

## 6. ALTERNATIVES

---

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews alternatives to the proposed project considered during the preparation of this SEIR. The purpose of the alternative analysis, according to CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a), is to describe a range of reasonable alternative projects that could feasibly attain most of the objectives of the proposed project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(b) requires consideration of alternatives that could reduce to a less-than-significant level or eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project. The range of alternatives evaluated in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason,” which requires the evaluation of alternatives “necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” Alternatives considered must include those that offer environmental advantages over the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished considering economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

In accordance with the CEQA *Guidelines*, the project alternatives considered in the 2006 EIR included those that 1) could accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, and 2) could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. The development of the proposed reclaimed water irrigation sites for which this SEIR has been prepared was included as a component of the proposed project analyzed by the 2006 EIR. This SEIR does not reconsider overall project alternatives but rather considers alternative reclaimed water irrigation sites.

To provide the appropriate context for this alternatives analysis, the project objectives are summarized below in **Section 6.2** below. **Section 6.3** below provides a summary of the alternative disposal methods initially considered in the 2006 EIR but eliminated from further consideration due to their inability to achieve the project objectives and reduce environmental effects. The criteria for selecting potential reclaimed water irrigation sites for analysis under this SEIR are discussed in **Section 6.4** below. Each of the selected sites has been subject in in-depth analysis in **Chapter 4.0** of this SEIR and the impacts are summarized in Table 1-2. Several potential irrigation scenarios involve use of more than one proposed site. These scenarios are presented and compared against the CEQA-required No Project Alternative in **Section 6.5** below. Based on this comparison, the “environmentally superior alternative” is identified in **Section 6.6** below.

### 6.2 OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

The proposed project has been planned in order to meet the objectives outlined below:

- Provide additional wastewater disposal capacity by spring of 2009;
- Provide sufficient wastewater disposal capacity to serve planned population growth through 2015 as identified in the City of Hollister 2005 General Plan;

- Implement recycling of treated DWTP effluent as identified in the GWMP in order to manage water resources in a manner consistent with regional goals;
- Manage the amount of water entering the groundwater basin by maintaining or reducing the amount of effluent disposed of by percolation at the DWTP and IWTP, in order to protect land uses in the region from high groundwater levels;
- Treat wastewater as a resource rather than a waste product by recycling effluent consistent with the California Department of Health Services (DHS) criteria for recycled water (Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3 of the California Administrative Code);
- Assist in the attainment of regional groundwater management goals in a manner that is feasible;
- Comply with the City's obligations under the ACL Order No. R3-2002-0097 and CDO No. R-3-2002-0105, which require the City to fully implement the Long Term Wastewater Management Program (LTWMP);
- Make efficient use of existing public facilities in order to reduce infrastructure costs;
- Make efficient use of infrastructure investments to facilitate long-term goals for water management in the region;
- Implement project elements that avoid or minimize adverse impacts to biological resources, including riparian habitats, habitats supporting sensitive plant or animal species, and to archaeological/historic sites;
- Implement project elements that avoid or minimize adverse impacts to existing and planned land uses including agriculture;
- Identify projects capable of being permitted and implemented in a timely fashion; and
- Identify project elements that are financially feasible.

### 6.3 ALTERNATIVE DISPOSAL METHODS

The 2006 EIR analyzed a range of alternative disposal methods. Eight disposal alternatives were found to be infeasible. These included the use of existing percolation ponds, enhancement of the existing percolation ponds, leach fields, deep ground injection, export to water poor areas, ocean discharge, reverse osmosis and brine injection, and evaporation ponds. The 2006 EIR analyzed two alternatives that were identified as feasible. These are described below:

**Discharge to the San Benito River (Surface Water Discharge)** Under this alternative, the City would construct an outfall to discharge treated effluent into the San Benito River. The outfall would be a channel or pipe routed directly from the DWTP to the San Benito River.

**Construction of New Percolation Ponds** This alternative consists of the construction of new percolation ponds. The City would acquire approximately 100-200 acres of land to provide adequate percolation capacity.

The 2006 EIR concluded that these alternatives would result in a greater magnitude of water resource impacts than the proposed disposal methods. The river discharge alternative would contribute to high groundwater levels in the San Juan Valley and potentially degrade downstream water quality. The new

percolation pond alternative would contribute to high salinity levels in the groundwater basin. In consideration of these impacts, the proposed disposal methods were found to be the environmentally superior alternative. The analysis of alternative disposal methods is presented in Section 6 of the 2006 EIR, and is incorporated by reference into this EIR.

## 6.4 CONSIDERATION OF SITE ALTERNATIVES

### 6.4.1 SITE SELECTION PROCESS

The selection of potential sites was made by the City of Hollister based on the evaluation of potential sites by the Master Plan Governance Committee. The Governance Committee was formed as a condition of the MOU, and is comprised of two elected officials from City, County and Water District. To identify and review potential sites, the Governance Committee formed a site-selection sub-committee that established selection criteria to guide the selection of potential sites. The "Criteria for Disposal Area" identified by the Site-Selection Sub-Committee are summarized below:

1. Areas that have been offered by landowner or others.
2. Reasonable proximity to the DWTP.
3. Priority will be given to land uses (such as golf courses, sod farms, grazing lands) that can accommodate water.
4. Practicality of including area. This criterion includes: engineering aspects such as pumping elevation; piping components; topographic constraints, such as steepness and run-off issues, and accessibility.
5. Must be consistent with the terms of the Master Plan MOU.
6. Selected area must accommodate adequate disposal capacity.
7. Consider water quality, quantity and groundwater level impacts to San Juan Valley.
8. Consider applicability of areas for long-term disposal.
9. Consider impacts to high groundwater areas.

The potential sites were evaluated according to these criteria. A matrix comparing the five sites to the criteria is presented in **Appendix O**.

### 6.4.2 SITES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

#### East Foothills Sites

In addition to the five potential reclaimed water irrigation sites analyzed in this SEIR, the City reviewed two additional sites in the east foothills area: the approximately 625-acre Guerra Property and the approximately 584-acre Tobias/Puria Property. A preliminary assessment of the sites identified several environmental constraints that discouraged the City from further consideration of these properties.

The preliminary environmental assessment found that the east foothills area is located within designated Critical Habitat for the California tiger salamander. The California tiger salamander is listed as a

Threatened species under the Federal Endangered Species Act. There have been three recorded occurrences of the tiger salamander at the Guerra Property. In addition, there have been two recorded occurrences of the California red-legged frog, which is listed as an Endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Although there are not any recorded occurrences on the Tobias/Pura Property, the site is expected to contain suitable habitat for both the California tiger salamander and the California red-legged frog.

Due to the likely presence of federally listed species on the east foothills sites and because the Guerra Property has been identified as having habitat essential to the conservation of the tiger salamander, reclaimed water irrigation on these sites would likely require extensive consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). It is estimated that consultation with the USFWS and the completion of necessary surveys at the east foothills site to allow for reclaimed water irrigation could take several years. This delay would not comply with the City's objective to accomplish operation of the proposed project by spring of 2009. As a result, the City has eliminated the east foothills area sites from further consideration as potential alternative irrigation sites in this SEIR.

## 6.5 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN THIS SEIR

### 6.5.1 RECLAIMED WATER IRRIGATION SITES 1 - 5

The characteristics of the five potential reclaimed water irrigation sites that were identified through the site selection process described above are presented in **Table 3-4**. The table presents the gross acreages, proposed land uses, and effluent disposal estimates. Three of the five potential sites (Hollister Municipal Airport, Brookhollow Ranch, and Pacific Sod Farm) would provide adequate capacity; however, as discussed in **Section 3.3.4**, due to limitations in the amount of water that could be applied at Riverside Park and San Juan Oaks Golf Club, these sites would require operation in combination with other land application areas in order to achieve the objective disposal capacity for Phase I of 0.72 MGD. Additionally, reclaimed water deliveries and irrigation scenarios would vary at the Airport site depending on the availability of the adjacent privately owned property, and at San Juan Oaks depending on the blend ratios that are utilized. With this in mind, nine operational scenarios were developed through a cooperative process involving representatives of the City of Hollister, SBCWD, and the owners of land considered for reclaimed water irrigation. These scenarios were developed as reasonably foreseeable alternatives for achieving the disposal capacity requirements of the DWTP. The nine operational scenarios are described in detail in **Table 4.2-1**, and are listed below:

- Scenario A: Airport (Expanded) and Riverside Park
- Scenario B: San Juan Oaks (w/ blending) and Pacific Sod Farm
- Scenario C: Riverside Park and Pacific Sod Farm
- Scenario D: Airport (Expanded)
- Scenario E: Sod Farm
- Scenario F: Brookhollow Ranch
- Scenario G: Airport (Reduced) and Riverside Park
- Scenario H: Airport (Reduced)
- Scenario J: Airport (Reduced) and San Juan Oaks (no blending)

In most cases the impacts of reclaimed water irrigation at each site would remain the same, irrespective of whether or not the site is operated in conjunction with another land application area. However, in some instances, the combined result of reclaimed water irrigation at multiple sites would result in compounded cumulative effects. Specifically, the cumulative effects of multiple site operation are particularly unique with respect to groundwater level and quality impacts. Accordingly, while each site is analyzed independently with the issue area chapters, a detailed analysis of cumulative effects resulting from each operational scenario is presented in **Section 4.2, Hydrology and Water Quality** and summarized in **Table 4.2-2**. **Table 6-1** presents a summary matrix of potential environmental effects resulting from each operational scenario. It should be noted that all impacts identified can be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

### **6.5.2 No-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

The purpose of the No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project versus the impacts of not approving the proposed project. According to CEQA *Guidelines* 15126.6(e)(2), the No-Project Alternative shall discuss what would reasonably be expected to occur in the *foreseeable future* if the project were not approved. For the purposes of the 2006 EIR and this SEIR, the No-Project Alternative is defined as the continued percolation of all domestic wastewater at the DWTP and IWTP and no reclaimed water irrigation development. The No-Project Alternative assumes that the City's building moratorium would continue and no new connections to the municipal sewer system would be allowed. For the five potential reclaimed water irrigation sites, the No-Project Alternative assumes the continuation of existing land uses and associated impacts. A brief discussion of the environmental effects resulting from the No-Project Alternative is included below.

### **Impacts of the No-Project Alternative**

#### **Land Use**

Under the No-Project Alternative, no new off-site infrastructure would be developed; therefore the conversion of any existing land uses would not be required and inconsistencies with area zoning and land use designations would not occur. Because anticipated and planned growth within the City described in the City of Hollister 2005 General Plan would not be accommodated with the additional effluent disposal capacity at the DWTP afforded by the proposed project, the No-Project Alternative would be inconsistent with the City of Hollister General Plan Land Use Policy 2, which states: "Ensure that public utilities and infrastructure adequately meet the demands for services placed on them by existing and future commercial and residential users." However, no adverse environmental consequences are expected to result from this inconsistency. A similar level of impacts to land use would occur under this alternative, as compared to the proposed project.

#### **Geology and Soils**

The No-Project Alternative would continue the use of on-site DWTP and IWTP disposal methods for municipal wastewater and would eliminate the need for any construction or excavation of the reclaimed water irrigation infrastructure that would occur under the proposed project. Therefore, vegetative cover along the proposed pipelines and reclaimed water irrigation routes would remain and no new surface soils

would be exposed to natural elements. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Agricultural Services**

Under the No-Project Alternative, potential impacts to agricultural soil productivity and agricultural zoning would be avoided. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the No-Project Alternative, potential impacts associated with localized effects to both the quality and level of groundwater in the vicinity of proposed reclaimed water irrigation areas would be avoided. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no changes to existing land uses. Potential impacts to federal and state listed plant and animal species, as well as sensitive natural communities, native wildlife habitats, riparian habitats, and wetlands would be avoided. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

Under the No-Project Alternative, no changes to existing land uses would occur. Potential impacts to buried archeological resources from construction activities would be avoided under this alternative. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Public Health and Safety**

Under the No-Project Alternative, excavation activities would not be required for the reclaimed water irrigation system, and the possibility of encountering underground utilities, pipelines, or contaminated soils and/or groundwater would be avoided. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

### **Air Quality**

Under the No-Project Alternative, air quality emissions associated with the construction and maintenance of the pipelines and reclaimed water irrigation areas would not occur. A lesser level of impacts would occur under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

## **6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d) requires an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed project.

The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the

major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

~~The No-Project Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. As identified in CEQA *Guideline* Section 15126.6(e)(2), when the environmentally superior alternative is the No-Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Consistent with this CEQA requirement, the 2006 EIR compared the effectiveness of each of the alternatives in reducing environmental impacts. The 2006 EIR concluded that although the No Project Alternative would result in fewer adverse environmental effects than would occur under the proposed project, the overall degree of adverse impacts to water quality would be more significant. The 2006 EIR also concluded that alternative disposal methods would increase impacts to water quality and biological resources.~~

This SEIR illustrates the similarity of impacts that would occur through the development of the reclaimed water irrigation sites selected for analysis. Differences between sites are only variations in the degree of impacts that are below established significance thresholds. With the implementation of mitigation measures presented in **Section 4.0** of this SEIR, development of each potential reclaimed water irrigation site can be reduced to a less-than-significant levels. Based on a comparison of the relative potential for environmental consequences between each proposed alternative, it was determined that the use of the Pacific Sod Farm for reclaimed water irrigation is the environmentally superior alternative as less ground disturbance would be required due to its proximity to the DWTP and use of the existing irrigation system. ~~Consequently, the analysis presented in this SEIR supports the 2006 EIR's identification of reclaimed water irrigation as the environmentally superior disposal alternative.~~

TABLE 6-1. OPERATIONAL SCENARIO COMPARISON MATRIX

Scenario Characteristics/ Environmental Concerns	Scenario A		Scenario B		Scenario C		Scenario D	Scenario E	Scenario F	
	Site 3 - Riverside Park	Site 1 – Airport (Expanded)	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 5 – San Juan Oaks (with blending)	Site 3 – Riverside Park	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 1 – Airport (Expanded)	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 2a – Brookhollow Ranch Subarea A	Site 2b – Brookhollow Ranch Subarea B
<b>SCENARIO CHARACTERISTICS</b>										
<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</b>	Riverside Park at maximum rate throughout Phases 1 and 2. Irrigation at Airport site occurs on airport property and adjacent privately owned land. Years 7 and 8 transition from Airport to Offsite Irrigation sites. No irrigation at Airport after Year 8.		Begin irrigation at Pacific Sod Farm in Year 3. San Juan Oaks Golf Club irrigation starts in Year 1 and is at maximum sustained rat in Year 3. At San Juan Oaks, reclaimed water is blended with CVP water to achieve a TDS level of 500 mg/L.		Riverside Park at maximum rate throughout Phases 1 and 2. Pacific Sod Farm has gradual increase in irrigation during Phase 1. Maximum rate reached in second year of Phase 2. Offsite irrigation starts in second year of Phase 2.		Irrigation at Airport site occurs on airport property and adjacent privately owned land. Years 7 and 8 transition from Airport to Offsite irrigation during Phase 1. No irrigation at Airport after Year 8.	Pacific Sod Farm has gradual increase in irrigation during Phase 1. Maximum rate reached in second year of Phase 2.	Brookhollow Ranch has gradual increase in irrigation during Phase 1. Maximum rate reached in second year of Phase 2. Offsite irrigation starts in second year of Phase 2.	
<b>TOTAL LENGTH OF PIPELINE DEVELOPMENT</b>	(0.02 miles) Combined length: 7.22 miles	(7.2 miles)	(0.5 or 1.4 miles) Combined length: 3.5 or 4.4 miles	(3 miles)	(0.02 miles) Combined length: 5.02 or 1.42 miles	(0.5 or 1.4 miles)	7.2 miles	0.5 to 1.4 miles	3.9 or 5.8 miles	
<b>TOTAL DISPOSAL CAPACITY</b>	157 AFY Combined: 1,463 AFY (182% of capacity needs)	1,306 AFY	908 AFY Combined: 986 AFY (123% of capacity needs)	78 AFY	157 AFY Combined: 1,065 AFY (133% of capacity needs)	908 AFY	1,306 AFY (162% of capacity needs)	908 AFY (113% of capacity needs)	1,109 AFY (138% of capacity needs)	
<b>SITE SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS</b>										
<b>LAND USE</b>	Not consistent with County's land use designation. Conditional use permits required to reduce impacts.	None.	None.	None.	Not consistent with County's land use designation. Conditional use permits required to reduce impacts.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>										
<b>Flooding and Drainage</b>	Located within floodplain fringe – however importation of fill is not expected to alter or re-direct flood flows.	None.	None.	None.	Located within floodplain fringe – however importation of fill is not expected to alter or re-direct flood flows.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>Water Level Effects<sup>2</sup></b>	No increase in water levels.	Water levels remain below 8 ft bgs during reclaimed water irrigation period.	Water levels increase above 8 ft bgs – however existing tile drain system in place to avoid impacts.	Zero effect to groundwater re-charge.	No increase in water levels.	Water levels increase above 8 ft bgs – however existing tile drain system in place to avoid impacts.	Water levels remain below 8 ft bgs during reclaimed water irrigation period.	Water levels increase above 8 ft bgs – however existing tile drain system in place to avoid impacts.	Water levels increase less than 6 feet – resulting in groundwater levels 120 feet bgs.	Potential water level increase over 25 feet resulting in surfacing of groundwater. Further studies required prior to proceeding with reclaimed water irrigation at this site.
<b>Localized Salinity Effects</b>	Increase of +1,000, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,000. Five potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +500, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,800. Six potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +100, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,100. Ten potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +100, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,400. Zero impacted wells.	Increase of +900, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,000. Five potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +100, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,100. Ten potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +600, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,900. Six potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +100, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,100. Ten potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +700, resulting in max TDS concentration of 3,100. One potentially impacted well.	Increase of +300, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,500. Zero potentially impacted wells.
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	Approximately 5 acres of prime farmland would be converted for the development of the gravel parking lot.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	None.	Approximately 5 acres of prime farmland would be converted for the development of the gravel parking lot.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	None.	None.
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.

Scenario Characteristics/ Environmental Concerns	Scenario A		Scenario B		Scenario C		Scenario D	Scenario E	Scenario F	
	Site 3 - Riverside Park	Site 1 – Airport (Expanded)	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 5 – San Juan Oaks (with blending)	Site 3 – Riverside Park	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 1 – Airport (Expanded)	Site 4 – Pacific Sod Farm	Site 2a – Brookhollow Ranch Subarea A	Site 2b – Brookhollow Ranch Subarea B
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	Suitable Kit Fox habitat – further surveys and informal consultation with USFWS may be required.	Worker awareness program required for California Tiger Salamander.	No biological issues.	Several on-site wetlands are present that provide suitable habitat for a number of special status amphibian and reptile species. 100-foot buffers are required around these features	Suitable Kit Fox habitat – further surveys and informal consultation with USFWS may be required.	No biological issues.	Worker awareness program required for California Tiger Salamander.	No biological issues.	Several on-site wetlands are present that provide suitable habitat for a number of special status amphibian and reptile species. 100-foot buffers are required around these features.  Suitable Kit Fox habitat – further surveys and informal consultation with USFWS may be required.	
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	Asbestos and lead based paints could be encountered during demolition of on-site structures.	Located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The potential for aviation safety hazards associated with construction and wildlife attraction require coordination with jurisdictional agencies.	None.	None.	Asbestos and lead based paints could be encountered during demolition of on-site structures.	None.	Located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The potential for aviation safety hazards associated with construction and wildlife attraction require coordination with jurisdictional agencies.	None.	None.	None.
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.

Scenario Characteristics/ Environmental Concerns	Scenario G		Scenario H	Scenario J	
	Site 3 – Riverside Park	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)	Site 5 – San Juan Oaks (no blending)	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)
<b>SCENARIO CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</b>	Similar to Project Scenario A however irrigation at Airport site is confined to Airport property and turf grass is the only product irrigated at the airport site (versus turf grass and grass hay).		Similar to Project Scenario D however irrigation at Airport site is confined to Airport property and turf grass is the only product irrigated at the airport site (versus turf grass and grass hay).	San Juan Oaks receives all reclaimed water until exceeding demand in year 2, and remains at 100% capacity during remainder of Phase 1 and 2. Blending of reclaimed water is not utilized at the gold course under this scenario. Irrigation at Airport site occurs on airport property only and starts in year 2, reaching a maximum rate in Year 6. No irrigation at Airport after Year 8.	
<b>TOTAL LENGTH OF PIPELINE DEVELOPMENT</b>	(0.02 miles)	(7.2 miles)	7.2 miles	(0.02 miles)	(0.5 or 1.4 miles)
	Combined length: 7.22 miles			Combined length: 5.02 or 1.42 miles	
<b>TOTAL DISPOSAL CAPACITY</b>	157 AFY	803 AFY	803 AFY (100% of capacity needs)	157 AFY	908 AFY
	Combined: 1,463 AFY (120% of capacity needs)			Combined: 1,065 AFY (133% of capacity needs)	
<b>SITE SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS</b>					
<b>LAND USE</b>	Not consistent with County's land use designation. Conditional use permits required to reduce impacts.	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> <b>Flooding and Drainage</b>	Located within floodplain fringe – however importation of fill is not expected to alter or re-direct	None.	None.	None.	None.

Scenario Characteristics/ Environmental Concerns	Scenario G		Scenario H	Scenario J	
	Site 3 – Riverside Park	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)	Site 5 – San Juan Oaks (no blending)	Site 1 – Airport (reduced)
	flood flows.				
<b>Water Level Effects<sup>2</sup></b>	No increase in water levels.	Water levels remain below 8 ft bgs during reclaimed water irrigation period.	Water levels remain below 8 ft bgs during reclaimed water irrigation period.	Zero effect to groundwater re-charge.	Water levels remain below 8 ft bgs during reclaimed water irrigation period.
<b>Localized Salinity Effects</b>	Increase of +1,000, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,000. Five potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +500, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,800. Six potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +700, resulting in max TDS concentration of 3,000. Six potentially impacted wells.	Increase of +700, resulting in max TDS concentration of 3,000. Zero impacted wells.	Increase of +300, resulting in max TDS concentration of 2,600. Six potentially impacted wells.
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	Approximately 5 acres of prime farmland would be converted for the development of the gravel parking lot.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.	None.	Prime farmland would require special management to avoid impacts to soil quality.
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	Suitable Kit Fox habitat – further surveys and informal consultation with USFWS may be required.	Worker awareness program required for California Tiger Salamander.	Worker awareness program required for California Tiger Salamander.	Several on-site wetlands are present that provide suitable habitat for a number of special status amphibian and reptile species. 100-foot buffers are required around these features	Worker awareness program required for California Tiger Salamander.
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	Asbestos and lead based paints could be encountered during demolition of on-site structures.	Located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The potential for aviation safety hazards associated with construction and wildlife attraction require coordination with jurisdictional agencies.	Located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The potential for aviation safety hazards associated with construction and wildlife attraction require coordination with jurisdictional agencies.	None.	Located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The potential for aviation safety hazards associated with construction and wildlife attraction require coordination with jurisdictional agencies.
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
Sources: Yates, 2007; AES 2007.					