



INITIAL STUDY
AND PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR

EASTSIDE WATER DISTRICT
ANNEXATION

Prepared for:

Stanislaus LAFCO
1010 10th Street, 3rd Floor
Modesto, CA 95354
Phone: (209) 525-7660

Prepared by:

Eastside Water District
731 East Yosemite Avenue, Suite B #147
Merced, CA, 95340

May 17, 2018

**EASTSIDE WATER DISTRICT
PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The Eastside Water District (“EWD”) prepares, makes, declares and published this proposed Negative Declaration for the Eastside Water District Annexation Project.

Project Title: Eastside Water District Annexation

Project Location: The project is located immediately adjacent to the existing geographical boundaries of the District, within Stanislaus and Merced Counties, as shown on the map attached as **EXHIBIT “A”**.

Project Description: Annexation of approximately 2,400 acres into the Eastside Water District. The Project Description is more fully set forth in the Initial Study for the project. Based on the Initial Study, it has been found that the project will have no significant impact on the environment.

Determination: EWD has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project, as identified in the attached Initial Study, will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code).

Public Review: The Initial Study/Negative Declaration has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and contains an environmental review of the potential impacts of the proposed project. This Initial Study/Negative Declaration is being circulated for 20 days from May 22, 2018 through June 12, 2018. Comments on the Initial Study/Negative Declaration may be sent by to Eastside Water District, ATTN: Kevin Kauffman, 731 East Yosemite Avenue, Suite B #147, Merced, CA, 95340 by 12:00 noon on June 12, 2018. Comments will be reviewed by EWD, and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration will be revised, as appropriate, prior to the adoption of the proposed Negative Declaration by EWD, which is scheduled for June 21 2018.

This environmental review process and Negative Declaration filing is made pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 6 of the California Administrative Code Section 15070.

A copy of the Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration may be reviewed at:
www.eastsidewaterdistrict.com

Mr. Al Rossini, President
EWD Board of Directors

**EASTSIDE WATER DISTRICT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the project described below has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Public Resources Code Section 21100, et seq.) and a determination has been made that it will have no significant effect upon the environment.
2. PROJECT NAME: Eastside Water District Annexation
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT: Annexation of approximately 2,400 gross acres into the Eastside Water District. The Project Description is more fully set forth in the Initial Study attached hereto and incorporated into this Negative Declaration by reference. Based on the Initial Study, it has been found that the project will have no significant effect on the environment.
4. LOCATION OF PROJECT: The Project is located immediately adjacent to the existing geographical boundaries of the district, as shown on the map attached as **EXHIBIT "A"**.
5. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PROJECT PROPONENT: Eastside Water District, Kevin Kauffman, 731 East Yosemite Avenue, Suite B #147, Merced, CA, 95340.
6. MITIGATION MEASURES: None.
7. A copy of the Initial Study regarding the environmental effect of this project is on file at www.eastsidewaterdistrict.com. This study was:

 Adopted as presented.

 Adopted with changes. Specific modifications supporting reasons are attached.
8. The Eastside Water District considered this Negative Declaration at a public meeting of its Board of Directors on May 17, 2018.
9. DETERMINATION: *(To be completed by the Lead Agency)*.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to the applicable standards, and (c) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Al Rossini, President
Eastside Water District

Date

EXHIBIT "A"
MAP OF PROPERTY TO BE ANNEXED

[EastsideWDboundary2017.pdf](#)

**EASTSIDE WATER DISTRICT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **Project Title:** Eastside Water District Annexation
2. **Lead agency name and address:**

Eastside Water District
731 East Yosemite Avenue, Suite B #147
Merced, California 95340
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kevin Kauffman, (209) 478-4940.
4. **Project location:** The Project is located immediately adjacent to the existing geographical boundaries of the District, as shown on **EXHIBIT "A"**.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** The Eastside Water District, Post Office Box 280, Denair, California 95316.
6. **General plan designation:** Agriculture, Foothill Pasture.
7. **Zoning:** General Agriculture.
8. **Description of project:** The Project is the proposed annexation of the properties identified in **Table 1**, a total of approximately 2,400 acres into the Eastside Water District.

TABLE 1 – Land to be Annexed into Eastside Water District

Assessor's Parcel Number	Landowner	Acreage
008-020-016	Hall	193.90
008-021-015		10.00
008-021-023		96.00
008-021-024		96.00
008-021-025		118.60
008-008-008	D Crocker	69.00
019-030-003	J A Barnes	613.30
019-030-004	M Giannini	200.60
019-030-009	L White	28.60
019-030-014	C Acosta	190.43
020-002-014	R Whoolley	23.00
020-002-015	Hooker Grain	315.20
020-002-033	F Brumley	39.00
020-002-034		40.00
020-007-003	Hooker Grain	26.50
020-009-005		5.60
020-009-006		26.00
020-009-022	G Erickson	150.61
020-009-023		155.39
	TOTAL =	2,397.73

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Agricultural (irrigated and dry)

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only those effects that remain to be addressed by mitigation.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in the earlier

EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

DATE: May 17, 2018

Kevin M. Kauffman, P.E.
EWD Water Consultant

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u>: <i>Would the Project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

DISCUSSION:

a – d) The proposed project is the annexation of land into the district; no new construction or land alterations are involved. Therefore, the Project would have no impact.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:¹

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the Maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Res. Code section 12220(g)), timberland, (as defined by Public Res. Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Gov. Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

¹ In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

to non-agricultural use or conversion of Forestland to non-forest use?

DISCUSSION:

a-e) The proposed project is the annexation of land into the District. No change in land use will occur. There is no forest land or timberland in the project area, as all lands are already agricultural in use. The project is likely to allow the acreage to continue in agricultural use. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>III. AIR QUALITY:</u> ²				
<i>Would the Project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of an criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

² Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination.

DISCUSSION:

a-e) The proposed project is the annexation of agricultural land into the district. No construction or changes in land use is involved in this project. Therefore, the project would have no impact to air quality.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	--	---	----------------------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Would the Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species indentified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protection biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? X

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved Local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? X

DISCUSSION:

a-f) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. There will be no change in land use, and no construction or land alterations are involved. While EWD does obtain surplus surface water supplies from adjacent districts when available for groundwater recharge, no change to the district’s existing activities is contemplated. As a result, the project will cause no change in water diversions from any water body; therefore, the project will have no impact.

ISSUES

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources as defined in section 15064.5? X

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5? X

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? X

d) Disturb any human remains,

including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

DISCUSSION:

a-d) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into EWD. No construction or land alterations are involved. Therefore, the project would have no impact on cultural resources.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the Project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

DISCUSSION:

a-e) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS

EMISSIONS:

Would the Project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of green-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

house gases?
DISCUSSION:

a-b) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction, land alterations or change in land uses are involved that could increase greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**VIII. HAZARDS AND
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:**

Would the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.2 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would be the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? X

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan? X

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? X

DISCUSSION:

a-h) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

ISSUES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the Project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? X

b) Substantially deplete ground-water supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local ground- X

water table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

X

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

X

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

X

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

X

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

X

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

X

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

X

i) Expose people or structures to

a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? X

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

DISCUSSION:

a-j) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project that would affect hydrology or water quality in any way. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hydrology or water quality.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the Project:

a) Physically divide an established community? X

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? X

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? X

DISCUSSION:

a-c) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on land use and planning.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the Project:

a) Result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

b) Result in the loss or availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

DISCUSSION:

a & b) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on mineral resources.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

XII. NOISE:

Would the Project:

a) Result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

b) Result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

c) A substantial permanent

increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above noise levels existing without the project? X

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? X

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would people in the area be expose to excessive noise levels? X

DISCUSSION:

a-f) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on noise.

ISSUES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? X

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

DISCUSSION:

a-c) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on population or housing.

ISSUES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	----------------------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Other public facilities?

DISCUSSION:

The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on public services.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	--	---	----------------------

XV. RECREATION:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Does the project include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

DISCUSSION:

a & b) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved and change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on recreation.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/
TRAFFIC:**

Would the Project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing

measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation systems, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

DISCUSSION:

a-f) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on transportation or traffic.

ISSUES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</u>				
<i>Would the Project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

DISCUSSION:

a-g) The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the district. No construction or land alterations are involved, and no change in land use is contemplated by the project; therefore, the project would have no impact on utilities or service systems. Most of the agricultural land within EWD is irrigated with groundwater. The only other source of supply is a very limited amount of surface water from purchases in wet years from the Turlock and Merced Irrigation District's canals lying adjacent to District and from riparian water rights along the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers. From 1997 to 2016 the District constructed and operated pilot recharge basin. The District is contemplating expanding its studies by constructing additional recharge facilities. Inclusion of additional lands will provide additional support for expanded groundwater recharge efforts. It is not anticipated that additional surface water supplies will be provided to annexed lands, but those lands will benefit from groundwater recharge.

ISSUES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but

cumulatively considerable?
("Cumulatively considerable"

means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

DISCUSSION:

The proposed project is the annexation of existing agricultural land into the District. The project will not change the current land use of any land to be annexed, and no changes in District operations are contemplated. No construction or land alterations are involved. Therefore, there are no mandatory findings of significance.

CONSULTATION WITH RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

The Stanislaus County Local Agency Formation Commission is a responsible agency under Public Resources Code § 21080.3 and Title 14 California Code of Regulations § 15381. CEQA requires that as soon as the lead agency has decided that an initial study is required, it must consult with all responsible agencies to obtain their recommendations on whether an EIR or a Negative Declaration should be prepared. Public Resources Code § 21080.3; Title 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15063(g). EWD has been communicating with Stanislaus LAFCO regarding the annexation and the CEQA process.

DETERMINATION

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study, it is determined that the Negative Declaration should be adopted.