

4.3.16 Public Services and Utilities

Impact UT-1: Increased Demand on Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Response Services from New Workers in the Plan Area as a Result of Constructing the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: Effects related to the provision of law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency response services as a result of construction of the proposed water conveyance facilities would be identical to those described for Alternative 4. Increased Public Service Demands Associated with Workers Relocating to the Study Area

Alternative 4A would not result in a permanent increase in population that could tax the ability to provide adequate law enforcement, fire protection services, and medical services, the increase in construction workers anticipated during the construction period of approximately 13.5 years could increase demands for these services during this period. The construction population needed for construction of the water conveyance facilities would primarily come from the existing five-county labor force which is already served by law enforcement agencies and medical/emergency response services (hospitals) in the Plan Area (Tables 20A-1 to 20A-3 in Appendix 20A of the Draft EIR/EIS), and because the minor increase in demand from the worker population that would move into the area to fill specialized jobs (e.g., tunnel construction) would be spread across the large multi-county study area, construction of the alternative is not anticipated to result in an increased demand on law enforcement, fire protection, or medical services. This effect is not considered adverse.

Increased Public Service Demands Associated with Construction Work Areas and Activities

Construction of Alternative 4A would be identical to Alternative 4. Alternative 4A would not increase the demand on law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency response services either due to an increased worker population or due to construction-related hazards, such that it would result in substantial adverse physical effects associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities. Environmental commitments to lessen the impacts associated with construction property protection and the potential for construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, or fires, and reduce potential effects associated with increased service demands from new construction workers in the Plan Area (as discussed in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS) would continue to reduce potential effects associated with increased service demands from new construction workers in the project area. Impacts on emergency response times from construction traffic using emergency routes are discussed in Chapter 19, *Transportation*, Impact Trans-3, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Therefore, the effect would not be adverse.

CEQA Conclusion: The potential for impacts on law enforcement and fire services and facilities is not expected to be significant because the estimated increase in population in the Plan Area associated with construction of the alternative during peak construction would be distributed over multiple cities and counties within the Plan Area. Incorporation of environmental commitments (described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS) would minimize construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, and fires, and provide for onsite security at construction sites would minimize potential effects related to the potential for construction-related accidents, and increased demand for public services associated with construction property protection. Environmental commitments would also be

1 incorporated to reduce potential exposure of hazardous materials to the human and natural
2 environment, thereby minimizing the potential demand for fire or emergency services.

3 Construction of Alternative 4A would not require new or physically altered governmental facilities
4 since it would not cause a marked increase in the worker population in the Plan Area, nor would it
5 increase the potential for construction-related hazards. This impact would be less than significant.
6 No mitigation is required.

7 **Impact UT-2: Displacement of Public Service Facilities as a Result of Constructing the** 8 **Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities**

9 **NEPA Effects:** Construction impacts of water facilities under Alternative 4A would be identical to
10 those under Alternative 4. There are no public facilities in the proposed tunnel alignment.
11 Construction of the tunnel facilities is not anticipated to conflict with any public facilities, nor would
12 it require the construction or major alteration of such facilities. Therefore, this effect would not be
13 adverse.

14 **CEQA Conclusion:** Construction of the proposed water conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A
15 would not require the construction or major alteration of public service facilities. Therefore, this
16 impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

17 **Impact UT-3: Effects on Public Schools as a Result of Constructing the Proposed Water** 18 **Conveyance Facilities**

19 **NEPA Effects:** Construction of Alternative 4A water conveyance facilities will be identical to
20 Alternative 4 and is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in demand for public schools in
21 the Plan Area and would not create a need for new or physically altered public schools due to the
22 fact that any increase in the population due to the necessary construction workforce would be
23 temporary and would represent a small incremental increase in the projected regional population.
24 Most of the project construction jobs would be filled by workers from within the existing five-county
25 labor force and any incremental increase in school-age children of construction personnel moving
26 into the area for specialized jobs (e.g., tunnel construction) required by construction of Alternative
27 4A would likely be distributed through a number of schools within the Plan Area. There would be no
28 adverse effect.

29 **CEQA Conclusion:** There would be a significant impact if the proposed action resulted in substantial
30 adverse physical effects associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered
31 governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, for
32 any public services. The majority of construction jobs are expected to be filled by workers from the
33 existing five-county labor force. The incremental increase in school-age children of construction
34 personnel moving into the area for specialized construction jobs (e.g., tunnel construction) would
35 likely be distributed through a number of schools within the Plan Area. This increase in school
36 enrollment would not be substantial enough to exceed the capacity of any individual district, or to
37 warrant construction of a new facility or alteration of an existing facility within the Plan Area. The
38 impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.¹

¹ Under California law, the rules governing what constitutes adequate mitigation for impacts on school facilities is governed by legislation. Pursuant to the operative statutes, impacts on schools, with some exceptions, are sufficiently mitigated, as a matter of law, by the payment of school impact fees by residential developers. (See Cal. Gov. Code, § 65995[h], 65996[a].)

1 **Impact UT-4: Effects on Water or Wastewater Treatment Services and Facilities as a Result of**
2 **Constructing the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities**

3 **NEPA Effects:** Effects related to the need for expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities
4 would be similar to those for Alternative 4. For purposes of this analysis, the amount of water
5 supply required under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 4. As such, the total
6 potable water supply needed under this alternative is estimated to be 177.8 million gallons (Table
7 20-3 in the Draft EIR/EIS). It is anticipated that if there are existing water lines in the vicinity of the
8 construction sites, the field office will connect to them. Because construction of this alternative
9 would primarily occur in rural parts of the study area, and is not likely to occur in areas with
10 municipal water service, it is not expected to impact municipal water systems. If there are no
11 existing water lines in the vicinity, then field offices will require construction of a water tank. Water
12 for construction will be provided by available sources to the extent possible; if needed, water may
13 be brought to the construction sites in water trucks. Construction impacts associated with trucks,
14 including water trucks, are addressed in Chapter 19, *Transportation*, Chapter 22, *Air Quality and*
15 *Greenhouse Gases*, and Chapter 23, *Noise*. As such, this alternative would not likely adversely affect
16 municipal water supplies. Additionally, the potable water demand would be temporary and limited
17 to the construction period.

18 Tunnel boring for Alternative 4A would create a substantial amount of wastewater as with
19 Alternative 4. As part of the alternative, DWR would implement an environmental commitment (as
20 discussed in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*) that would dispose of and reuse spoils,
21 reusable tunnel material, and dredged material. Concrete batch plants would also create
22 wastewater, which would be treated onsite at designated concrete batch plant sites. Wastewater
23 generated during construction at field offices and temporary construction facilities will be served by
24 temporary portable facilities (e.g., portable toilets). As discussed in Chapter 8, *Water Quality*, as part
25 of the *Environmental Commitments* (Appendix 3B) for each alternative, DWR will be required to
26 conduct project construction activities in compliance with the State Water Board's *NPDES*
27 *Stormwater General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land*
28 *Disturbance Activities* (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ/NPDES Permit No. CAS000002). This General
29 Construction NPDES Permit requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP that outlines
30 the temporary construction-related BMPs to prevent and minimize erosion, sedimentation, and
31 discharge of other construction-related contaminants, as well as permanent post-construction BMPs
32 to minimize adverse long-term stormwater related–runoff water quality effects.

33 Considered across the alternative, potable water supply needs are substantial in volume; however,
34 these requirements would need to be met over a construction period of approximately 13.5 years,
35 and would be anticipated to be met with non-municipal water sources without any need for new
36 water supply entitlements. Also similar to Alternative 4, wastewater created as a result of tunnel
37 boring and concrete batching would be provided by temporary facilities and treated onsite.
38 Construction of Alternative 4A would not require or result in the construction of new water or
39 wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. This effect would not be adverse.

40 **CEQA Conclusion:** Construction of Alternative 4A would not require or result in the construction of
41 new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. While construction
42 of Alternative 4A would require 177.8 million gallons of potable water, this supply could be met by
43 non-municipal sources such as non-municipal water wells or water trucks, without any new water
44 supply entitlements. Additional needs for wastewater treatment and potable water could also be
45 served by non-municipal entities. Water for construction activities would be brought to the site in

1 water trucks. Wastewater services for construction crews would be provided by temporary portable
2 facilities. This impact would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

3 **Impact UT-5: Effects on Landfills as a Result of Solid Waste Disposal Needs during**
4 **Construction of the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities**

5 **NEPA Effects:** Alternative 4A would create the same amount of solid waste as Alternative 4. Overall,
6 the construction waste that could be generated by implementing Alternative 4A would not result in
7 an adverse effect on the capacity of available landfills because 50% or more of construction waste
8 generated by this alternative would be diverted (in accordance with diversion requirements set
9 forth by the State Agency Model IWMA and BMP 13 [Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*, in
10 Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS]), and the construction debris and excavated material that would
11 require disposal at a landfill could be accommodated by, and would have a negligible effect, on the
12 remaining permitted capacity of Plan Area landfills. This alternative is not expected to affect the
13 lifespan of area landfills, because over 70% of the remaining permitted capacity is associated with
14 landfills with expected lifespans of between 18 and 70 years—well beyond the expected timeframe
15 for construction of project facilities, when solid waste disposal services would be needed. This effect
16 would not be adverse.

17 **CEQA Conclusion:** Based on the capacity of the landfills in the region, and the waste diversion
18 requirements set forth by the State of California, it would be expected that construction of the
19 proposed water conveyance facilities would not cause any exceedance of landfill capacity. RTM
20 resulting from construction of tunnel segments would be treated in designated RTM work areas.
21 Debris from structure demolition, power poles, utility lines, piping, and other materials would be
22 diverted from landfills to the maximum extent feasible at the time of demolition. This alternative is
23 not expected to affect the lifespan of area landfills, because over 70% of the remaining permitted
24 capacity is associated with landfills with expected lifespans of between 18 and 70 years—well
25 beyond the expected timeframe for construction of project facilities, when solid waste disposal
26 services would be needed. Further, implementation of BMP 13 (Appendix 3B, *Environmental*
27 *Commitments*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS) would require development of a project-specific
28 construction debris recycling and diversion program to achieve a documented 50% diversion of
29 construction waste. Construction of Alternative 4A would not create solid waste in excess of the
30 permitted capacity of area landfills, nor would it adversely affect the expected lifespan of these solid
31 waste facilities. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact on solid waste management
32 facilities.

33 **Impact UT-6: Effects on Regional or Local Utilities as a Result of Constructing the Proposed**
34 **Water Conveyance Facilities**

35 **NEPA Effects:** Disruption of utility services or relocation of existing facilities would be identical to
36 that described under Alternative 4. This water conveyance alignment, along with its associated
37 physical structures, could interfere with 12 overhead power/electrical transmission lines (Figure 24-
38 6 in the Draft EIR/EIS), 6 natural gas pipelines (Table 20-5 and Figure 24-3 in the Draft EIR/EIS), 11
39 inactive oil or gas wells (Figure 24-5 in the Draft EIR/EIS), the Mokelumne Aqueduct, and 43 miles
40 of agricultural delivery canals and drainage ditches, including approximately 13 miles on Byron
41 Tract, and 7 miles on Bouldin Island. Additionally, active gas wells may need to be plugged and
42 abandoned. Relocation of additional facilities near proposed forebays, RTM, and borrow or spoils
43 areas could also be necessary. The potential damage and disruption to buried and overhead electric
44 transmission lines would be similar for telecommunication infrastructure. Because relocation and

1 disruption of existing utility infrastructure would be required under this alternative and would have
2 the potential to create environmental effects, this effect would be adverse.

3 Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c are available to reduce the severity of this effect. If
4 coordination with all appropriate utility providers and local agencies to integrate with other
5 construction projects and minimize disturbance to communities were successful under Mitigation
6 Measure UT-6b, the effect would not be adverse.

7 **CEQA Conclusion:** Under this alternative, most features would avoid disrupting existing facilities by
8 crossing over or under infrastructure. However, construction of facilities would conflict with
9 existing utility facilities in some locations. Regional power transmission lines and one natural gas
10 pipeline would require relocation. Because the relocation and potential disruption of utility
11 infrastructure would be required, this impact would be significant.

12 Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c are available to reduce these impacts through
13 measures that could avoid disruption of utility infrastructure. If coordination with all appropriate
14 utility providers and local agencies to integrate with other construction projects and minimize
15 disturbance to communities were successful under Mitigation Measure UT-6b, the impact would be
16 less-than-significant. However, because coordination with a third party is required in order to carry
17 out this mitigation, a conservative assessment of significant and unavoidable is being made.

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

19 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6a under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
20 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

21 **Mitigation Measure UT-6b: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or** 22 **Minimizes Any Effect on Operational Reliability**

23 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6b under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
24 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

25 **Mitigation Measure UT-6c: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or** 26 **Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety**

27 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6c under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
28 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

29 **Impact UT-7: Effects on Public Services and Utilities as a Result of Operation and Maintenance** 30 **of the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities**

31 **NEPA Effects:** Operation and maintenance activities would require minimal labor. Impacts under
32 Alternative 4A would be identical to that under Alternative 4. Given the limited number of workers
33 involved and the large number of work sites, it is not anticipated that routine operations and
34 maintenance activities or major inspections would result in substantial demand for law
35 enforcement, fire protection, or emergency response services. In addition, operation and
36 maintenance would not place service demand on public schools or libraries. The operation and
37 maintenance of the proposed water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for new or
38 physically altered government facilities as a result of increased need for public services.

1 Potential effects associated with operation and maintenance of water conveyance facilities would be
2 similar to those described under Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4A would not result in
3 physical effects associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities.

4 Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4A facilities would involve use of water for pressure
5 washing intake screen panels and basic cleaning of building facilities and other equipment. Impacts
6 would be identical to those under Alternative 4. The operation and maintenance of the proposed
7 water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for new water supply entitlements, or
8 require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing
9 facilities.

10 Similar to Alternative 4, the operation and maintenance activities associated with the proposed
11 water conveyance facilities would not be expected to generate solid waste such that there would be
12 an increase in demand for solid waste management providers in the Plan Area and surrounding
13 communities. Therefore, there would be no or minimal effect on solid waste management facilities.

14 As with Alternative 4, operation and maintenance of proposed water conveyance facilities under this
15 alternative would require new transmission lines for intakes, pumping plants, operable barriers,
16 boat locks, and gate control structures throughout the various proposed conveyance alignments and
17 construction of project facilities. Points of interconnection would be located identically to
18 Alternative 4.

19 Operation and maintenance activities associated with the proposed water conveyance facilities
20 would not be expected to result in the disruption or relocation of utilities. Effects associated with
21 energy demands of operation and maintenance of the proposed water conveyance facilities are
22 addressed in Chapter 21, *Energy*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

23 Overall, operation and maintenance of the conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A would not
24 result in adverse effects on service demands, water supply and treatment capacity, wastewater and
25 solid waste facilities nor conflict with local and regional utility lines. There would not be an adverse
26 effect.

27 **CEQA Conclusion:** Operation and maintenance activities associated with the Alternative 4A
28 proposed water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for the provision of, or the need
29 for, new or physically altered government facilities from the increased need for public services;
30 construction of new water and wastewater treatment facilities or generate a need for new water
31 supply entitlements; generate solid waste in excess of permitted landfill capacity; or result in the
32 disruption or relocation of utilities. The impact on public services and utilities would be less than
33 significant. No mitigation is required.

34 **Impact UT-8: Effects on Public Services and Utilities as a Result of Implementing the**
35 **Proposed Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–12, 15, and 16**

36 **NEPA Effects:** Effects of Alternative 4A related to the potential for effects on public services and
37 utilities from implementing applicable conservation and other stressor reductions would be similar
38 to those described for Alternative 4. However, as described under Section 4.1, *Introduction*, of this
39 RDEIR/SDEIS, Alternative 4A would restore up to 15,548 acres of habitat under Environmental
40 Commitments 3, 4, 6–10 as compared with 83,900 acres under Alternative 4. Environmental
41 Commitments 11, 12, 15, and 16 would be implemented only at limited locations. Conservation
42 Measures 2, 5, 13, 14, and 17–21 would not be implemented as part of this alternative. Therefore,

1 the magnitude of effects under Alternative 4A would likely be smaller than those associated with
2 Alternative 4.

3 **Public Services**

4 Potential effects of implementing conservation and other stressor reductions under Alternative 4A
5 on law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency response services would primarily involve
6 demand for services related to construction site security and construction-related accidents. The
7 effect would be similar to that under Alternative 4, but because only portions of the restoration
8 conservation measures and fewer of the other stressor reduction conservation measures would be
9 implemented under Alternative 4A, it is likely that the effects on public services would be less than
10 those presented for Alternative 4. This effect would not be considered adverse with the
11 implementation of environmental commitments to provide onsite private security services at
12 construction areas and environmental commitments that would minimize the potential for
13 construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, or fires, as
14 described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS. These
15 environmental commitments would be incorporated into this alternative and would provide for
16 onsite security at construction sites and minimize construction-related accidents associated with
17 hazardous materials spills, contamination, and fires that may result from construction of the
18 conservation components.

19 **Utilities**

20 ***Water and Wastewater***

21 Implementation of some of the conservation components, in particular those involved with
22 restoration and enhancement of some habitat types, could require a water supply, but would not
23 require city or county treated water sources. Effects would be similar to, but lesser in magnitude
24 than that under Alternative 4, due to the fact that Alternative 4A involves smaller acreage amounts
25 of restoration and conservation. Additionally, some components that would require water supply
26 under Alternative 4 are not a part of Alternative 4A (CM5). Conservation components that could
27 increase need for water supply are restoration of natural tidal communities (Environmental
28 Commitment 4), channel margin (Environmental Commitment 6), riparian (Environmental
29 Commitment 7), vernal pool and alkali seasonal wetland complex (Environmental Commitment 9),
30 and nontidal marsh habitats (Environmental Commitment 10); and maintenance of these habitats.
31 Measures related to the reduction of stressors on covered species that are a part of Alternative 4A
32 would not generally require a treated water supply or generate wastewater. Because the location
33 and construction or operational details (i.e., water consumption and water sources associated with
34 conservation components of these facilities and programs) have not yet been developed, the need
35 for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities is uncertain. However, because the
36 habitat restoration and enhancement activities consist of restoration consistent with open space, the
37 need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities is unlikely.

38 ***Solid Waste***

39 Implementation of some of the conservation components would result in construction debris and
40 green waste. Implementation of habitat restoration and enhancement proposed under
41 Environmental Commitments 4, 6, 7, and 9–11 would involve restoration, enhancement, and
42 management of various types of habitat. Construction activities could require clearing and grubbing,
43 demolition of existing structures (e.g., roads and utilities), surface water quality protection, dust

1 control, establishment of storage and stockpile areas, temporary utilities and fuel storage, and
2 erosion control. Effects would be similar to, but less in magnitude than that under Alternative 4, due
3 to the fact that Alternative 4A involves smaller acreage amounts of restoration and conservation.
4 The estimated tonnage of construction debris and solid waste that would be generated from
5 construction associated with the proposed conservation components is unknown. However, there is
6 a remaining landfill capacity of over 300 million tons in nearby landfills (Table 20A-6 in Appendix
7 20A of the Draft EIR/EIS). The disposal of construction debris and excavated material would occur
8 at several different locations depending on the type of material and its origin. Based on the capacity
9 of the landfills in the region, and the waste diversion requirements set forth by the State of
10 California, it is expected that construction and operation of the proposed conservation components
11 would not cause any exceedance of landfill capacity.

12 ***Electricity and Natural Gas***

13 Conservation components including habitat restoration and enhancement would, in some cases,
14 involve substantial earthwork and ground disturbance. As discussed above under Impact UT-6,
15 construction could potentially disrupt utility services, and ground disturbance has potential to
16 damage underground utilities. The long-term conversion of existing utility corridors to habitat
17 purposes could require the relocation of utility infrastructure, which could carry environmental
18 effects. Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c would be available to reduce the severity of
19 these effects.

20 Effects would be similar to, but less in magnitude than that under Alternative 4, due to the fact that
21 Alternative 4A involves smaller acreage amounts of restoration and conservation. The locations,
22 construction, and operational details for these and other conservation components have not been
23 identified. Adverse effects due to the construction, operation and maintenance activities associated
24 with the conservation components are not expected to result in the need for new government
25 facilities to provide public services or the need for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment
26 facilities based on increased demand. Environmental commitments would minimize construction-
27 related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, and fires that may
28 result from construction of the conservation components. However, there is a potential for the
29 disruption or relocation of utility infrastructure, which has the potential to result in an adverse
30 effect. Further, no substantive adverse effects on solid waste management facilities are anticipated.
31 Because the location and construction and operational details (i.e., water consumption and water
32 sources associated with conservation components) related to these facilities and programs have not
33 yet been developed, the need for new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities is
34 uncertain. However, because the habitat restoration and enhancement activities consist of
35 restoration consistent with open space, the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment
36 facilities is unlikely. This effect would be adverse.

37 ***CEQA Conclusion:*** Significant impacts could occur if implementation of the proposed conservation
38 components would result in the need for the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered
39 government facilities from the increased need for public services; construction of new water and
40 wastewater treatment facilities or generate a need for new water supply entitlements; generate
41 solid waste in excess of permitted landfill capacity; or result in the disruption or relocation of
42 utilities.

43 Implementation of the proposed conservation components under Alternative 4A is not likely to
44 require alteration or construction of new government facilities due to increased need for public

1 services and utilities. Several measures to reduce stressors on covered species could result in water
2 supply requirements, but are not expected to require substantial increases in demand on municipal
3 water and wastewater treatment services.

4 Construction and operation activities associated with the proposed conservation measures would
5 result in a less-than-significant impact on solid waste management facilities based on the capacity of
6 the landfills in the region, and the waste diversion requirements set forth by the State of California.

7 Potential impacts of implementing conservation components on law enforcement, fire protection,
8 and emergency response services within the ROAs would be less-than-significant with the
9 incorporation of environmental commitments into this alternative and would minimize
10 construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, and fires
11 that may result from construction of the conservation components (Appendix 3B, *Environmental*
12 *Commitments*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS).

13 The need for new or expanded water facilities and the potential to disrupt utilities in the study area
14 as a result of construction of operation of conservation and other stressor reductions is unknown at
15 this time, nor have construction and operational details been settled upon. However, because the
16 habitat restoration and enhancement activities consist of restoration consistent with open space, the
17 need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities is unlikely. While Mitigation Measures
18 UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c could reduce the significance of impacts on utilities; it is uncertain whether
19 these mitigations could reduce this impact in every case. Therefore, this impact would be significant
20 and unavoidable.

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

22 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6a under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
23 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

24 **Mitigation Measure UT-6b: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or**
25 **Minimizes Any Effect on Operational Reliability**

26 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6b under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
27 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

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

30 Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6c under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4 in
31 Chapter 20, *Public Services and Utilities*, in Appendix A of this RDEIR/SDEIS.