
1 1.0 INTRODUCTION

2 1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES, PURPOSE, AND NEED

3 The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (section 15126.6.a)
4 require that a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project must be
5 described, analyzed, and feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project.
6 Therefore, in order to explain the need for the proposed Project, and to guide in
7 development and evaluation of alternatives, the Project Applicant, Pacific Gas and
8 Electric Company (PG&E), was asked to define its Project objectives. PG&E
9 identified the following objectives for the proposed Line 406/407 Natural Gas
10 Pipeline Project (Project):

- 11 • Provide greater capacity and service reliability to the existing gas transmission
12 and distribution pipeline system while minimizing costs to PG&E's customers;
- 13 • Extend natural gas service to planned residential and commercial
14 developments in Placer, Sutter, and Sacramento counties;
- 15 • Install Project facilities in a safe, efficient, environmentally sensitive, and cost-
16 effective manner; and
- 17 • Locate the pipeline to minimize the potential of environmental impacts resulting
18 from damage by outside sources. Outside forces include impact by
19 mechanical equipment, such as bulldozers and backhoes; earth movements
20 due to soil settlement, washouts, or geological hazards; weather effects, such
21 as winds, storms, and thermal strains; and willful damage.

22 These objectives are discussed below.

23 1.1.1 Greater Capacity and Service Reliability

24 PG&E's Sacramento Valley Local Gas Transmission System currently serves
25 approximately 675,000 customers located in some of the highest growth counties in
26 California, including Sacramento, Sutter, Placer, and El Dorado counties. PG&E's
27 current load growth forecast for the system anticipates an average annual increase
28 of 19,890 new gas customers over the next 10 years and a total increase in demand
29 of 135 million cubic feet per day for residential customers and 22 million cubic feet
30 per day for small commercial customers.

1 PG&E's existing transmission system within the Sacramento Valley region no longer
2 provides sufficient capacity to deliver reliable natural gas service to existing
3 customers or to extend service to planned development in the region. PG&E has
4 indicated that without the addition of this Project, customer service reliability will be
5 at risk and unplanned core customer outages could occur as early as 2009. PG&E's
6 local gas transmission system serving Yolo, Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, Sutter,
7 Yuba, and Nevada counties has operated at maximum capacity over the last several
8 years and has required an escalating amount of annual investments in pipeline
9 capacity to maintain customer service reliability and serve new customers. This
10 region is projected to continue experiencing a significant amount of ongoing
11 residential and commercial development over the next 25 years, and will require that
12 PG&E respond through the provision of increased local gas transmission pipeline
13 capacity.

14 **1.1.2 Service to Planned Residential and Commercial Developments**

15 The Project would serve several major residential and commercial development
16 projects that are planned in the vicinity of the Project. The Project is needed, in part,
17 to service the following growth areas (PG&E 2007).

- 18 • The Metro Air Park - an 1,800-acre commercial development just east of the
19 Sacramento airport. The parcel is bound by West Elverta Road to the north,
20 Lone Tree Road to the east, Interstate 5 to the south, and Powerline Road to
21 the west and would consist of commercial uses that support airport related
22 activity (hotels, car rental companies);
- 23 • The Sutter Pointe Project - designates 7,500 acres of the 10,500-acre
24 Industrial/Commercial Reserve area in southern Sutter County for residential,
25 industrial, commercial, and educational development;
- 26 • The Placer Vineyards Project - development of a planned 5,230-acre, mixed-
27 use, master-planned community with up to 14,132 residential units, 101 acres
28 of office development, 166 acres of retail commercial centers, and
29 approximately 920 acres of new parks and open space in the southwest corner
30 of Placer County; and
- 31 • The Sierra Vista Specific Plan - proposed to consist of approximately 2,100
32 acres of residential and commercial uses, schools, parks, and open space
33 located west of Fiddymont Road, north of Baseline Road, and south of the City
34 of Roseville's existing boundary.

1 **1.1.3 Efficient and Cost-Effective Planning**

2 PG&E's current 10-year investment plan for meeting the customer load growth
3 projected for the Sacramento Valley Local Transmission System includes a new
4 transmission pipeline that extends from Lines 400 and 401 and travels in a north-
5 south direction paralleling County Road (CR) 85 near Esparto to Line 172A (Line
6 406), a new transmission pipeline that extends from Line 172A in the town of Yolo
7 east to Line 123 in Roseville (Line 407), and a new distribution feeder main (DFM)
8 that extends from Line 407 south to the Sacramento Metro Air Park. These
9 additions to the local gas transmission system are intended to minimize the cost to
10 PG&E's customers during the planned, incremental increase in capacity.

11 **1.1.4 Safety and Environmental Sensitivity**

12 PG&E corporate goals require that all projects be planned and constructed in an
13 environmentally sensitive manner. Through the selection of the proposed route for
14 the Project and associated construction methods, PG&E has endeavored to
15 minimize potential impacts to environmental resources. To ensure long-term safety
16 of the Project, PG&E would implement a maintenance schedule that requires
17 patrols, leak surveys, cathodic protection surveys, and valve maintenance.

18 **1.1.5 Minimize Damage by Outside Sources**

19 One of PG&E's Project objectives is to select an alignment that minimizes the risk of
20 damage by outside forces (as defined in Section 1.1.1 Project Objectives, Purpose,
21 and Need). Outside forces include impact by mechanical equipment, such as
22 bulldozers and backhoes; earth movements due to soil settlement, washouts, or
23 geological hazards; weather effects, such as winds, storms, and thermal strains; and
24 willful damage. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) requires pipeline
25 operators to report significant pipeline incidents. Damage by outside forces is the
26 most common cause for significant pipeline incidents, at 42.9 percent. The second
27 largest cause is corrosion, at 21.4 percent (PG&E 2007).

28 The Project right-of-way (ROW) would be coordinated with future road improvement
29 plans to locate the pipeline in future public utility easements and/or landscape strips
30 whenever possible. When traversing agricultural lands, the Project would be located
31 in a straight line of sight such that it is easily identifiable by operators of farm
32 equipment. The Project as proposed by PG&E would have added depth (5 feet of
33 cover rather than the minimum 3 feet of cover required by DOT standards) in
34 agricultural areas to aid in the prevention of damage by outside forces.

1 **1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EIR**

2 Section 15124(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an Environmental Impact
3 Report (EIR) contain a statement within the project description briefly describing the
4 intended uses of the EIR. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that the EIR should
5 identify the ways in which the Lead Agency and any responsible agencies would use
6 this document in their approval or permitting processes. The following discussion
7 summarizes the roles of the agencies and the intended uses of the EIR.

8 The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) is the State agency with jurisdiction
9 and management control over California's sovereign and submerged lands. As
10 such, the CSLC is the Lead Agency in California for preparing the EIR, complying
11 with CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] section 21000 *et seq.*), following the
12 guidelines for the implementation of CEQA (California Code of Regulations [CCR]
13 Title 14, section 15000 *et seq.*), and coordinating the review of the EIR by State and
14 local responsible and trustee agencies. These responsible and trustee agencies
15 include the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), the Regional Water
16 Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), the California Department of Transportation
17 (Caltrans), and the local Air Quality Management Districts and Air Pollution Control
18 Districts (AQMDs and APCDs). The EIR will be used by the CSLC to exercise its
19 jurisdictional responsibilities in making its decision to grant a lease for the pipeline
20 river crossing at the Sacramento River.

21 The proposed Project would also require approvals and/or review by a number of
22 Federal, State, and local agencies as noted in Section 1.4 - Permits, Approvals and
23 Regulatory Requirements.

24 **1.2.1 Organization of EIR**

25 • Section 2.0 - Project Description describes the proposed Project, its location,
26 layout and facilities, and presents an overview of its operation and
27 construction.

28 • Section 3.0 - Alternatives and Cumulative Projects describes the alternatives to
29 the proposed Project carried forward for analysis, the alternatives that were
30 considered but eliminated from detailed evaluation. This Section also identifies
31 the cumulative projects that will be analyzed.

32 • Section 4.0 - Environmental Analysis describes existing environmental
33 conditions, Project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, and the impact

1 analysis of the alternatives. This Section also evaluates the impacts of the
2 cumulative projects.

3 • Section 5.0 - Environmental Justice analyzes the distributional patterns of high-
4 minority and low-income populations on a regional basis and characterizes the
5 distribution of such populations adjacent to the proposed and alternative
6 pipeline corridors and focuses on whether the proposed Project has the
7 potential to adversely and disproportionately affect minority populations and
8 low-income communities, thus creating an inconsistency with the intent of the
9 CSLC environmental justice policy.

10 • Section 6.0 - Other Required CEQA Sections addresses other required CEQA
11 elements, and describes significant unavoidable environmental effects,
12 irreversible environmental effects, and growth-inducing impacts.

13 • Section 7.0 - Mitigation Monitoring Compliance Program presents the
14 Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP).

15 • Section 8.0 - Report Preparation Sources presents information on the
16 qualifications of those who prepared the report.

17 • Section 9.0 - References lists reference materials used to prepare the report.

18 • Section 10.0 - List of Acronyms and Abbreviations includes a list of acronyms
19 and abbreviations used in the report.

20 • Appendix A to this Draft EIR contains the mailing list.

21 • Appendix B to this Draft EIR contains the Notice of Preparation (NOP), copies
22 of comments received on the NOP, transcripts of public meetings regarding the
23 NOP, and the location in the Draft EIR where comments are addressed.

24 • Other technical appendices are also included in this Draft EIR.

25 **1.2.2 Study Area Boundary**

26 The Study Area for this Project includes the proposed pipeline route and permanent
27 easement areas, from the tie-in location with Line 401, north of Capay in Yolo
28 County to the existing PG&E Line 123 in the City of Roseville. The Study Area also
29 extends south along Powerline Road to the Sacramento Metro Air Park. The Study
30 Area would also include temporary work areas necessary for construction of the

1 Project as well as those adjacent areas that may be affected by pipeline upsets as
2 identified in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Section 2, Project
3 Description, describes and illustrates the limits of the Study Area in more detail.

4 **1.2.3 Definition of Baseline and Future Conditions**

5 The CEQA Guidelines (section 15125(a)) require a description of the existing
6 environmental setting in order to examine and analyze the effects of the proposed
7 Project on the environment. This EIR analyzes the environmental impacts
8 associated with installation and operation of the Project extending from Yolo County,
9 just west of Yolo CR-85 and north of Capay and Cache Creek, to existing Line 123
10 in the City of Roseville. This EIR examines the impact on the existing environment
11 of constructing and operating the Project for the design life of the pipelines (50
12 years).

13 **1.3 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT**

14 **1.3.1 Scoping**

15 The CSLC, as Lead Agency in accordance with the provisions of CEQA, determined
16 that the proposed Project may result in potentially significant adverse environmental
17 impacts, and therefore required preparation of this Draft EIR pursuant to and in
18 accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code, section 21000 et seq.), the CEQA
19 Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, section 15000 et
20 seq.), and the CSLC's guidelines implementing CEQA.

21 On June 19, 2007, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (sections 21080.4 and
22 15082(a)), the CSLC provided a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed
23 Project to responsible and trustee agencies and to other interested parties. The
24 NOP solicited both written and verbal comments on the EIR's scope during a 30-day
25 comment period and provided information on a forthcoming public scoping meeting.
26 The CSLC held four public and agency scoping meetings, two in Woodland,
27 California on July 9, 2007, and two in Roseville, California on July 10, 2007, to solicit
28 verbal comments on the scope of the EIR. Verbal comments were made at the
29 scoping meetings and the associated transcripts are included in Appendix B.
30 Written comments were received in response to the NOP from the following (listed in
31 the order received):

- 32 • U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Phil
33 Hogan;

- 1 • Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, Mathew R. Jones;
- 2 • Yolo County Farm Bureau, Joe F. Martinez;
- 3 • William L. Dibble, Property Owner;
- 4 • Wildlands, Inc., Brian Monaghan;
- 5 • Wildlands, Inc., Jeff Mathews;
- 6 • Michael R. Valentine, Property Owner;
- 7 • U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kenneth Sanchez;
- 8 • RSC Engineering, Richard S. Chavez;
- 9 • Wirth Real Estate/Valuation Services, Robert B. Wirth, Jr.;
- 10 • Placer County Office of Education, Matt Shawver;
- 11 • Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Andrew Darrow;
- 12 • Placer County Community Development Resources Agency, Andrew Gaber;
- 13 • Howard Lopez, Property Owner;
- 14 • Yolo County Board of Supervisors, Duane Chamberlain;
- 15 • Robert B. and Vesta E. Wirth Revocable Trust, Doug Wirth;
- 16 • Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration, Heidi R. Miller;
- 17 • Department of Conservation, Dennis J. O'Bryant;
- 18 • Department of Water Resources, Floodway Protection Section;
- 19 • City of Roseville, Mark Morse;
- 20 • George M. Carpenter, Attorney at Law;
- 21 • Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo / Attorneys for Center Unified School
22 District, Elizabeth B. Hearey; and
- 23 • Hefner, Stark & Marois, Martin B. Steiner.

1 A copy of the NOP, scoping meeting transcripts, and comment letters received, as
2 well as an index of where such written comments are addressed in the document,
3 are included in Appendix B.

4 **1.3.2 Public Comment on the Draft EIR**

5 This Draft EIR is being circulated to Federal, State, and local agencies and to
6 interested individuals who may wish to review and comment on the report. Written
7 comments may be submitted to the CSLC during the 45-day public review period.
8 Verbal and written comments on this Draft EIR will be accepted at a noticed public
9 meeting (either noticed in this document or separately). All comments received will
10 be addressed in a Response to Comments addendum document, which, together
11 with this Draft EIR, will constitute the Final EIR for the proposed Project.

12 This Draft EIR identifies the environmental impacts of the proposed Project on the
13 existing environment, indicates how those impacts would be mitigated or avoided,
14 and identifies and evaluates alternatives to the proposed Project. This document is
15 intended to provide the CSLC the information required to exercise its jurisdictional
16 responsibilities with respect to the proposed Project, which would be considered at a
17 separate noticed public meeting of the CSLC.

18 The CEQA requires that a Lead Agency shall neither approve nor implement a
19 project as proposed unless the significant environmental impacts have been reduced
20 to an acceptable level. An acceptable level is defined as eliminating, avoiding or
21 substantially lessening significant environmental effects to below a level of
22 significance. If the Lead Agency approves the project, even though significant
23 impacts identified in the Final EIR cannot be fully mitigated, the Lead Agency must
24 state in writing the reasons for its action. Findings and a Statement of Overriding
25 Considerations (SOC) must be included in the record of project approval and
26 mentioned in the Notice of Determination (NOD).

27 **1.4 PERMITS, APPROVALS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS**

28 In addition to action by the CSLC, the proposed Project will require permits or
29 approvals from the following reviewing authorities and regulatory agencies:

- 30 • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE);
- 31 • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS);
- 32 • National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries;

- 1 • Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB);
- 2 • California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG);
- 3 • California Department of Transportation (Caltrans);
- 4 • State Reclamation Board;
- 5 • Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD);
- 6 • Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD);
- 7 • Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD);
- 8 • Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD);
- 9 • Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District;
- 10 • Placer County Flood Control and Conservation District;
- 11 • City of Roseville;
- 12 • Sacramento, Yolo, Placer, and Sutter Counties; and
- 13 • Reclamation Districts 730, 1000, 1600, and 2035.

14
15

