

5 MANDATORY CEQA TOPICS

This Section discusses other issues for which the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires analysis in addition to the specific issue areas discussed in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis. These additional issues include (1) significant effects that cannot be avoided, (2) significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed Project should it be implemented, and (3) growth-inducing impacts.

5.1 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to identify significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). As discussed in Sections 4.1 through 4.9 of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, Recreation, Transportation, and Tribal Cultural Resources. All of the proposed Project's environmental impacts to these environmental topics would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures, with the exception of impacts to historic resources (Section 4.3, Cultural Resources).

As discussed in Section 4.3, there are no plans for the future rehabilitation or replacement of the historic Bridge No. 3 at the time of the preparation of this Draft EIR. Because the timing of the ultimate rehabilitation or replacement of Bridge No. 3 is unknown, it is unknown whether the new permanent bridge would be constructed in such a manner that would allow for its preservation as a historical resource. As such, it is reasonably foreseeable that implementation of the proposed Project, which would retain the temporary bridge structure until funding is available for the design and construction of a new permanent bridge: (1) would allow for the continued deterioration of the existing Bridge No. 3, and (2) would not guarantee its future rehabilitation or replacement in accordance with the U.S. Department of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Therefore, even with implementation of mitigation measures, the Project-related impacts to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable.

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR, and that such a statement may be contained in an attached copy of an Initial Study. A copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study for the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project Areas 2 and 3 (proposed Project) is included in Appendix A-1 of this Draft EIR, and the appendices to the Initial Study are included in Appendix A-2. Table 5-1 identifies the following: (1) the significance conclusions in the Initial Study for each environmental topic, (2) which topics were determined to not require additional analysis in the Draft EIR, (3) which topics were brought forward into the Draft EIR for further analysis, and (4) the significance conclusions of the Draft EIR. Refer to the Initial Study for the analysis that supports the conclusions included in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Aesthetics | | |
| Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project: | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | No Impact | |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | Less Than Significant Impact | |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | No Impact | |
| Agriculture and Forestry Resources | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| 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? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | No Impact | |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | No Impact | |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | No Impact | |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | No Impact | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Air Quality</i> | | |
| <i>Would the project:</i> | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | Potentially Significant: See Section 4.1 | Less Than Significant Impact |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | | |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | | |
| <i>Biological Resources</i> | | |
| <i>Would the project:</i> | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | Potentially Significant: See Section 4.2 | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | |
| 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? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|--|--|---|
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? | Potentially Significant: See Section 4.3 | Significant and Unavoidable Impact |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| Energy | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | No Impact | |
| Geology and Soils | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| 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. | | |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | |
| iv) Landslides? | | |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | |
| 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? | | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|---|---|---|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? | | |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | No Impact | |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ¹ | Potentially Significant: See Section 4.3 | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | Less Than Significant Impact: See Section 4.4 | Less Than Significant Impact |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| 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? | | |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | |
| d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | No Impact | |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | Less Than | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | Significant Impact | |
| Hydrology and Water Quality | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | | Less Than Significant Impact |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | Potentially Significant Impact: See Section 4.5 | Less Than Significant Impact |
| i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; | | |
| ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site; | | |
| iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or | | |
| iv. impede or redirect flood flows? | | |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | Less Than Significant Impact | |
| Land Use and Planning | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | Less Than Significant Impact | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|--|---|---|
| Mineral Resources | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | | |
| Noise | | |
| Would the project result in: | | |
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | Potentially Significant Impact: See Section 4.6 | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | Less Than Significant Impact |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| Population and Housing | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | |
| Public Services | | |
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| Fire protection? | | |
| Police protection? | | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|--|---|---|
| Schools? | | |
| Parks? | | |
| Other public facilities? | | |
| 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? | Potentially Significant Impact: See Section 4.7 | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | No Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| Transportation | | |
| Would the project: | | |
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? | Potentially Significant Impact: See Section 4.8 | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i></p> <p><i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i></p> | | |
| <p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact: See Section 4.9</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</p> |
| <p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p> | | |
| <p><i>Utilities and Service Systems</i></p> <p><i>Would the project:</i></p> | | |
| <p>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | <p>Refer to Initial Study</p> |
| <p>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</p> | | |
| <p>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</p> | <p>No Impact</p> | |
| <p>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | |
| <p>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p> | | |

Table 5-1. Initial Study Conclusion Summary

| CEQA Threshold | Initial Study Conclusion | Draft EIR Conclusion |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Wildfire | | |
| <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i> | | |
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | Less Than Significant Impact | Refer to Initial Study |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | | |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | No Impact | |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | Less Than Significant Impact | |

Source: Appendix A-1.

5.2 Significant Irreversible Changes

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires the evaluation of (14 CCR 15000 et seq.):

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project [that] may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as a highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Renewable resources are those that are generally unlimited in supply, such as solar, hydro, or wind energy, and those that can be readily replenished, such as biomass materials that can be grown (e.g. wood products, agricultural commodities). As such, the vast majority of materials used to construct and operate projects are considered to be non-renewable, or those with a finite supply that cannot be readily replenished. Such non-renewable resources include, but are not limited to, fossil fuels, natural gas, metals (e.g. steel, copper, aluminum), plastics, and cement.

Construction Materials Use

Fossil fuel would be used during construction activities in Area 2 and 3 and would include gasoline/diesel for construction equipment, material deliveries, demolition waste disposal, and construction crew travel. No natural gas is required. Petroleum consumed by construction equipment, transport of construction materials, and worker trips would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction activities. Construction workers would likely travel to and from the Project area in gasoline- or diesel-powered vehicles. Construction is expected to require approximately one year. However, once construction activities cease, petroleum use from off-road equipment and transportation vehicles would not differ from the operations at the Project site in the current existing condition. Because of the short-term nature of construction and relatively small scale of the construction activities required for the Project, the petroleum consumption would be negligible when compared to California's daily total use of approximately 1.8 million barrels of petroleum. Project impacts related to consumption of nonrenewable resources are considered to be less than significant because the Project would not use unusual or wasteful amounts of energy or construction materials.

In addition to fossil fuel use, a variety of resource materials would be used during the construction process, including steel, wood, concrete, electrical wiring, and fabricated materials. Upon completion of the construction activities, the commitment of such materials is considered irreversible because it is unlikely that the facilities would ever be decommissioned, and if they were decommissioned in the future, it is unlikely that the materials would be reused. Construction and demolition (C&D) waste is required to be diverted from landfills by the CALGreen Code, which requires a minimum 50 percent of diversion; however, for the purposes of this analysis, the use of such resources is considered a permanent and irreversible use.

Construction materials used in Area 2 include the concrete, metal, and rocks for the diversion and intake structure as well as the engineered roughened channel. Additionally, concrete, cinderblocks, roofing materials, and electrical components and wiring would be used for the intake service building, which would house the electrical and hydraulic controls for the diversion structure. Construction materials used in Area 3 would include pipes and valves, as well as engineered fill materials (e.g. sands and gravel) to construct the bermed walls of the spreading basins.

These construction materials would likely be committed to other similar projects in the region if not used for this Project. Resources used for the Project would be typical of similar water infrastructure projects in the region and would require a relatively minimal amount of resources when compared to land use development projects with habitable structures. Therefore, although irretrievable commitments of resources would result from the proposed Project, such changes would be less than significant.

Irreversible changes may occur from environmental damage, such as spill or release of hazardous materials due to failure of human-made structures, or accidental fire resulting from mechanical or electrical failure. While there are many other types of accidents possible, those listed above represent the key sources for irreversible damage that can be associated with water infrastructure projects. As discussed in the Initial Study, construction activities would utilize hazardous materials on a short-term basis, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous material use, storage, disposal, and transport would prevent risks to public health and safety. Construction wastes that meet hazardous waste criteria would be stored, manifested, transported, and disposed of in accordance with the California Code of Regulations (Title 22) and to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Fire Department, which serves as the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Therefore, with compliance with applicable state and local regulations, the proposed Project would not result in irreversible damage from environmental accidents associated with the Project.

Operational Use of Resources

Once operational, the Area 2 components would consume more energy on a daily basis than is currently consumed, given the addition of the intake service building that would house the electrical and hydraulic controls for the diversion structure. Electric power for the operation of the diversion structure and control equipment enclosure would be supplied by an existing power line at the Screen Building (southeast of the intake structure). A portion of the energy used would be provided by non-renewable sources, which would be an irreversible commitment of such resources.

The Pasadena Water and Power would service the Project, and the design of the proposed Project are all subject to regulations that are working to reduce the amount of non-renewable resources from development projects. The electrical demand associated with the Area 2 activities is a minor energy consumer compared to other local and regional users that have long-term operations.

No new employees are required for the long-term operation or maintenance of the Project components in Area 2. No operational changes would occur, and may be potentially reduced with the automation of the weir to control flows in the intake. Similarly, PWP's future schedule of maintenance activities would not substantively differ from the current maintenance routine and procedures. City personnel would continue to provide maintenance of the diversion and intake structures as occurs under the existing conditions. Similarly, no new employees are required for the long-term operation or maintenance of the Project components in Area 3. PWP typically scrapes and tills the existing spreading basins about once per year, which is anticipated to generally reflect the proposed ongoing maintenance schedule. An estimated 100 truckloads of soil from the existing and proposed spreading basins would have to be disposed of off-site approximately every 5 years (approximately 20 trucks per year), which is reflective of current maintenance activities. Therefore, the long-term use of non-renewable fossil fuel resources would not be substantively different than in the current condition, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the operation of the proposed Project would not be considered a significant irreversible environmental effect or cause irreversible environmental damage.

5.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(e) of the CEQA Guidelines defines growth-inducement as the ways in which a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. A project can induce growth by removing obstacles to population growth (e.g. a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant); providing new transportation infrastructure that reaches previously undeveloped areas; building infrastructure sized beyond the needs to serve the existing region; or otherwise attracting growth to the project area that is not assumed in a General Plan or the regional growth projections. Growth-inducing impacts could be significant if they increase the population or require the construction of new regional-serving facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; and/or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

The proposed Project would not directly foster economic or population growth. The Project does not involve the construction of any habitable structures that could support any occupiable land uses; no commercial or residential activity would result from Project implementation. As discussed above, no new employees would be required for the long-term operation and maintenance of the proposed Project.

The proposed Project would not indirectly foster economic or population growth, or otherwise remove a barrier to growth. The Project would allow for the additional recharge of an average 1,000 acre-feet/yr into the groundwater basin, which would supplement the PWP's local water supplies. The proposed Project would facilitate the efficient use of water in the Arroyo Seco by allowing for the increased utilization of the City's surface water rights and reducing reliance upon imported water supplies from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Importantly, PWP is able to pump between 60 to 80 of the water that is infiltrated through the spreading basins, which would result in a net augmentation of groundwater in storage as a benefit to the basin. The proposed Project would not change the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin or otherwise alter the anticipated water supply projections set forth in the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Therefore, the Project would not increase the available water supply such that population growth could be indirectly induced. Because there would be no direct or indirect impact related to fostering economic or population growth, or otherwise remove a barrier to growth, there would be no cumulative impacts related to growth-inducing impacts.

Additionally, the Project would not propose any physical or regulatory changes that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in the Project area, such as regulatory changes including General Plan Amendments encouraging population growth, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; Local Agency Formation Commission annexation; or other similar actions. The Project is intended to increase water supply reliability and water system resiliency through an increase in local water supplies and would not encourage housing growth or result in growth-inducing impacts.

5.4 References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–N. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21177. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK