<1	22	5	2,3
49.05 (U)	31,168	23	22	<1	11	<1	37	5	2,3
49.06 (U)	39,349	25	24	<1	23	<1	20	7	2,3
50.01 (U)	36,716	27	22	<1	22	<1	21	6	2,3,4,5,6
50.02 (U)	25,498	31	23	<1	22	<1	18	4	2,3,4,5,6
51.01 (U)	36,828	35	18	<1	20	<1	19	7	2,3,4,5,6
51.02 (U)	36,414	50	11	<1	17	<1	16	4	2,3,4,5,6
86 (R)	77,236	84	2	<1	3	<1	7	3	2,3,4,5

Area/Census Tracts	Median Household Income (\$) \$	% White	% African American	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	% Hispanic or Latino	% Other#	Relevant Project Alternative
92 (R)	50,865	60	2	2	15	<1	15	5	2,3,4,5,6
93.11 (R)	63,621	61	6	<1	18	<1	11	4	2,3,4,5,6
93.16 (U)	51,226	45	15	<1	16	<1	17	4	2,3,4,5,6
93.18 (U)	50,383	24	14	<1	38	1	17	6	2,3,4,5,6
93.19 (U)	48,836	29	11	<1	36	2	17	6	2,3,4,5,6
94.06 (R)	68,594	83	<1	<1	2	<1	10	2	2,3,4,5
96.01 (R)	46,652	14	27	<1	31	3	18	7	4,5,6
96.06 (U)	36,351	22	29	<1	16	1	26	5	4,5,6
96.07 (U)	35,216	16	28	<1	21	2	25	7	4,5,6
Study Area Avg.	40,322	33	17	0	19	1	19	5	
San Joaquin									
County Average	41,282	47	6	<1	11	<1	30	4	
46 (R)	49,000	74	<1	<1	3	<1	20	2	2,3,4,5
47.01 (R)	43,494	70	<1	<1	1	<1	26	2	2,3,4,5
47.02 (R)	52,241	71	<1	<1	2	<1	23	2	2,3,4,5
Study Area Avg.	48,245	72	<1	<1	2	<1	23	2	
Amador County Average	42,280	82	4	2	<1	<1	9	5	
5 (R)	46,184	89	<1	1	<1	<1	6	4	6
Calaveras County Average	41,022	88	<1	1	<1	<1	<7	4	
2.10	46,184	83	1	1	<1	<1	10	5	6

Notes:

The population totals do not add to exactly 100% because of rounding and because of the Census data's double-counting of respondents that checked more than one race on their Census form.

\$ = 1999 dollars

= Other includes those nationalities not listed in the previous columns or multi-racial groups

U = Urban

R = Rural

Environmental Consequences

Methods and Assumptions

Sections 53091 and 53096 of the California Government Code exempt the “location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water” from regulation under local zoning

ordinances; therefore, inconsistencies between most project facilities and zoning would not be considered, in and of themselves, potential significant impacts in this assessment.

Freeport Intake Facility to Mokelumne Aqueducts

Construction assumptions associated with the project components from the intake facility to the Mokelumne Aqueducts include the following:

- 130-foot-wide right-of-way for all pipeline alignments. The 130-foot-wide right-of-way consists of an 80-foot-wide permanent operation corridor and a 50-foot-wide temporary construction corridor. While there are some pipeline segments that will not require a full 130-foot-wide right-of-way (the FSCC segments in particular), that width is used consistently for purposes of this analysis.
- Agricultural land within the permanent operation corridors would *not* return to agricultural production, but agricultural land uses would be re-established in the temporary 50-foot wide construction corridors, as described in the Agricultural Land Restoration Plan outlined in the project description (see Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this document). This method of analysis considers a worst-case scenario.
- The Zone 40 Surface WTP would be an 80- to 100-acre parcel in the larger area shown on Figure 2-1. For the purposes of impact assessment, it is assumed that the plant could be placed on any part of that larger area. The canal pumping plant is evaluated for the 3.2-acre site described in Chapter 2; land use issues associated with the aqueduct pumping plant and pretreatment facility (Camanche site and optional Brandt site) are evaluated based on the conceptual designs and locations indicated in Chapter 2.
- Alignments following roadways without adequate amounts of unpaved rights-of-way would be constructed within the paved roadway or along its shoulder to the extent feasible. It is likely that private land (using temporary easements and, in limited cases, permanent easements) would be used in some instances for construction and/or long-term maintenance/access purposes. Examples include Gerber and Florin Roads.
- Alignments following parcel boundaries or existing and anticipated rights-of-way would be constructed in a manner that minimizes long-term impacts on private property. Temporary and/or permanent easements would be used for construction and/or long-term maintenance and access purposes. Examples include segments such as Segment Option 1 north of the SRWWTP (east of the Freeport community), and Segment N east of the terminus of Gerber Road.

Enlarge Pardee Reservoir

Several assumptions are associated with construction of the enlarge Pardee Reservoir component of the FRWP. The impact analysis assumes that the downstream replacement dam would be constructed first to allow Pardee Reservoir to continue normal operations during construction, and that no drawdown of the reservoir would be required. Also, FRWA would purchase and secure properties/easements for all public and private non-EBMUD lands surrounding the Pardee Reservoir before project construction.

For construction of the new dam, investigations of local quarry sites have concluded that there is suitable construction material available in the project vicinity. Materials from commercial sources would be transported to stockpiles at the site via local roads. Most staging areas would be located within the inundation zone of the enlarged reservoir. Staging areas that are located outside the inundation zone would avoid sensitive habitats. Materials from on-site quarries, to be located within the inundation zone of the enlarged reservoir, would be transported to dam construction sites using large off-highway haulers operating on dedicated haul roads.

The analysis of impacts related to raising the level of the Pardee Reservoir examines the effects of raising the reservoir to 614 feet msl, the maximum flood-control water level.

Significance Criteria

The criteria used for determining the significance of an impact on existing or planned land uses are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist) and professional standards and practices. Impacts on land use may be considered significant if implementation of an alternative would:

- physically divide an established community;
- conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; or
- conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Less-than-Significant Impacts

Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, no FRWP facilities would be constructed, and no construction-related or operation-related land use impacts would occur.

Alternatives 2–5

Alternatives 2 through 5 differ only in the pipeline alignments from the Freeport intake facility to the FSC. Project construction and operation for Alternatives 2 through 5 are very similar. Impacts related to land use for each alternative differ only slightly from each other; therefore, the results for Alternatives 2 through 5 are presented together but are representative of each individual alternative, unless otherwise noted.

Impact 10-1: Construction-Period Conflicts with Residential and Urbanized Land Uses

Land use conflicts from pipelines would consist mainly of combined nuisance effects on local residents and business operations from construction-related traffic, increased noise, and dust from trenching and ground disturbances. Construction of the intake facility, Zone 40 Surface WTP, and canal pumping plant could also expose neighboring land uses to these impacts.

All of the pipelines would be buried. In some sensitive areas and at some major roadway intersections, pipelines would be bored and jacked to minimize conflicts. Temporary construction period impacts related to dust/air quality and noise could result in conflicts with nearby land uses. These impacts and applicable mitigation measures are addressed in those topical sections of this EIR/EIS (Chapters 13 and 14, respectively). Because these nuisance impacts would be temporary and relatively short-term, construction-period land use conflicts with nearby residential and commercial development would be minor and less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-2: Postconstruction Conflicts with Residential and Urbanized Land Uses

Within the urbanized portions of the project area, some pipelines would follow existing or proposed roadway corridors and would not impact existing or proposed development after construction is complete. For these pipelines (i.e., those that would generally follow existing roadway corridors or public rights-of-way), potential direct conflicts with existing residential, commercial, and industrial uses are expected to be minimal. In addition, the applicant would adhere to its environmental commitments and continue ongoing coordination with affected municipalities (e.g., City and County of Sacramento, San Joaquin County) to review each pipeline alignment with respect to these potential conflicts (refer to Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments). For those segments or facilities that would not be within roadways/public rights-of-way, some conflicts with existing urbanized land uses could occur. In these situations, FRWA would adhere to the environmental commitments concerning acquisition of lands and compensation for affected property (refer to Chapter 2 under

Environmental Commitments). Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-3: Inconsistency with Local Plans and Policies and Land Use Designations

Construction and operation of the project facilities would be consistent with general plan policies of the City of Sacramento and Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. Underground water supply pipelines and the associated facilities are generally consistent with the applicable land use designations within the project area. One exception exists within the portion of the Zone 40 Surface WTP siting area between Bradshaw and Vineyard Roads. This area is designated by the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan primarily for single-family residential uses, with a small commercial area at Bradshaw Road. Development of a large (80- to 100-acre) water treatment plant within this area could conflict with these land use designations and the residential and commercial land uses that are developed pursuant to them. However, based on preliminary work being carried out by SCWA staff, the Zone 40 Surface WTP will not likely be located within the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan area. If the treatment plant is developed on the portion of the siting area outside of this Specific Plan area, this potential inconsistency would be avoided.

Therefore, Alternatives 2–5 would not conflict with any general plan designations or policies described in the Affected Environment section above. This impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-4: Conflicts with Planned New Land Uses

As outlined in Table 10-2, at least nine projects are currently being planned within the vicinity of the alternative pipeline alignments and associated facilities in Sacramento County. The planned projects range from utility and transportation system extensions to residential projects and planned developments. Because the pipeline alignments generally follow existing roadway/utility corridors, potential direct conflicts with proposed commercial, residential, and office development projects are expected to be minimal. Certain pipeline segments parallel certain proposed project facilities and could potentially create conflicts during construction phases, although some flexibility in the timing of construction at specific sites exists and may be sufficient to minimize such conflicts. In addition, because coordination with City, County, Regional Transit, and SCRSD staff is ongoing and would be an integral component of implementation of Alternatives 2–5, the impacts associated with the pipelines and related facilities are less than significant.

As described under Impact 10-3, above, development of a large (80- to 100-acre) water treatment plant within the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan area could conflict with planned land uses in that area. If the Zone 40 Surface WTP is proposed to be located within the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan area,

careful coordination with the Sacramento County planning department would be required to identify and mitigate potential land use conflicts.

No new development is planned in the San Joaquin County portions of the project area.

Therefore, Alternatives 2–5 would not substantially conflict with any planned new land uses. This impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required. (Refer to the various commitments made in the Environmental Commitments section in Chapter 2 for additional information concerning coordination with the County of Sacramento Planning and Community Development Department, the City of Sacramento Department of Planning and Development, the City and County Public Works Departments, Regional Transit, and SCRSD during project planning phases.)

Impact 10-5: Environmental Justice Effects

The median household income and ethnic diversity of each census tract through which the project components from the intake facility to the Mokelumne Aqueducts would pass are shown in Table 10-4. The project components would pass through census tracts that exhibit median household incomes both above and below the median household income reported for each county. Of the 22 census tracts crossed by the project in Sacramento County, 10 exhibit poverty levels greater than the county average (U.S. Census Bureau 2002a). Of the 4 census tracts crossed by the project in San Joaquin County, all exhibit poverty levels lower than the county average (U.S. Census Bureau 2002b). The project components would cross census tracts that exhibit both high and low levels of ethnic diversity. Thirteen census tracts have minority populations that are 50% or more of the total population within the tract.

The construction-related environmental impacts identified for each of the project pipeline alignment alternatives are not expected to result in a disproportionate impact on minority or low-income populations because the pipeline alignments cross an area that is both ethnically diverse and more homogenous than county averages. In addition, the alignment alternatives cross an area that exhibits income levels lower and higher than county averages. Finally, none of the construction-related impacts are unique to any of the census tracts crossed by the pipeline alignment alternatives. Operational impacts would occur at the intake facility, Zone 40 Surface WTP, canal pumping plant, and aqueduct pumping plant and pretreatment facility (Camanche site or optional Brandt site). Only the intake facility would be located within a census tract that exhibits a high level of ethnic diversity and poverty levels greater than the Sacramento County average. However, operating the intake facility is not expected to result in a disproportionate impact on a minority or low income population because of the distance between the facility and residential and commercial areas. In addition, the impacts of operating the intake facility are not expected to affect the socioeconomic characteristics of the surrounding community.

In addition, efforts to minimize social effects were considered as part of the alternative development process. Efforts included an extensive screening analysis that evaluated various alignment alternatives against several criteria, including environmental and technical factors. Alignment alternatives were modified to minimize project impacts, including pipeline construction within city streets, use of trenchless construction methods, and routing through rural areas. Most of the project effects related to construction of the pipelines, including relocating housing and businesses, disrupting surrounding land uses, and disrupting transportation facilities and circulation have been avoided. This impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Alternative 6

As described in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” Alternative 6 consists of enlarging Pardee Reservoir and conveying water from the Sacramento River to the Zone 40 WTP. Alternative 6 includes the following project components: enlarge Pardee Reservoir (which includes additional components), intake facility, pipeline from intake facility to the Zone 40 Surface WTP, and the Zone 40 Surface WTP. Though slightly different in size, the intake facility, pipeline from intake facility to the Zone 40 Surface WTP, and the Zone 40 Surface WTP project components are the same as those that make up Alternative 5. Therefore, several of the impacts associated with Alternative 5 (described above) are also associated with Alternative 6 and are restated below. Additionally, impacts associated with the enlarge Pardee Reservoir component of this alternative are described below.

Impact 10-6: Construction-Period Conflicts with Residential and Urbanized Land Uses

Land use conflicts from pipelines would consist of combined nuisance effects on local residents and business operations from construction-related traffic, increased noise, and dust from trenching and ground disturbances. Additionally, construction of the intake facility and Zone 40 Surface WTP could expose neighboring land uses to these impacts.

All of the pipelines would be buried. In some sensitive areas and at some major roadway intersections, pipelines would be bored and jacked to minimize conflicts. Temporary construction period impacts related to dust/air quality and noise could result in conflicts with nearby land uses. These impacts and applicable mitigation measures are addressed in those topical sections of this EIR/EIS (Chapters 13 and 14, respectively). Because these nuisance impacts would be temporary and relatively short-term, construction-period land use conflicts with nearby residential and commercial development conflicts would be minor and less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-7: Postconstruction Conflicts with Residential and Urbanized Land Uses

Within much of the urbanized portions of the project area, pipelines would follow existing or proposed roadway corridors and would not affect existing or proposed development after construction is complete. For these pipelines (i.e., those that would generally follow existing roadway corridors or public rights-of-way), potential direct conflicts with existing residential, commercial, and industrial uses are expected to be minimal. In addition, the project applicant would adhere to its environmental commitments and continue ongoing coordination with affected municipalities (e.g., City and County of Sacramento) to review each pipeline alignment with respect to these potential conflicts (refer to Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments).

For those pipeline segments not within roadways/public rights-of-way, some conflicts with existing urbanized land uses could occur. In these situations, FRWA would adhere to the environmental commitments concerning acquisition of lands and compensation for affected property (refer to Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments). Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-8: Inconsistency with Local Plans and Policies

As previously described above in Impact 10-3, construction and operation of project facilities would be consistent with general plan policies of the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County. One exception exists within the portion of the Zone 40 Surface WTP siting area between Bradshaw and Vineyard Roads. This area is designated by the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan primarily for single-family residential uses, with a small commercial area at Bradshaw Road. Development of a large (80- to 100-acre) water treatment plant within this area could conflict with these land use designations and the residential and commercial land uses that are developed pursuant to them. However, based on preliminary work being carried out by SCWA staff, the Zone 40 Surface WTP will not likely be located within the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan area. If the treatment plant is developed on the portion of the siting area outside of this Specific Plan area, this potential inconsistency would be avoided.

The Amador County General Plan designates the areas north of the Pardee Reservoir that would be affected by implementation of Alternative 6 as Agricultural-General (A-G); Mineral Resources Zone; and Open-Recreation (Grijalva pers. comm.). The Amador County Zoning Code (Title 19) cites “wells, water storage, and reservoirs, including on-site excavation or removal of materials for construction” as compatible uses within Agricultural areas. The Open-Recreation designation is intended to fully protect and maintain the open and recreational character of the designated area, as well as the natural environmental values. Because the project would include relocation and expansion of the recreational facilities at the Pardee Reservoir Recreation Area to

an area within the Open-Recreation land use designation, the proposed project would not be in conflict with the Open-Recreation designation.

In addition, a portion of lakeside property within the project's potential area of effect, but outside the area proposed for inundation (i.e., below 614 feet msl near the SR 49 Pardee Reservoir overcrossing in Amador County, is managed by BLM and is designated in the Amador County General Plan as Open Forest [Grijalva pers. comm.]). The Amador County Open Forest designation is applied to public lands in the county owned by agencies other than the County itself. The County does not have additional jurisdiction on this land (Grijalva pers. comm.).

Construction within BLM lands would need to be completed under a federal license to comply with the BLM specifications for construction in the Sierra Planning area. Once the federal license is issued, if necessary for construction activities and staging, or to establish a new buffer around the reservoir, FRWA would purchase the affected land from the BLM. No additional BLM requirements would be applicable after completion of the land transfer (Hummel pers. comm.).

Expansion of the reservoir would be an allowable use within the Calaveras County Dam Inundation Area. The Calaveras County Rural Residential zoning designation allows for public utility facilities with approval of a conditional use permit. As noted in the Calaveras County Zoning Code (Title 17), all recreational uses are allowed within the Calaveras County Recreation zone, with a conditional use permit required for campgrounds and a planned development permit for planned facilities.

The Wildlife Habitat area surrounding the southeastern shore of the Pardee Reservoir is also designated as a Bald Eagle Wintering Area on the Calaveras County General Plan Significant Wildlife Habitat map. Under General Plan Policy V-1A, Implementation Measure V-1 A-2, the County would require a wildlife assessment and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including specifications for the construction period, prior to approval of the development permit for the Pardee Reservoir expansion in the Bald Eagle Wintering area.

Therefore, Alternative 6 would not be inconsistent with any plan designations or policies. This impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-9: Inconsistency with Future Planned Land Uses

Several of the proposed project components for Alternative 6 would pass through lands designated for commercial, industrial, and residential uses in the City and County of Sacramento and Calaveras County. Potential conflicts between Alternative 6 and the designated future land uses within the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento would be the same as those described above for Alternatives 2 through 5. No significant impacts would occur.

There are no planned new land uses adjacent to Pardee Reservoir in Calaveras or Amador Counties; therefore, there would not be any conflicts with new land uses. However, some land uses adjacent to Pardee Reservoir are designated for Future Single Family Residential (5–40 units per acre) in the Calaveras County General Plan. Additionally, the Mokelumne Hill Community Plan designates a portion of the land uses adjacent to Pardee Reservoir as Rural Residential (1- to 5-acre parcels). These areas are not currently developed with residential land uses but rather contain mainly grazing and open space land. Therefore, this impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact 10-10: Conflict with Proposed Scenic Highway Designation for State Route 49

As described above, SR 49 has been proposed for inclusion in the State Scenic Highway system but this designation has not yet been adopted. Construction of a new bridge over the Mokelumne River would not substantially alter the values for which SR 49 is being considered as a scenic highway. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

Impact 10-11: Inundation Associated with Enlarging Pardee Reservoir

Implementation of Alternative 6 would involve raising the level of the Pardee Reservoir and consequently inundating lands between 568 feet msl (existing water surface elevation) and 614 feet msl (maximum future flood-control water surface elevation). As a result, the reservoir inundation area would be increased resulting in the loss of land currently in recreational grazing uses. All on-shore recreational uses would be relocated. The loss of grazing lands would be permanent. However, this loss is an extremely small proportion of grazing land in the area and grazing on these lands is currently very limited because of EBMUD water quality concerns. This minor loss of potential grazing land use is a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-12: Conflict with Mineral Resources Zone General Plan Classification

The Amador County Mineral Resources Zone classification is applied to lands “having current mining operations or ...identified as having a significant or potentially significant mineral resource deposits.... The purpose of the classification is ...prevention of the premature conversion of important mineralized lands to other land uses....” The Amador County General Plan cites public recreation as a compatible use for Mineral Resource Zone designated areas. Based on historic maps and officially listed mine locations (California Division of Mines and Geology 1962), approximately 16 to 23 mines are located within the project inundation area (between 568 feet and 614 feet msl), and up to

25 mines are located within the Pardee Reservoir project area. However, all mines in the project area have been closed. While enlargement of the reservoir will result in the inundation of several mines, these mines are not currently and have not been operational for many years, their relative value as mineral extraction sites is unknown and likely very limited, and inundation of these mines would result in only a very minor impact on available mineral extraction areas. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact 10-13: Environmental Justice Effects

Impacts associated with the project components from the intake facility to the Zone 40 Surface WTP would be the same as for Alternatives 2–5, described above.

The median household income and ethnic diversity of each census tract in which the enlarge Pardee Reservoir component lies are shown in Table 10-4. Both of the two census tracts within which the enlarge Pardee Reservoir component would occur exhibit poverty levels lower than the averages for Amador and Calaveras Counties (U.S. Census Bureau 2002c and 2002d). The enlarge Pardee Reservoir component would occur in an area with low ethnic diversity. The enlarge Pardee Reservoir component would not result in a disproportionate impact to minority or low income groups because the project is located away from urban areas and within census tracts that exhibit income levels above the averages for Amador and Calaveras Counties and a population that is predominantly white. This impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

None of the project alternatives would result in significant land use impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary.