

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	23-OPT-01
Project Title:	Fountain Wind Project
TN #:	248288-17
Document Title:	DEIR Utilities And Service Systems
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Caitlin Barns
Organization:	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
Submitter Role:	Applicant Consultant
Submission Date:	1/3/2023 10:55:06 AM
Docketed Date:	1/3/2023

3.15 Utilities and Service Systems

This section identifies and evaluates issues related to Utilities and Service Systems (including water supplies, wastewater treatment, and solid waste) in the context of the Project and alternatives. It includes information about the physical and regulatory setting and identifies the criteria used to evaluate the significance of potential impacts, the methods used in evaluating these impacts, and the results of the impact assessment. The County did not receive any scoping input about these considerations. See **Appendix J**, *Scoping Report*.

Section XIX of the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G environmental checklist, which addresses utilities and service systems, also identifies considerations relating to water and wastewater treatment facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, electric power and telecommunications facilities, natural gas facilities, and regulatory compliance and solid waste. Scoping input and the potential for the Project to result in impacts to these considerations is addressed in Section 3.1.4, *Environmental Considerations Unaffected by the Project or Not Present in the Project Area*.

3.15.1 Setting

3.15.1.1 Study Area

For the purposes of this analysis, the study area is defined as all relevant utility or service systems (water supply, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste disposal, gas and electrical, and telecommunication utilities) that provide service to the Project Site.

3.15.1.2 Environmental Setting

Water Supply

The Project Site is not currently served by water supply infrastructure. Most water supply in Shasta County comes from surface flows that are subject to existing water rights (Shasta County, 2004). The closest public water supply provider to the Project Site is the Burney Water District, a municipal provider that sources water from deep groundwater wells (Burney Water District, 2020). Groundwater supplies underlying the Project Site are not well defined; however, new onsite well(s) may be used to access local groundwater as the Project's water supply. For more information regarding surface water and groundwater resources, please see Section 3.12, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, and the Project-specific water supply assessment prepared by the Applicant that is provided in **Appendix I**, *Water Supply Assessment*. The County independently reviewed this and other materials prepared by or on behalf of the Applicant and determined them to be suitable for reliance (in combination with other materials included in the formal record) in the preparation of this Draft EIR.

Wastewater Service

Wastewater treatment in Shasta County typically is achieved through on-site disposal systems or community wastewater disposal (Shasta County, 2004). The Project Site is not currently served by wastewater infrastructure; wastewater from the operations and maintenance (O&M) facility

would be processed using an on-site septic system. The closest public wastewater treatment provider to the Project Site is the Burney Water District.

Stormwater Service

Existing stormwater infrastructure at the Project Site predominantly consists of standard culverts that discharge stormwater runoff to intermittent streams along existing access roads throughout the study area. See Section 3.12, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for more information on stormwater and drainage in the area.

Solid Waste Disposal

Shasta County currently has three landfills in operation: West Central Landfill, Anderson Landfill, and Twin Bridges Monofill. Solid waste and debris produced from the Project during construction would be sent to the Burney Transfer Station, approximately 18 miles northeast of the Project Site, and ultimately would be disposed of or recycled at the Anderson Landfill. The Anderson Landfill is approximately 76 miles away from the Project Site and has a remaining capacity of 10,409,132 cubic yards and a maximum capacity of 16,353,000 cubic yards (CalRecycle, 2019). The Anderson Landfill is permitted to accept construction and demolition waste, in addition to agricultural, industrial, mixed municipal, sludge, biosolids, tires, and wood waste (CalRecycle, 2019).

Energy Service

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) provides electricity and natural gas service to Shasta County and would provide electricity to the Project Site. The Project would connect to existing PG&E infrastructure in addition to an existing 230 kV transmission line, which would be located directly adjacent to the proposed switching station. See Figure 2-2, *Site Plan*, for more details. See Section 3.7, *Energy*, for more information on PG&E infrastructure.

Telecommunication Utilities

There are two cellular telecommunications towers located near the Project Site. The International Communications Group, Inc., cell tower is located south of the Project Site and the Hatchet Mountain cell tower, which is owned by the State of California, is located north east of the Project Site. Both are located in unincorporated Shasta County (Cell Reception, 2020).

3.15.1.3 Regulatory Setting

Federal

No federal regulations governing utilities and service systems apply to the Project.

State

California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates services and utilities and assures California's access to safe and reliable utility infrastructure and services. The essential services

regulated include, electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies. The CPUC implements CEQA for utility construction by PG&E and the other public utilities under its jurisdiction, and regulates the location and relocation of power lines by investor-owned utilities, such as PG&E.

Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973

The Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (Pub. Res. Code §§4511–4360.2) and its implementing regulations, the Forest Practice Rules (14 Cal. Code Regs. §895 et seq.), govern the management of privately-owned forestlands in California, including regarding the disposal of related refuse, litter, trash and debris. See Rule 934.5, which establishes the following performance standard in connection with waste disposal: “Non-biodegradable refuse, litter, trash, and debris resulting from timber operations, and other activity in connection with the operations shall be disposed of concurrently with the conduct of timber operations” (14 Cal. Code Regs. §934.5).

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The State of California’s Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code §13000 et seq.) grants authority over water quality regulation to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The Central Valley RWQCB serves the Project Site. The Central Valley RWQCB prepares and updates the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Central Valley, which covers about 60,000 square miles or nearly 40 percent of the State. Additionally, the Central Valley RWQCB issues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits and Waste Discharge Requirements in accordance with the Clean Water Act NPDES program. See Section 3.12, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, which describes the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act in more detail.

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act

On September 16, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown signed into law a three-bill legislative package, composed of Assembly Bill (AB) 1739 (Dickinson), Senate Bill (SB) 1168 (Pavley), and SB 1319 (Pavley), collectively known as the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). SGMA requires governments and water agencies of “high” and “medium” priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. As described in Section 3.12, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the closest defined groundwater basins to the Project Site are Burney Valley Groundwater Basin and Dry Burney Valley Basin beyond the ridge to the east of the Project Site: Neither is a “high” or “medium” priority basin, or a basin in a condition of critical overdraft.

NPDES Construction General Permit

Construction activities disturbing 1 acre or more of land, as proposed for the Project Site, are subject to the permitting requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) and must apply for Construction General Permit coverage. For all new projects, applicants must electronically file permit registration documents using the Stormwater Multiple Applications and Report Tracking Systems (SMARTS), and must include a Notice of Intent (NOI), risk assessment, site map, and stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to be covered by the

General Construction Permit prior to beginning construction. The risk assessment and SWPPP must be prepared by a State-Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD). See Section 3.12, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for more detailed discussion relative to water quality.

California Integrated Waste Management Act

The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Pub. Res. Code §40050 et seq.), as amended, required each local agency to divert 50 percent of all solid waste generated within the local agency's jurisdiction by January 1, 2000. This diversion requirement remains relevant as the basis for subsequent requirements summarized below. This law requires local agencies to maximize the use of all feasible source reduction, recycling, and composting options before using transformation (incineration of solid waste to produce heat or electricity) or land disposal. The Act also resulted in the creation of the State agency now known as CalRecycle.

Under the Integrated Waste Management Act, local governments develop and implement integrated waste management programs consisting of several types of plans and policies, including local construction and demolition ordinances described in more detail below. The Act also set into place a comprehensive statewide system of permitting, inspections, and maintenance for solid waste facilities, and authorized local jurisdictions to impose fees based on the types and amounts of waste generated.

AB 341

AB 341 (Chesbro, 2011), declares that it is the policy goal of the State that not less than 75 percent of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by the year 2020, and annually thereafter. However, it does not permit CalRecycle to establish or enforce a diversion rate on a city or county that is greater than the 50 percent diversion rate established in the Integrated Waste Management Act.

Title 22 California Code of Regulations Division 4.5

Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 4.5, discusses an array of requirements with respect to the disposal and recycling of hazardous and universal wastes. Specific standards and requirements are included for the identification, collection, transport, disposal, and recycling of hazardous wastes. Additional standards are included for the collection, transport, disposal, and recycling of universal wastes, identified in Section 66273.9 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Requirements include recycling, recovery, returning spent items to the manufacturer, or disposal at an appropriately permitted facility. Division 4.5 of Title 22 also provides restrictions and standards relevant to waste destination facilities, and provides authorization requirements for various waste handlers.

Title 22 also regulates the treatment and use of recycled water. It lists 40 specific allowed uses of disinfected tertiary recycled water (such as irrigating parks), 24 specific allowed uses of disinfected secondary recycled water (such as irrigating animal feed and other unprocessed crops), and seven specific allowed uses of undisinfected secondary recycled water (such as industrial uses). Certain Project-related construction activities that could utilize recycled water include dust suppression, batch concrete, emergency fire suppression, washing, and other activities.

2016 California Green Building Standards Code

As amended, California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; 24 Cal. Code Regs., Part 11) requires that nonresidential building projects recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste, or meet a local construction and demolition waste management ordinance, whichever is more stringent (24 Cal. Code Regs. §5.408.1). Additionally, 100 percent of trees, stumps, rocks, and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing must be reused or recycled unless contaminated by disease or pest infestation (24 Cal. Code Regs. §5.408.3).

The 2016 version of the code increased the minimum diversion requirement for nonhazardous construction and demolition waste to 65 percent from 50 percent (in the 2013 and earlier versions) in response to AB 341. Therefore, some local ordinances still list minimums that are less stringent than (and therefore overridden by) the statewide requirement.

California Water Code Section 10910

Water Code Section 10910 discusses water supply planning to support existing and planned future uses. It states that any project "subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 21080.1 of the Public Resources Codes, shall identify any water system that is, or may become as a result of supplying water to the project identified pursuant to this subdivision, a public water system, as defined in Section 10912, that may supply water for the project. If the city or county is not able to identify any public water system that may supply water for the project, the city or county shall prepare the water assessment required by this part after consulting with any entity serving domestic water supplies whose service area includes the project site, the local agency formation commission, and any public water system adjacent to the project site."

Local

Shasta County General Plan

The Public Facilities and Water Resources and Water Quality elements of the Shasta County General Plan (2004) contain information regarding landfill facilities, solid waste disposal, water supply, and wastewater treatment for Shasta County. The Public Facilities element does not contain objectives or policies that would be applicable to the Project or inform the analysis of potential impacts of the Project. The following objectives and policies from the Water Resources and Water Quality element would apply:

Objectives:

W-9: Institute effective measures to protect groundwater quality from potential adverse effects of increased pumping or potential sources of contamination.

Policies:

W-a: Sedimentation and erosion from proposed developments shall be minimized through grading and hillside development ordinances and other similar safeguards as adopted and implemented by the County.

W-c: All proposed land divisions and developments in Shasta County shall have an adequate water supply of a quantity and a quality for the planned uses. Project proponents

shall submit sufficient data and reports, when requested, which demonstrate that potential adverse impacts on the existing water users will not be significant. The reports for land divisions shall be submitted to the County for review and acceptance prior to a completeness determination of a tentative map. This policy will not apply to developments in special districts which have committed and documented, in writing, the ability to provide the needed water supply.

Shasta County Department of Resource Management Environmental Health Division

The Shasta County Environmental Health Division (EHD) provides permits and inspections designed to protect public health and the environment in Shasta County. The water well program was developed to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public and the environment, by ensuring that groundwater used by the County will not be polluted or contaminated. Well permits are required for construction, destruction (abandonment), deepening, and repairs of all wells in the County. Work resulting in drilling may only be performed by a C-57 licensed driller/contractor.

In August 2019, EHD implemented the revised Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) for onsite wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS), which requires a permit for the installation of a new or replacement septic tank and leach field. A permit application must be submitted along with a complete site plan, fees, and soil test data. The EHD is also the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for all solid waste matters in Shasta County.

3.15.2 Significance Criteria

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XIX identifies considerations relating to utilities and service systems. See Section 3.1.4, *Environmental Considerations Unaffected by the Project or Not Present in the Project Area*, as it relates to the County's analysis of the potential impacts of this Project to the considerations suggested in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XIX. Otherwise, for purposes of this analysis, a project would result in a significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems if it would:

- a) Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years;
- b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; or
- c) 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.

3.15.3 Direct and Indirect Effects

3.15.3.1 Methodology

The analysis of direct and indirect impacts on utilities and service systems is based on a review of the Shasta County General Plan guidelines, goals, and policies, as well as other applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The evaluation of impacts was based upon the likelihood of

the Project to increase demand, alter, or interfere with existing utilities and service systems, and/or result in the construction of additional utilities and service systems.

3.15.3.2 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Project

a) Whether the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

Impact 3.15-1: The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project for the reasonable and foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. (*Less-than-Significant Impact*)

The Project would require up to 49 acre-feet of water for site clearing and construction and 5.6 acre-feet of water per year for O&M. For purposes of comparison, an average California household uses between 0.5 acre-foot and 1 acre-foot of water per year for indoor and outdoor use (Water Education Foundation, 2020). Decommissioning requirements are assumed to be comparable to construction requirements.

During construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, water would be purchased from the Burney Water District and trucked onsite. The Burney Water District operates a public water system and sewer system in the unincorporated town of Burney. Burney Water District is an independent special district formed as a county water district under California Water Code Section 30000 et seq. and serves a population of 3,154 from 1,267 service connections (Appendix I).

Although groundwater supplies in this area are not well understood, the Shasta County General Plan reports that “Shasta County has not experienced a level of growth and development resulting in groundwater overdrafting” (Shasta County, 2004). The Sierra Pacific Mill, located near Burney but outside of the Burney Water District service area, withdraws 500,000 gallons per day (1.5 acre-feet per day) from onsite wells within the Burney Creek Valley Groundwater Basin, which the district also uses (Shasta County, 2004, Table W-4; DWR, 2004, 2020a). The Burney Creek Valley Groundwater Basin, Goose Valley Basin, and Dry Burney Creek Valley Basin are the closest DWR 118-designated groundwater basins to the Project Site. Each is listed as “Very Low Priority” on the SGMA Basin Prioritization Dashboard (DWR, 2020b; Appendix I).

The current production capacity of the three Burney Water District wells is 4,600 gallons per minute (gpm), or 7,420 acre-feet per year (afy), if operated continuously. Because the Project would only temporary require 49 acre-feet of water for construction and would require only up to 5.6 afy for the operation and maintenance period, the estimated annual demand for the Project represents a negligible use compared with existing production capacity.

The Project would not result in additional reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, as it would provide electricity to the regional grid and would not indirectly induce local population growth.

Because the Project is proposed in a rural setting and would not be served by a public water system, a Water Supply Assessment has been prepared for the Project in accordance with Water Code Section 10910 (c)(4). See Appendix I, Water Supply Assessment, for details regarding the definition of a public water system. As described in detail above and further discussed in the Water Supply Assessment, it is expected that the Burney Water District would have sufficient supplies available to serve the lifespan of the Project even in dry and multiple dry years. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

- b) Whether the Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.**

Impact 3.15-2: The Project could result in a determination by a wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. (*Less-than-Significant Impact*)

As described above, the majority of water used during construction and decommissioning would be for activities related to fire protection and dust suppression, and would not require treatment as wastewater because this water would be applied to the ground (or to facilities, and later run off to the ground) and most would infiltrate or evaporate. Additional runoff generated by other construction activities or increases in impervious surfaces would be managed and controlled by the SWPPP. During construction, portable toilets would be used by construction workers and would be treated on a regular basis by a licensed contractor with capacity to dispose of sanitary wastewater pursuant to applicable regulations.

Wastewater would also be processed during maintenance and operation from the O&M facility, which would use an onsite septic system. The onsite septic system would be installed in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management's Environmental Health Division. A permit would be required prior to the installation of a new or replacement septic tank and leach field. The Applicant would apply for an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Permit with the Environmental Health Division and provide a completed site plan, fee, and soil test data.

Because it would be regulated by an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System permit, the Project would not result in a significant reduction on wastewater treatment capacity within Shasta County. Therefore, the Project would not result in a determination by a wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to its existing commitments; therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

c) Whether the Project would 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.

Impact 3.15-3: The Project could 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. (*Less-than-Significant Impact*)

During site preparation and construction, approximately 10,000 pounds (5 tons) of solid waste would be generated per week, consisting of construction debris such as scrap wood and metal. The Anderson Landfill has a permitted throughput of 1,850 tons per day (CalRecycle, 2019), and the Project's contribution of approximately 1 ton per day would be a negligible increment during the construction period.

Regarding total permitted capacity of the landfill, this weight estimate is converted to cubic yards by assuming that half of the total weight is scrap metal at 1,000 pounds per cubic yard and the remaining half scrap lumber at 300 pounds per cubic yard (WasteCap Resource Solutions Inc., 2011). Based on these values, the estimated volume of solid waste generated during construction would be 22 cubic yards per week or up to approximately 2,112 cy for a duration of 24 months. During operation, solid waste generation would be significantly less than 1 cubic yard per week, consisting mainly of office trash and paper waste.

All solid waste would be collected by the contractor during construction or by Burney Waste Disposal Inc. during operation. Waste would be transported to the Burney Transfer Station and ultimately recycled or disposed of at the Anderson Landfill in accordance with federal, state, and local solid waste regulations. Decommissioning would generate the same amount of solid waste as construction (approximately 22 cubic yards per week or up to 2,112 cy for a duration of 24 months).

Prior to operation of the Project, the Applicant would prepare a Draft Decommissioning Plan that details a restoration plan and how Project facilities and infrastructure would be removed. The Draft Decommissioning Plan would include plans and procedures for facility dismantling and removal, including disposal and recycling, and would be developed in compliance with standards and requirements at the time of site decommissioning. The Anderson Landfill has an estimated ceased operation date of 2093 with a maximum permitted throughput of 1,850 tons/day, and a remaining capacity of approximately 10,409,132 cubic yards, as of 2015 (the most recent date for which published data was available as of June 24, 2020). The Project would not generate solid waste or debris in an amount that would exceed the capacity of local infrastructure, or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

Consistent with the requirements of the Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973, all non-biodegradable refuse, litter, trash, and debris resulting from timber harvesting operations would be disposed of concurrently with the conduct of timber operations. In addition, biodegradable waste, consisting of 100 percent of trees, stumps, rocks, and associated vegetation and soils resulting from land clearing would be reused and/or recycled unless contaminated with disease or pest infestation, consistent with the California Green Building Standards Code. In compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code and AB 341, approximately 65 percent of all

nonhazardous construction and demolition waste would be recycled or salvaged for reuse at an appropriate facility. Therefore, the Project would not impair the attainment of these solid waste reduction goals, and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

3.15.3.3 PG&E Interconnection Infrastructure

The Project would tap into the existing PG&E 230 kV line via an aboveground line tap located directly adjacent to the switching station. Minor modifications or upgrades to the existing 230 kV line may be required to facilitate the Project's interconnection. Upgrades to PG&E facilities are anticipated to include construction and/or reconfiguration of utility line structures and transmission line circuits involving four to six new transmission poles. If required, these new poles are anticipated to occur adjacent to the proposed substation and switching station. The Applicant would construct the switching station and PG&E would construct the electrical connections to its facility. PG&E ultimately would own and operate the switching station and interconnection components.

Although these modifications would result in alterations of an existing electrical facility, the Project would not disrupt service or result in alteration due to an increase in need or lack of capacity. The PG&E interconnection infrastructure for the Project would not result in the need for new or relocated utilities or service systems, would not generate its own water demand that could result in insufficient supplies, and would not result in substantial solid waste generation. The amount of water required and waste generated during construction of these facilities is included in the totals for the Project as a whole and, for the reasons explained in Section 3.15.3.2, *Direct and Indirect Effects of the Project*, impacts would be less than significant.

3.15.3.4 Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternatives

Alternative 1: South of SR 299

Alternative 1 would consist only of Project components located south of SR 299. This would include approximately 4,086 acres located south of SR 299, and exclude approximately 378 acres, including seven turbines and associated infrastructure, located north of SR 299. For the purposes of this analysis, it can be assumed that water, wastewater, and hazardous materials-related requirements would be slightly reduced relative to the Project; and that the number of workers and durations of construction, O&M, and decommissioning and site restoration would be substantially the same as for the Project. Impacts related to water and wastewater services would be the same as the Project (less than significant).

It also can be reasonably assumed that solid waste generated during construction and decommissioning would be incrementally less than the Project because there would be less to construct, and therefore, less to remove. The Anderson Landfill would still maintain capacity during construction, O&M, and decommissioning of Alternative 1. Stormwater drainage would

not be required north of SR 299 and Alternative 1 would not result in a need for additional stormwater drainage facilities to serve the Alternative further from what is proposed in the Project. The impact and ground disturbance related to the overhead and underground collector system, access roads, and laydown areas also would be reduced and the impact would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2: Increased Setbacks

Alternative 2 would exclude construction of proposed turbines M03, D05, B01, and K02 based on the setbacks mentioned in Section 2.5.3.3, *Alternative 2: Increased Setbacks*. These setbacks would result in no temporary turbine construction areas, access roads, and/or crane roads for these four turbine work areas. It reasonably can be assumed that the water, wastewater, and hazardous materials would be slightly less than the Project. Stormwater drainage in the form of culverts and ditches along access roads would be reduced, but would not result in the need for additional stormwater drainage facilities. The impact and ground disturbance related to the overhead and underground collector system, access roads, and laydown areas also would be reduced and the impact would remain less than significant for utilities and service systems under Alternative 2.

No Project Alternative

If the No Project Alternative is implemented, none of the proposed wind project infrastructure would be delivered to the Project site or constructed, operated and maintained, or decommissioned there. No groundwater well, water storage tank, or septic system would be installed onsite, no construction-related or other refuse would be removed from the site. No electric power would be needed at the Project Site, or delivered to the regional grid from the Project Site. Ground clearance would not occur for laydown areas; utility line rights-of-way; or the collector substation, switching station, or O&M facility. No new roads would be constructed within the Project Site, and none of the existing roads would be improved. Existing stormwater drainage patterns on the site would not be affected. The Project Site would continue to be operated as managed forest timberlands. Because there would be no change relative to baseline conditions, the No Project Alternative would create no impact related to Utilities and Service Systems.

The Project Site is zoned for timber production. Pursuant to regulations implementing the California Timberland Productivity Act (Government Code §51100 et seq.; 14 Cal. Code Regs. §897[a]), there is a legal presumption that “timber harvesting is expected to and will occur on such lands.” The regulations further specify that timber harvesting on such lands “shall not be presumed to have a Significant Adverse Impact on the Environment” (14 Cal. Code Regs. §898). Therefore, the No Project Alternative, including anticipated timber harvesting, is not presumed to result in a significant adverse individual or cumulative effect related to Utilities or Service Systems. CAL FIRE would review any future timber harvesting proposal to evaluate any potential project-specific, site-specific environmental impacts.

3.15.4 Cumulative Analysis

The geographic scope of cumulative impact analysis for utilities and service systems includes the service areas of each of the relevant utility or service systems including water supply, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste disposal, electrical, and telecommunication utilities that provide service to the Project site and/or could be affected by the Project. This geographic extent is appropriate because increases in demand are generally limited to the service area of the utility purveyor or service provider. The majority of the less-than-significant impacts on utilities and service systems would result from temporary construction lasting 18 to 24 months. None would require mitigation or be significant and unavoidable. The following impacts are all determined to be less than significant and are discussed cumulatively below.

As discussed above in the context of Impact 3.15-1, the Project would use groundwater sourced from onsite wells or an off-site provider likely to be Burney Water District, which draws water from the Burney Creek Valley Groundwater Basin. None of the groundwater basins in the Burney area are in an overdraft condition. The effects of the existing Hatchet Ridge Wind Project and other industrial groundwater users such as the Sierra Pacific Mill in Burney are accounted for in the baseline conditions (i.e., no overdraft). None of the other reasonably foreseeable projects described in Section 3.1.2.1, *Cumulative Scenario*, would be located within the same groundwater basins that may be used for Project water sources; therefore, no significant cumulative impact would occur. (Less than Significant)

As discussed above in the context of Impact 3.15-2, the majority of workers during construction would be local, so the Project would not cause a population increase that could increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity. Direct Project wastewater treatment needs would be served by a licensed contractor with capacity to dispose of sanitary wastewater pursuant to Shasta County EHD regulations (during construction) and by an onsite septic system (during operation and maintenance and decommissioning). Therefore, the Project would have no contribution to potential cumulative impacts on wastewater treatment capacity. (No Impact)

As discussed above in the context of Impact 3.15-3, the Anderson Landfill has a significant amount of remaining capacity to serve the Project (over 10 million cubic yards out of a total maximum capacity of 16 million cubic yards). The Project would generate approximately 22 cubic yards per week during construction and less than 1 cubic yard per week during operation, all of which either would be recycled or disposed of at the Anderson Landfill. Several of the other reasonably foreseeable projects described in Section 3.1.2.1 also could be served by Anderson Landfill. The Dignity Health North State Pavilion Project, which could be a large solid waste generator, would dispose of waste at the Richard W. Curry Sanitary Landfill, as would all projects within the City of Redding (City of Redding, 2019). No major development in the area of Shasta County in which the Project Site is located is foreseeable that would cause daily or total demand for landfill services to exceed the capacity of Anderson Landfill. Therefore, no significant cumulative impact would occur. (Less than Significant)

3.15.5 References

- Burney Water District, 2020. Services, Payments and Rates. Available online at: <https://www.burneywater.org/services-payments-and-rates>. Accessed March 21, 2020.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), 2019. SWIS Facility Detail—Anderson Landfill, Inc. Available online at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/45-AA-0020>.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR), 2004. Burney Creek Valley Groundwater Basin. Available online at: https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Bulletin-118/Files/2003-B118-Basin-Descriptions/B118-Basin-Boundary-Description-2003---5_048.pdf
- DWR, 2020a. Water Management Planning Tool, Bulletin 118 Basin Boundaries. Available online at: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/boundaries/>. Accessed March 28, 2020.
- DWR, 2020b. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act SGMA Basin Prioritization Dashboard. Burney Creek Valley (5-048). Available online at: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bp-dashboard/final/#>. Accessed June 18, 2020.
- Cell Reception, 2020. Cell Towers in the City of Burney. Available online at: <http://www.cellreception.com/towers/details.php?id=1222923> and <http://www.cellreception.com/towers/details.php?id=1013532>.
- City of Redding, 2019. Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, Section 5.16, Utilities and Service Systems. Available online at: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1uTIPs7hyi1wXAcXAKGIy2-5aL2m6sXvF>.
- Shasta County, 2004. Shasta County General Plan, as amended through September 2004, Section 6.6, Water Resources. Available online at: <https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/docs/libraries/resource-management-docs/docs/66water.pdf>.
- WasteCap Resource Solutions, Inc., 2011. Construction and Demolition Debris Weight to Volume Conversion. Available online at: <http://syracuselandsbank.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CD-weight-to-volume-calculation-Waste-Cap-from-other-sources.pdf>.
- Water Education Foundation, 2020. What's an Acre-foot? Available online at: <https://www.watereducation.org/general-information/whats-acre-foot>. Accessed June 24, 2020.

This page intentionally left blank