

12.1 Affected Environment

This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting associated with public services and public utilities.

12.1.1 Regulatory Setting

Federal

No federal regulations related to public services or utilities are applicable to the proposed Plan.

State

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned telecommunications, electric, natural gas, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies. CPUC is responsible for ensuring that California utility customers have safe, reliable utility service at reasonable rates, protecting utility customers from fraud, and promoting the health of California's economy. CPUC establishes service standards and safety rules, authorizes utility rate, and enforces CEQA for utility construction. CPUC also regulates the relocation of power lines by public utilities under its jurisdiction, such as PG&E, and works with other state and federal agencies in promoting water quality, environmental protection, and safety.

Local

Butte County General Plan

Relevant goals and policies of the *Butte County General Plan 2030* (Butte County 2012) are listed below.

Goal PUB-1: Maintain facilities and staff adequate to provide appropriate levels of government services and administration for the residents of Butte County.

Policy PUB-P1.4: Governmental and civic facilities shall accommodate multiple community uses.

Goal PUB: Provide adequate fire protection and emergency medical response services to serve existing and new development.

Policy PUB-P2.3: New fire stations shall be located on sites that are easily accessible, close to existing or future development, and/or close to fire hazard areas. (Land Use Element Policy 5.7.a).

Goal PUB-3: Maintain a safe environment in Butte County through the enforcement of law.

Policy PUB-P3.1: The County supports the expansion of volunteer services for law enforcement. (Policy Alternatives 29.c)

Goal PUB-4: Support high-quality schools and educational facilities for all Butte County residences.

Policy PUB-P4.3: Plans for future growth areas shall incorporate new school sites as appropriate. (Policy Alternatives 30.a)

Goal PUB-5: Provide library services to meet the informational and social needs of each community.

Policy PUB-A5.1: Identify opportunities to partner with the municipalities, other agencies, and library support organizations in providing library facilities and services.

Goal PUB-9: Provide safe, sanitary and environmentally acceptable solid waste management.

Policy PUB-P9.3: Innovative strategies shall be employed to ensure efficient and cost-effective solid waste and other discarded materials collection, disposal, transfer, and processing.

Policy PUB-P9.5: The Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility should prioritize disposal and processing capacity for waste materials generated within Butte County, but accept waste materials from outside the county when capacity is available and the rates cover the full cost of disposal and processing.

Goal PUB-12: Manage wastewater treatment facilities at every scale to protect the public health and safety of Butte County residents and the natural environment.

Policy PUB-P12.3: New community sewage systems shall be managed by a public County sanitation district or other County-approved methods. Proponents shall demonstrate the financial viability of constructing, operating, and maintaining the proposed community sewage system.

PUB-P12.4: New sewer collection and transmission systems shall be designed and constructed to minimize potential inflow and infiltration.

Goal PUB-13: Plan adequate wastewater infrastructure to serve new development.

Policy PUB-P13.1: The County shall encourage all plant operations to begin planning and implementing expansions to the existing Regional Wastewater Treatment master Plan to meet future demand for wastewater treatment generated by this General Plan at least four years prior to reaching the capacity of existing facilities.

Policy PUB-P13.2: New development projects shall demonstrate the availability of a safe, sanitary, and environmentally sound wastewater system.

City of Oroville

Relevant goals and policies of the *Oroville 2013 General Plan* (City of Oroville 2009a) are listed below.

Goal PUB-1: Maintain a safe environment in Oroville through the provision of law enforcement services, crime prevention and the creation of community partnerships for public safety.

P1.1: Provide law enforcement services that help to maintain a low occurrence of criminal activity within the community.

Goal PUB-2: Provide adequate fire protection and emergency response services.

P2.5: Strive to comply with Insurance Services Office (ISO) recommendations for fire engine response within the built areas of the City.

P2.6: Ensure that new development incorporates adequate emergency water flow, fire resistant design and materials, and evacuation routes; is accessible to emergency vehicles; and does not affect the ability of service providers to provide adequate emergency response.

Goal PUB-3: Provide educational facilities in Oroville sufficient to meet the demands of existing and new development.

P3.2: Support and cooperate with the Oroville Planning Area school districts in planning for and providing educational services, school facilities with sufficient capacity, and District- wide support facilities to meet the needs of current and projected future student enrollments and employees.

Goal PUB-6: Provide sufficient supplies of high quality water to City residents and businesses to serve the City in the most efficient and financially-sound manner.

P6.1: Ensure that Oroville’s potable water distribution and storage system is adequately sized to serve development allowed by the General Plan, without providing excess capacity.

P6.4: Require the installation of water lines concurrently with construction of new roadways to maximize efficiency and minimize disturbance due to construction activity.

P6.6: Ensure that all proposed developments can be adequately served by available water supplies.

City of Gridley

General Plan Public Facilities Element

Relevant goals and policies of the *City of Gridley 2030 General Plan* (City of Gridley 2010) are listed below.

Goal 1: To maintain safe and reliable ongoing water supply

Policy 1.2: The City will treat, monitor, and remediate water supplies using state and federal public health and water quality standards.

Goal 2: To provide environmentally sustainable, efficient and effective wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment.

Policy 2.2: The City will direct phased, efficient extension of wastewater collection and improvements to wastewater treatment and disposal systems, to meet existing and future needs.

Goal 4: To provide efficient and reliable electricity service to Gridley residents and businesses.

Policy 4.2: The City will monitor the electricity infrastructure in existing developed portions of the City and explore options for infrastructure improvements, as needed and as funding is available.

Goal 5: To provide high-quality law enforcement services designed to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

Policy 5.3: The City will require roadway connectivity, emergency access, and siting of new police facilities with the goal of maintaining an average police response time of 3 minutes or less for emergency calls.

Goal 6: To provide effective fire suppression and emergency response.

Policy 6.1: The City will ensure that fire suppression service providers have facilities with sufficient capacity, personnel, and equipment to provide a response time of four minutes or less at least 90 percent of the time within City limits, with response time measured from the 911 call time to the arrival time of the first responder at the scene.

City of Biggs

Relevant goals and policies of the *City of Biggs General Plan* (City of Biggs 2014) are listed below.

Goal PFS-1: Ensure that public facilities are planned and constructed in a comprehensive and efficient manner and that new development provides for facilities on an equitable basis.

Policy PFS-1.3 (infrastructure installation): Construction of oversized or off-site facilities may be required of development projects to provide capacity for future development.

Goal PFS-2: Ensure an ample supply of high quality water and adequate treatment and distribution facilities are available to meet the present and future needs of the City.

Policy PFS-2.1 (Water System): Provide a high-quality, cost-efficient municipal water supply and distribution system that meets California Department of Health guidelines and standards.

Goal PFS-5: Ensure that electrical service facilities are adequate to meet the needs of current and future residents and that those facilities are maintained and operated in a safe and efficient manner.

Policy PFS-5.1 (Electric System Planning): Prepare an Electric System Master Plan to address current and future electric service needs.

Policy PFS-5.2 (Electric System Upgrades): Continue to upgrade the city's electrical service infrastructure to reduce line losses and increase the power factor ratios.

Policy PFS-5.5 (Electric System Interconnection): Require main electric distribution lines to be interconnected wherever feasible to facilitate the reliable delivery of electricity within the city.

Goal PFS-6: Ensure that solid waste disposal and recycling services are adequate to meet the needs of the City's current and future residents.

City of Chico

Relevant goals and policies of the *Chico 2030 General Plan* (City of Chico 2011a) are listed below.

Goal PPFS-5: Maintain a sustainable supply of high quality water, delivered through an efficient water system to support Chico's existing and future population, including fire suppression efforts.

Policy PPFS-5.1: Consult with Cal Water to ensure that its water system will serve the City's long-term needs and that State regulations SB 610 and SB 122 are met.

Goal PPFS-8: Ensure that solid waste and recyclable collection services are available to City residents.

Policy PPFS-8.1: Provide solid waste collection services that meet or exceed state requirements for source reduction, diversion, and recycling.

12.1.2 Environmental Setting

Public Services

The County General Plan EIR describes the provision of public services within the Plan Area. The following descriptions are summarized from pages 379–387 of the County General Plan EIR.

Fire Protection

The responsibility for the prevention and suppression of wildfires in the county belongs to the Butte County Fire Department (BCFD) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), and to individual municipalities and a fire protection district (Butte County 2012).

In State Board of Forestry–designated State Responsibility Areas (SRAs), the state has fiscal responsibility for preventing and suppressing wildfires. CAL FIRE, BCFD, and the Butte County Fire Safe Council have collaborated to address wildland fire hazards by developing the Butte Unit Community Wildfire Protection Plan, and CAL FIRE and BCFD maintain the Fire Management Plan. This plan “systematically assesses the existing level of wildland fire protection service, identifies

high-risk and high-value areas where potential exists for costly and damaging wildfires, ranks these areas in terms of priority needs, and prescribes what can be done to reduce future costs and losses.” (Butte County 2012).

There are four independent fire departments in the county: the City of Chico Fire Department, the City of Oroville Fire Department, the Town of Paradise Fire Department, and the El Medio Fire Protection District.

The City of Chico Fire Department maintains a force of both full-time and volunteer firefighters in six operating stations. The department fields specialized teams for technical rescues, drowning accidents, and hazardous materials response. The average response time for residents in the City of Chico is 4.4 minutes. Locations of the six department fire stations are shown below.

- Station 1: 842 Salem Street, Chico, CA 95928
- Station 2: 182 S. 5th Avenue, Chico, CA 95926
- Station 3: 145 Boeing Avenue, Chico, CA 95973
- Station 4: 2405 Notre dame Boulevard, Chico, CA 95928
- Station 5: 1777 Manzanita Avenue, Chico, CA 95926
- Station 6: 2544 Highway 32, Chico, CA 95973

The City of Oroville has an independent fire department that provides services in the event of fire or medical emergencies. Fire Station One is located at 2055 Lincoln Street in Oroville and is supported by 21 full-time personnel and 12 paid fire fighters.

The Town of Paradise provides service to its constituents through the three stations run by the Paradise Fire Department. These three stations respond to all emergencies and provide response services to fires, emergency medical services, hazardous materials, rescue, and public assist.

The El Medio Fire Protection District is located south of the Oroville city limits. It consists of one station, located at 3515 Myers Street, Oroville, CA 95966, and houses two engines. The fire protection district consists of four operational divisions: Administration, Operations, Fire Prevention, and Training.

Emergency Medical Services

BCFD and CAL FIRE provide fire and emergency services to the entire unincorporated county population, with the exception of Cities of Chico and Oroville, the Town of Paradise, and the El Medio Fire Protection District (Butte County 2012). The BCFD Emergency Command Center (ECC) provides Emergency Medical Dispatch (EMD) services. The EMD services provide life-saving instruction for cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, control of bleeding, childbirth, choking, and other emergency medical procedures to help residents before fire engines and paramedics arrive (Butte County 2012).

Police Services

Law enforcement services in the county are provided by the Butte County Sheriff's Office (BCSO), the California Highway Patrol (CHP), and police agencies in the Cities of Chico, Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs and the Town of Paradise (Butte County 2012).

Law enforcement, criminal investigation, and crime prevention in the county are led by BCSO. BCSO, as the countywide coordinator for mutual aid situations, maintains mutual aid agreements with CHP and the municipal police departments (Butte County 2012). The county jail, which is used by all law enforcement agencies in the county, is administered by BCSO. The BCSO main office is located in Oroville, with substations in Chico and Magalia.

CHP has a mutual aid agreement with the Sheriff's Department and will respond quickly when requested by the Sheriff. CHP's primary role is to provide law enforcement services, primarily traffic control, for state roads and roads in the unincorporated portions of the county (Butte County 2012).

Municipal police departments in Oroville, Chico, Gridley, Biggs, and Paradise maintain a mutual aid agreement with the BCSO (Butte County 2012). Citizens and their property are protected by their respective municipal police departments and their authorized jurisdictions. Under the terms of the mutual aid agreement, BCSO can assume that role in the jurisdictions on request or in the event of the inability of municipal police departments to provide law enforcement (Butte County 2012).

Public Schools

The Butte County Office of Education (BCOE), Butte Community College, California State University, Chico, and local school districts provide public education in the county. Local districts provide elementary and secondary education to the municipalities and unincorporated areas of the county. BCPE provides special education and other related services to the individual districts within the county. Butte Community College is a 2-year junior college; California State University, Chico, is a 4-year college (Butte County 2012).

BCOE provides local and regional educational programs, services, and support to the individual school districts within the county and outside the county. Three areas of service are provided by the BCOE: administrative and organizational support, curriculum and staff support, and student services.

The Butte Community College main campus is located approximately 15 miles northwest of Oroville and is accessible to Oroville, Chico, Durham, Gridley, Paradise, and Magalia. This 2-year community college offers a range of liberal arts and career/technical classes through full-time, part-time, and evening programs (Butte County 2012).

California State University, Chico, is located in Chico and serves the county and the region. Chico State has seven colleges, six schools, and fourteen centers. Chico is one of the California State University system's most popular campuses, and is the second oldest campus in the system (Butte County 2012).

The school districts in the county are listed below.

- Biggs Unified School District.
- Chico Unified School District.
- Durham Unified School District.
- Paradise Unified School District.
- Gridley Union High School District.
- Gridley Union Elementary School District.

- Manzanita Elementary School District.
- Oroville Union High School District.
- Bangor Union Elementary School District.
- Feather Falls Union School District.
- Golden Feather Union School District.
- Oroville City Elementary School District.
- Palermo Union Elementary School District.
- Pioneer Union Elementary School District.
- Thermalito Union School District.

Public Utilities

Water

Much of the county's residential, commercial, and agricultural water needs are met through a network of local water providers, including municipal water departments, mutual water companies, investor-owned utilities, irrigation districts, systems serving a small number of connections, and special districts (Butte County 2012).

The following water districts are within the county.

- California Water District—Chico.
- California Water District—Oroville.
- Del Oro Water Company.
- Durham Irrigation District.
- Gran Mutual Water Company.
- Lake Madrone Water District.
- Paradise Irrigation District.
- Biggs–West Gridley Water District.
- Butte Water District.
- Durham Mutual Water Company.
- Ramirez Water District.
- Richvale Irrigation District.
- South Feather Water & Power Agency.
- Western Canal Water District.
- Thermalito Water and Sewer District.

Wastewater

Three different methods of wastewater treatment and disposal are currently used in the county: municipal wastewater treatment plants, non-municipal wastewater systems, and individual onsite wastewater disposal systems, generally referred to as septic systems (Butte County 2012).

The five active municipal wastewater treatment plants in the county are listed below.

- City of Biggs.
- City of Chico.
- City of Gridley.
- Richvale Sanitary District.
- Sewerage Commission—Oroville Region (SC-OR), which serves the City of Oroville, Thermalito Water and Sewer District (TWS), and the Lake Oroville Area Public Utility District (LOAPUD).

There are currently six community service areas (CSAs) managing nonmunicipal wastewater systems in the county.

- CSA 21: Oakridge Sewer.
- CSA 82: Stirling City Sewer
- CSA 94: Sycamore Valley Sewer.
- CSA 135: Keefer Creek Estates.
- CSA 141: Mountain Oaks Sewer.
- CSA 169: Pheasant Landing.

According to the County General Plan 2030, there are an estimated 50,000 onsite sewage disposal systems in the county (unincorporated areas as well as cities and towns) serving approximately half the county's population. Septic systems in the Chico area, both existing and new, are strictly regulated by the Nitrate Compliance Plan that was adopted in 2001 to mitigate elevated levels of nitrates in area groundwater.

Solid Waste

Existing solid waste management facilities in the county consist of two transfer stations, a large transfer station/materials recovery facility, the Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility (Neal Road Facility), one private wood waste recycler, and two municipal wood waste recyclers (Butte County 2012).

The County owns and runs the Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility, 7 miles southwest of Chico. The County Public Works Department assumed daily operational responsibility for the facility in 2003. The Neal Road facility is permitted to receive municipal solid waste, inert industrial waste, demolition materials, special wastes containing non-friable asbestos, and septage. Based on current waste volumes, projections suggest that the Neal Road facility has capacity to last through 2034 (Butte County 2012).

Existing recycling activities and programs are overseen and operated by the County at the Neal Road facility and by private entities at other locations (Butte County 2012). These include a permitted

regional composting facility (as well as a number of privately operated facilities) and one biomass conversion facility—the Pacific Oroville Power plant.

Electricity and Natural Gas

The City of Biggs owns, operates, and maintains its own utility system. This service has provided an important source of revenue for the City and has allowed residents to receive reliable power (City of Biggs 2014:PFS-4). The City is an active member of the Northern California Power Agency (NCPA). In the county, residential energy needs are often fulfilled by electricity or a combination of gas and electricity. Space heating is the most energy-consuming activity in residential structures (Butte County 2012). Electricity purchased from PG&E by local customers in the County is generated and transmitted to the county by a statewide network of power plants and transmission lines.

Transmission and distribution lines carry electrical power from power plants within and outside the county to electrical substations. The County has control over the siting of electrical substations (City of Chico 2011a). Much of PG&E's natural gas supply comes from Canada and is supplied to the region through the Hershey station in Colusa County. Wild Goose Storage Inc. operates an underground natural gas storage facility in the county. A 25-mile pipeline carries gas between the main PG&E pipeline in Colusa County and the Wild Goose facility, which stores natural gas in an underground rock formation that previously produced natural gas (City of Chico 2011a). Gridley is a member of the Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) and the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) (City of Gridley 2011). PG&E provides the county, including Oroville, with most of its electricity (City of Oroville 2011).

County and City Parks and Recreational Facilities

Large open space and recreational areas in the Plan Area are owned and managed by various federal and state agencies. Nine such federal and state recreational facilities are located throughout the county. For specific details on each location, please refer to Chapter 13, *Recreation, Open Space, and Visual Resources*.

Five recreation and park districts encompass most of the County's land. Three of these are fully within the Plan Area: Chico Area Recreation and Park District, Durham Recreation and Park District, and Richvale Recreation and Park District. A section of the Feather River Recreation and Park District within the Plan Area extends east and southeast of Lake Oroville. For detailed acreage of these park districts, please see Chapter 13.

The City of Biggs has three small parks with a variety of amenities such as ball courts, ball fields, picnic areas, playgrounds, restrooms, and a skatepark (City of Biggs 1998). Currently, no trails connect Biggs with levees, flood control lands, or public open space outside the community. The closest Class I bike trail is the Freeman Trail on the Thermalito Afterbay levee, approximately 2.5 miles away. A Class I bike trail is planned to connect Biggs to the Cherokee Canal levee to the northwest and the city of Gridley to the southeast. Class II bike trails have been planned leading from the city to the north, south, and east connecting the city to Cherokee Canal, Gridley, and Oroville Wildlife Area (Butte County 2007). Biggs does not have a boat ramp, water access, or fishing pier along the three levees closest to the city.

Recreational and open space resources, facilities, and services in Chico have historically been provided by both the City of Chico and the Chico Area Recreation and Park District (CARD). The City has primary responsibility for Bidwell Park (3,670 acres) and the neighborhood parks; CARD has

primary responsibility for recreation programming and community parks. The City has 37 existing sites that are parks, open space, or recreation centers totaling 4,176 acres (City of Chico 2011a).

The City of Gridley has four parks and a boat ramp. Amenities at Gridley's parks include ball courts, ball fields, picnic areas, playgrounds, restrooms, and a skatepark. The boat ramp is located on the Feather River east of the city next to the City's water treatment plant. There is a shooting range located at the boat ramp. Currently, no trails connect Gridley with levees, flood control lands, or public open spaces outside the community. The closest Class I bike trail is the Freeman Trail on the Thermalito Afterbay levee, approximately 5 miles away. A Class I bike trail is planned to connect Gridley to the Cherokee Canal levee via Biggs (Butte County 2007). Other Class II bike lanes have been planned leading from the city to the north, south, east, and west connecting the Gridley to Biggs, Live Oak, the Feather River, and Gray Lodge Waterfowl Management Area (Butte County 2007).

The City of Oroville has 37 existing parks, recreational facilities, and open spaces within its city limits. The city parklands encompass approximately 280 acres, while the Feather River Recreation and Parks District and the California Department of Parks and Recreation parklands encompass approximately 250 acres. The City has an extensive network of existing trails for walking, hiking, jogging, and riding horses. For example, the California Hiking and Equestrian trail, owned and maintained by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, is the longest recognized trail within the city. There are less formally recognized trails and paths used by residents, including trails within the Oroville Wildlife Refuge (City of Oroville 2011).

12.2 Environmental Consequences

This section incorporates by reference the impact determinations presented for public services and public utilities in the Local Agencies' general plan EIRs (as described in more detail in Chapter 3, Section 3.3, *Resource Chapter Organization and NEPA/CEQA Requirements*).¹ The significance findings and mitigation measures of each of the general plan EIRs are compiled in Appendix C. The Lead Agencies have reviewed these analyses and found them to be appropriate for the purposes of this EIS/EIR.

12.2.1 Methods for Impact Analysis

The BRCP would not provide individual project approvals or entitlements for any private or public development or infrastructure projects. Accordingly, this EIS/EIR does not provide CEQA or NEPA coverage for individual covered activities and does not function as a *programmatic* or *umbrella* CEQA or NEPA document for regional development and infrastructure projects. The BRCP EIS/EIR evaluates only the adverse and beneficial environmental effects associated with the decisions of the Local Agencies, water and irrigation districts, and Caltrans to approve, permit, and implement the BRCP. Accordingly, the methods for analyzing direct impacts on public services and public utilities are tailored to evaluate the decisions of the Local Agencies, water and irrigation districts, and Caltrans to approve, permit, and implement the BRCP. This EIS/EIR also incorporates the impact

¹ These previous CEQA documents are available collectively for public review at the BCAG offices (2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100 Chico, CA 95928-8441). Individual general plans and EIRs are also available at each of the respective land use agencies.

determinations of the Local Agencies' general plan EIRs to analyze indirect impacts on public services and public utilities.

In adopting the EIRs for the local general plans, each participating jurisdiction, except Gridley, determined that the programmatic impacts on public services and public utilities would be less than significant through the implementation of general plan policies and the adoption of identified mitigation measures. The City of Gridley 2030 EIR determined there would be significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from implementation of Gridley's general plan. It is assumed that all covered activities approved by the participating local jurisdictions would be consistent with the policies of their respective general plans and would be subject to any mitigation measures identified, such that impacts would be adequately mitigated to the extent identified in the general plan EIRs. Water and irrigation districts' activities have not been analyzed in previous CEQA documents. These activities include: rerouting of existing canals, replacement of water delivery structures, replacement of large weirs, mowing and trimming vegetation along service roads, and removing aquatic vegetation from canals. Potential impacts on public services and public utilities could occur primarily during construction or maintenance of these activities.

12.2.2 Significance Criteria

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the action alternatives would be considered to have a significant effect if they would result in any of the conditions listed below.

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:
 - Fire protection.
 - Police protection.
 - Schools.
 - Parks.
 - Other public facilities.
- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 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.
- Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed.
- 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.

- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

12.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)

As discussed in Section 2.3.1, *Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)*, under Alternative 1, project proponents would apply for permits on a project-by-project basis, without a coordinated and comprehensive effort to minimize and mitigate biological impacts through the BRCP. Under the Alternative 1, urban development and public infrastructure projects would continue to occur pursuant to the approved general plans of the Local Agencies and BCAG's regional plan(s). These include residential, commercial, and industrial development as well as construction, maintenance, and use of urban infrastructure, parks, recreational facilities, public services, and similar types of urban land uses. Other activities that would occur under Alternative 1 are construction and maintenance of public infrastructure projects outside of urban areas, including public infrastructure projects in and over streams (e.g. bridge replacements). No regional conservation strategy or conservation measures would be implemented; therefore, benefits to and impacts on public services and utilities associated with the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not occur. The primary impact mechanism for impacts on public services and public utilities under Alternative 1 is implementation of the various general plans, including the expansions of waste and wastewater facilities and upgrades and maintenance to utilities (e.g., electrical) and the maintenance of water and irrigation districts' facilities.

Impact PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville concluded that implementation of their general plans and associated projects would result in no impacts or less than significant impacts on public services and utilities (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). Buildout of these jurisdictions would be subject to the goals, policies, and actions of the general plans, precluding approval of projects that would overload the existing infrastructure and service ratios.

The City of Gridley determined that implementation of its general plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on most public services and utilities. Although population growth would occur in the city, and general plan goals, policies, and actions require public utilities, service ratios, and infrastructure capacities to be met, the City concluded that there is no mitigation beyond the general plan policies available to reduce impacts on service ratios to a less-than-significant level (City of Gridley 2009).

Maintenance activities within the water and irrigation districts include rerouting existing canals. These facilities are meant to better meet water delivery objectives of the water and irrigation districts and would not result in a population increase. The construction and maintenance activities associated with these activities would increase the efficiency of existing utilities, providing benefit to

their users. Similarly, expansion of existing water and wastewater facilities would increase the efficiency of utilities, providing benefits to their users. No significant impacts would result from these activities.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios for the City of Gridley due to the projected population increase. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios for the City of Gridley due to the projected population increase. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements and thus would avoid significant impacts (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that substantial adverse impacts on the environment would result from implementation of its general plan and as a result it would exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Operation of an expansion of any wastewater treatment facility in the Plan Area would require compliance with all Regional Water Quality Control wastewater treatment requirements; therefore, it is not expected to result in exceedances of those requirements.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-3: Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would avoid significant impacts on the environment resulting from the construction or expansion of new water and wastewater treatment facilities (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that substantial adverse impacts would result from implementation of its general plan as a result of population increases.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would avoid significant impacts on the environment resulting from the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that substantial adverse impacts would result from implementation of its general plan as a result of the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would avoid significant impacts on water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that sufficient water supplies would not be available or that new or expanded entitlements would be needed and, thus, substantial adverse impacts would result from implementation of its general plan.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements would be

needed. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements would be needed. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-6: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would avoid significant impacts on wastewater treatment capacity (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that wastewater treatment provider(s) may not have adequate capacity to serve the general plan area and thus substantial adverse impacts would result from implementation of its general plan.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

The County and the Cities of Biggs, Chico, and Oroville general plan goals, policies, and actions would avoid significant impacts on solid waste disposal capacity (City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). However, the City of Gridley determined that substantial adverse impacts would result from implementation of its general plan as a result of an increase in population and an increase in solid waste needs.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in an increase in solid waste needs. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1, specifically implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in an increase in solid waste needs. Implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels. Consequently, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 2—Proposed Action

Under Alternative 2, covered activities would include the existing, planned, and proposed land uses over which the Permit Applicants have land use authority; state and local transportation projects; maintenance of water delivery systems (e.g., WCWD canals and similar delivery systems); habitat restoration, enhancement, and management actions (conservation measures); and adaptive management and monitoring activities. Most covered activities would require individual permits and approvals pursuant to the Local Agencies' general plans and land use regulations or the requirements of the implementing agency (such as Caltrans and water and irrigation districts) and would undergo subsequent project-level CEQA review and relevant NEPA review for construction and operation-related impacts; some covered activities, however, may be exempted from environmental review requirements due to project characteristics including small projects or infill projects.

Impact PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable. Impacts associated with other activities (e.g., water and irrigation districts' maintenance activities) would also be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be less than significant.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase in the Plan Area. Population increase is the primary driver for increased demand for public services that would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios and for increased requirements for utilities distribution and infrastructure.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of decreased service ratios for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in a change to service ratios, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of decreased service ratios for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in a change to service ratios, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase in the Plan Area; consequently, it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, and this impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would exceed wastewater treatment requirements described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would exceed wastewater treatment requirements described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-3: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not entail the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities that would cause significant and avoidable environmental effects and the conservation strategy is not anticipated to demand water or wastewater services because it is a strategy that would establish lands to conserve covered species and habitat, and this impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities of expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities of expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Activities to Improve Urban Stormwater Water Quality (BRCP 5.4.4), supports the Cities of Chico, Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs in obtaining funding through federal and state grants and other sources to implement programs to support compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permits for municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). Actions under this conservation measure associated with funding could consist of physical changes to the stormwater system or planning and documentation. However, as the physical actions (i.e., changes to stormwater system) would be in support of compliance with the Cities' NPDES and MS4 permits and project-specific NPDES permits and thus are activities that would occur under the implementation of these Cities' general plans. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts associated with these types of activities are previously disclosed in the general plan EIRs. In addition, the activities associated with this conservation measure would not result in additional potentially significant environmental effects beyond those already disclosed in other resource chapters of this document (e.g., construction activities producing air emissions disclosed in Chapter 5, *Air Quality and Climate Change*). Therefore, significant environmental effects have been disclosed that might occur as a result of these activities.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of stormwater facilities as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of new stormwater facilities for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy could result in stormwater drainage facility modifications, these modifications are not expected to cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, and the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the construction of stormwater facilities as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of new stormwater facilities for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy could result in stormwater drainage facility modifications, these modifications are not expected to cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, and the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed (NEPA: significant and unavoidable CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not create additional demand on water supplies because it would establish conservation areas to conserve covered species and habitat.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of insufficient water supplies or new or expanded entitlements for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of insufficient water supplies or new or expanded entitlements for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-6: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase; therefore, it would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, and this impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of additional wastewater treatment services for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant-levels. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of additional wastewater treatment services for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant-levels. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 1 and would be significant and unavoidable.

Because implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase, it would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, and this impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in an increase in solid waste needs as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of increased solid waste needs for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2, specifically the implementation of the City of Gridley's general plan, would result in an increase in solid waste needs as described for Alternative 1, and implementation of Gridley's general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the effects of increased solid waste needs for the City of Gridley to less-than-significant levels. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2 except that it uses the various general plan EIR reduced development alternatives as described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, to create a single reduced development footprint. Covered activities under this alternative would be similar to those described in the BRCP but would be limited to the reduced development footprint for a reduced permit term of 30 years. The reduced footprint and reduced land conservation would result in fewer built structures and less ground disturbance.

It is anticipated that under Alternative 3, fewer acres of natural communities would be conserved because reduced development would provide reduced funding for the conservation strategy. However, it is anticipated that the conservation measures would be the same because the reduction of fill would be achieved through the reduced development footprint of the Local Agencies' general plans rather than through modification of the conservation measures. Consequently, the impacts related to implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would be the same as under Alternative 2.

Impact PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative 2 as a result of less development and potentially fewer residents; however, impacts would still be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase in the Plan Area. Activities within the water and irrigation districts could entail a modest decrease compared to the same activities under Alternative 2; however the impact would still be similar as compared to Alternative 2 and would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but less extensive than those under Alternative 2; however, impacts would still be significant and unavoidable.

Impacts associated with implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would be the same as under Alternative 2, and the impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-3: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative and 2and would be significant and unavoidable.

Impacts associated with implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would be the same as under Alternative 2, and the impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities of expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities of expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative 2 as a result of less development occurring; however, the impact would still be significant and unavoidable.

Impacts associated with implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would be the same as under Alternative 2, although they may be less extensive because there may be fewer changes to the stormwater system as a result of reduced development in the Plan Area. The impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not necessitate the construction of new or expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities that would cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not necessitate the construction of new or expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities that would cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative 2; however, the impact would still be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not create additional demand on water supplies, and the impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-6: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative 2; however, the impact would still be significant and unavoidable.

Because implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase, it would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, and the impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be similar to but potentially less extensive than those under Alternative 2; however, the impact would still be significant and unavoidable.

Because implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not result in a population increase, it would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, and the impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 4—Greater Conservation

Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 except that under Alternative 4, the conservation strategy would include the conservation of an additional 9,850 acres of grassland and 35,310 acres of riceland. Alternative 4 would include the same conservation measures as Alternative 2, and all other acreage protection targets for natural communities/land types would be the same as described under Alternative 2. Therefore, impact mechanisms for public services and public utilities would be similar to those described for Alternative 2.

Impact PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

. The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not increase the population and the demand on public services and utilities and therefore the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in a change to service ratios, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in a change to service ratios, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not increase the population and consequently would not result in a need for wastewater treatment; therefore the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in exceeding wastewater treatment requirements, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-3: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not increase the population and consequently would not result in a need for wastewater treatment facilities; therefore, the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater

treatment facilities of expansion of existing facilities that would cause significant environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not result in the need for stormwater drainage facilities; therefore, the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not necessitate the construction of new or expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities that would cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not necessitate the construction of new or expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities that would cause significant and avoidable environmental effects, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not result in a need for additional water supplies; therefore the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not create additional demand on water supplies, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-6: 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 (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not increase the population and consequently would not result in a need for wastewater treatment facilities as identified in Impact PS-3; therefore the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (NEPA: significant and unavoidable; CEQA: significant and unavoidable)

Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2 and would be significant and unavoidable.

The increased conservation under Alternative 4 would not increase the population and consequently would not result in a need for landfill facilities; therefore, the impacts associated would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. The impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2. Although the conservation strategy would not increase demand for solid waste disposal needs, the overall impact would be significant and unavoidable.

12.2.4 Cumulative Analysis

Methods and Approach

The cumulative analysis for public services and utilities is a qualitative evaluation considering the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects listed in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, under *Cumulative Impacts*; the general plan EIRs' impact determinations for cumulative impacts, where applicable; and the impact determinations identified above for the various alternatives.

This analysis examines whether the covered activities that were not analyzed in previous environmental documents would result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution that, when combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a cumulatively significant impact.

Cumulative Impacts

Past and present projects have resulted in an increase in water supply development in the Plan Area. As disclosed in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, under *Cumulative Impacts*, and Section 12.1.2, *Environmental Setting*, the Plan Area has numerous water distribution facilities that serve

agricultural and consumptive needs. These projects have provided beneficial cumulative effects for water distribution to businesses and residents relying on this resource. Past and present projects have resulted in the need and demand for all public services and utilities within the Plan Area, and these types of services have been accommodated by Local Agencies as their populations expand. Therefore, there is a beneficial cumulative effect for services such as police and fire and services such as wastewater, solid waste, and stormwater management.

Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)

The City of Gridley determined that cumulatively considerable and significant impacts on public services and utilities would occur within its jurisdiction; no other local jurisdiction made this determination. Consequently, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects—including implementation of the general plans—would result in cumulatively considerable and significant impacts on public services and utilities. Accordingly, Alternative 1 would result in an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts.

Alternative 2—Proposed Action

The City of Gridley determined that cumulatively considerable and significant impacts on public services and utilities would occur within its jurisdiction; no other local jurisdiction made this determination. Consequently, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects—including implementation of the general plan—would result in cumulatively considerable and significant impacts on public services and utilities. Although covered activities associated with implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would have less-than significant effects on public services and utilities, Alternative 2 in its entirety would result in an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts.

Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill and Alternative 4—Greater Conservation

The cumulative effects under these alternatives would be similar to those under Alternative 2. While Alternative 3 would likely result in slightly reduced effects because of its reduced development footprint, the City of Gridley concluded that the reduced development alternative would nevertheless result in significant and unavoidable impacts on public services and utilities. Consequently, neither Alternative 3 nor Alternative 4 would result in an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on public services and utilities.

12.3 References

Butte County. 2007. *2007 Future Bike Routes within Butte County*. Department of Public Works. Oroville, CA.

———. 2010. *Butte County General Plan 2030 Final Environmental Impact Report*. August, 30. Oroville, CA. Available: <http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2010-08-30_FEIR/default.asp>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.

———. 2012. *Butte County General Plan 2030*. Adopted October 26, 2010. Amended November 6, 2012. Oroville, CA. Available: <http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2012-11-06_GPA_ZO_Adopted/ButteCountyGP2030_Amended.pdf>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.

City of Biggs. 1998. *City of Biggs General Plan 1997–2015*. January 12. Biggs, CA. Prepared by Pacific Municipal Consultants, Chico, CA. Available: <http://www.bigsgeneralplan.com/documents/General_Plan.pdf>. Accessed: March 13, 2013.

———. 2013. *Biggs General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. October. Prepared for the City of Biggs. Prepared by PMC, Chico, CA.

———. 2014. *City of Biggs General Plan*. March. Available: <<http://www.bigsgeneralplan.com/documents/BiggsGeneralPlanUpdate.pdf>>. Accessed: March 2014.

City of Chico. 2011a. *Chico 2030 General Plan*. April. Chico, CA. Available: <http://www.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/documents/CompleteGeneralPlan.pdf>. Accessed: February 22, 2013.———. 2011b. *2030 General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report*. January. SCH# 2008122038. Prepared by PMC, Chico, CA.

City of Gridley. 2009. *2030 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. November. Gridley, CA. Prepared by: EDAW/AECOM, Sacramento, CA.

———. 2010. *City of Gridley 2030 General Plan*. February 15. Gridley, CA. Available: <<http://www.gridley.ca.us/city-departments/planning-department/documents>>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.

City of Gridley. 2011. Pg. 12-9.

City of Oroville. 2009a. *Oroville General Plan 2030*. Prepared by Design, Community & Environment, Berkeley, CA, in association with Fehr & Peers Associates and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.

———. 2009b. *2030 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. March 31. SCH# 2008022024. Oroville, CA. Prepared by Design, Community & Environment, Berkeley, CA, in association with Fehr & Peers Associates and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. Available: <<http://www.cityoforoville.org/index.aspx?page=452>>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.

City of Oroville. 2011. Pg. 12-9.