
3.5 Aesthetics

3.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional Visual Character

The project area is located in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in Amador County. The terrain in and around the City of Lone is characterized predominantly by gently rolling hills. The City of Lone is bisected by Sutter Creek, which flows from the east to the west. Two highways also run through the City, including Highway 104, which travels generally southeast to northwest, and Highway 124, which travels generally southwest to northeast. These two highways intersect in the eastern portion of the City's downtown. The project area is centered in the southern and more developed portion of the City of Lone, with nearly all project-level activity occurring south of Sutter Creek.

Scenic Roads

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the State Legislature in 1963. This program's purpose is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to highways. The State laws governing the Scenic Highway Program are found in the Streets and Highways Code, Section 260 et seq. A highway may be designated scenic depending upon how much of the natural landscape can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes upon the traveler's enjoyment of the view. The State Scenic Highway System includes a list of highways that either have already been designated as scenic highways or that are eligible for designation as scenic highways. The status of a State Scenic Highway changes from eligible to officially designated when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as a Scenic Highway (Caltrans 2007).

A portion of State Route (SR) 88 in northeastern Amador County is a designated scenic highway, but at its nearest point, SR 88 is located about 30.5 mi south of the project area. The southwestern portion of SR 88 is eligible for designation, and the westernmost point of this segment of SR 88 is located approximately 10 miles east of Lone. Lastly, the entire portion of SR 49 that runs north-south through Amador County is also eligible for designation, and its closest portion to Lone is located about 9 miles to the east (Caltrans 2008).

Local Visual Character

Overview

The visual resources of the project area have been analyzed using CEQA considerations. The local setting was evaluated using aerial photography, maps, and site visits.

Viewsheds

A viewshed is an area that can be seen from a given vantage point and viewing direction. A viewshed is composed of foreground items (items closer to the viewer) that are seen in detail and background items (items at some distance from the viewer) that frame the view. If a person is moving, as when traveling along a roadway (a view corridor), the viewshed changes as the person moves, with the foreground items changing rapidly and the background items remaining fairly consistent for a long period of time.

The viewshed at the secondary and tertiary WWTPs and along the existing pipeline routes is shaped by the regional features in the background and the local land uses in the foreground. The

background consists of rolling hills and valley, and the foreground is primarily composed of residential, agricultural, and rural land uses. The foreground, more specifically, contains the existing WWTPs, single-family residences, streets and roadways, agricultural fields, wetlands, and riparian habitat associated with Sutter Creek. The background is generally more natural, and therefore more aesthetically pleasing, than the foreground.

The scenic quality of the viewsheds is discussed further below.

Scenic Quality within the Viewsheds

Definition

Scenic quality is a measure of the visual appeal of a tract of land. Several factors contribute to a site's scenic quality, including:

- Landform
- Vegetation
- Water
- Color
- Adjacent scenery
- Scarcity (common or rare)
- Cultural modifications

Areas with the most variety and the most harmonious composition have the greatest scenic value. Features of the human environment do not necessarily detract from the scenic value of the landscape. Scenic quality is based on its appeal as well as a site's uniqueness in a physiographic region.

Scenic Quality of the Project Site

The project area can be divided into four areas. The first project area (containing the secondary and tertiary WWTPs and the pipelines to connect these facilities) contains project-level facilities, while the remaining three project areas contain project elements that are being reviewed at a programmatic level. The four portions of the project area are as follows:

- The secondary and tertiary WWTPs locations and the proposed connecting pipeline
- The pipeline routes from the tertiary WWTP to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine
- The pipeline route from the tertiary WWTP to the Preston Reservoir
- The pipeline route from the tertiary WWTP to the Lone Water Reservoir

Secondary and Tertiary WWTPs and Connecting Pipelines

The existing WWTPs are in the foreground of the viewshed from adjacent residential neighborhoods, agricultural properties, West Marlette Street, Five Mile Drive, and Old Stockton Road. The existing facilities of the secondary WWTP consist of seven open ponds and ancillary equipment, which includes an aerobic digester, primary clarifier, blower building and maintenance shed, operation building, and sludge drying beds. Two stormwater catch basins for the secondary WWTP are located southwest of Pond 7. In addition, access roads, yard piping, manholes, and monitoring wells exist on the secondary WWTP site.

The existing facilities of the tertiary WWTP consist of a tertiary flocculation/ headworks facility, four tertiary sand filters, sodium hypochlorite (commonly known as bleach) mix tanks and contact basin, effluent pump station, solids handling facility, electrical service, control and chemical building, chemical storage, sewerage lift station, forcemain, maintenance building, and storage area.

The existing pipeline from the tertiary WWTP to Castle Oaks Golf Course is located underground and not visible to anyone in the view corridor. The existing pipeline from Preston Reservoir to the

tertiary WWTP is also located underground and is likewise not visible to anyone in the view corridor.

The foreground visual elements of the project area are not particularly unique, nor are they considered particularly attractive. The overall scenic quality of the region is much more influenced by the regional topographic features in the background of the viewshed. The regional scenic quality is typical of the surrounding area, and is typified by rolling hills and scattered copses of trees.

Pipeline Routes from the Tertiary WWTP to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine

The foreground visual elements of the six potential pipeline routes are not particularly unique. The areas that the various pipeline routes pass through include agricultural fields, residential neighborhoods, highway shoulders, and scattered natural terrain. The overall scenic quality of the region is more influenced by the regional topographic features in the background of the viewshed. The regional scenic quality is typical of the surrounding area, and is typified by rolling hills and scattered copses of trees.

Pipeline Route from the Tertiary WWTP to the Preston Reservoir

The exact pipeline route for this potential future connection between the expanded tertiary WWTP and Preston Reservoir has not been identified; however, it is reasonable to assume that the southern portion of the pipeline route would include the same scenic quality as described in the secondary and tertiary WWTP area. The northern portion of the pipeline would likely run through a sparsely developed area with few surrounding buildings, established roads, and signs of human activity. The few developments on the northern portion of the likely pipeline route are buffered with a natural terrain setting. The overall scenic quality of the entire pipeline route is likely to be more influenced by the regional topographic features in the background of the viewshed. The regional scenic quality is typical of the surrounding area, and is typified by rolling hills and scattered copses of trees.

Pipeline Route from the Tertiary WWTP to the Lone Water Reservoir

The exact pipeline route for this potential future connection between the expanded tertiary WWTP and the Lone Water Reservoir has not been identified; however, it is reasonable to assume that the western portion of the route would have the same scenic quality as described in the pipeline routes from the secondary WWTP to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine. The eastern portion of the pipeline would enter an area of lightly disturbed natural terrain. The overall scenic quality of the western pipeline route is likely to be more influenced by the regional topographic features in the background of the viewshed, and the eastern portion of the pipeline route would be located in a more natural terrain where the scenic viewshed would be influenced by the features of both foreground and background viewsheds. The regional scenic quality is typical of the surrounding area, and is typified by rolling hills and scattered copses of trees.

Sensitive Viewers

Definition

Viewer sensitivity is a measure of public concern for changes to scenic quality. Viewer activity, view duration, distance away from seen objects (foreground and background), adjacent land uses, and special planning designations such as scenic route designation are used to characterize viewer sensitivity.

Sensitive Viewers at the Project Site

Sensitive viewers near the WWTPs are largely limited to adjacent residences, farms, and motorists along local roads. Motorists have an unobstructed view of the secondary WWTP from the site's frontage onto West Marlette Street, as well as for an approximately one mile length of Old

Stockton Road. A single-family residence located to the immediate west of the secondary WWTP across Old Stockton Road has a largely unobstructed view of the site as well. The secondary WWTP is also potentially visible to the residents of the mobile home park to the immediate east of the WWTP site, though fences and mature trees largely obstruct the view of the site from the mobile home park.

The tertiary WWTP is visible to motorists along an approximately half-mile length of Five Mile Drive, as well as to a single-family residence located across Five Mile Drive. The tertiary WWTP is also partially visible to the single-family residence to the south of the site across Sutter Creek, but the mature trees along the creek and the fence along the rear of the tertiary WWTP site help obscure the facility from view.

Visitors to the Castle Oaks Golf Course can also view the two WWTP sites; however, the secondary WWTP is partially obstructed from view by vegetation along Sutter Creek.

Sensitive viewers surrounding the six possible pipeline routes from the expanded tertiary WWTP to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine pass include adjacent residences, farms, and/or motorists along local roads. These pipelines would largely only be visible during the construction phase, as the pipelines would be underground and therefore out of view during operation.

Sensitive viewers along the pipeline route from the tertiary WWTP to the Preston Reservoir, or the lone Water Reservoir could include adjacent residences, farms and/or motorist along local roads, depending on the final location of the pipeline. These pipelines would largely only be visible during the construction phase, as the pipelines would be underground and therefore out of view during operation. Any new reservoirs or storage locations, however, would have the potential to be highly visible depending on location and surrounding uses.

Light and Glare

Light pollution is defined as any adverse effect of artificial light, including sky glow, glare, light trespass, light clutter, decreased visibility at night, and energy waste (IDA 2007).

The largest source of light and glare in the project area vicinity is the exterior lighting located at the Mule Creek State Prison. There is also street lighting along West Marlette Street. There is no routinely used lighting at the secondary or tertiary WWTPs. There is a community of homes to the east of the WWTP that are also sources of light and glare.

3.5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Federal Regulations

There are no relevant federal regulations for assessment of visual resources.

State Regulations

There are no relevant State regulations for assessment of visual resources.

Local Regulations

Amador County General Plan

The Amador County General Plan does not currently contain an Aesthetics Element. The General Plan does contain a Scenic Highways Element (Amador County 1993a), which places regulations on building materials, paints, cut and fill, permits, etc., for any structures proposed within a scenic highway corridor. None of the proposed project elements are located within a scenic highway corridor.

City General Plan

The City of Lone General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element's (City of Lone 2009) goals and policies relevant to aesthetics are listed below.

- **Conservation and Open Space:**
 - Goal CO-9: Protect open space areas, including preservation of scenic views.
 - Policy CO-9.2: Maximize the potential benefits of natural resource mitigation lands within urban development.

3.5.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- 1) Have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic quality of the local environment, as experienced by sensitive viewers
- 2) Cause a substantial adverse effect on the scenic quality of the region by indirect effects to regional water-dependent vegetation and wetlands, as experienced by sensitive viewers
- 3) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect neighboring properties or the nighttime sky in the area

3.5.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Potential Impact 3.5-1: The potential to have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic quality of the local environment, as experienced by sensitive viewers

Overview of Impacts

Visual impacts from the proposed project would differ depending upon the stage of work. Construction impacts would be temporary and would result in some visual impacts within the foreground of the project area viewshed. Visual impacts would be associated with ground disturbance, the construction of some new above ground structures, and the presence of construction equipment and materials. Operational and maintenance impacts would include the presence of facilities and related structures.

The proposed project would not have significant visual impacts because the project elements would not be visually obtrusive or detract from the overall scenic views associated with the scenic quality of the viewshed, including the vegetation and surrounding hillsides. The visual impacts of all of the project-level elements in Part I and Part II would be less than significant because most above ground elements would be modifications to existing wastewater treatment infrastructure, while other project elements would be placed underground.

Existing Infrastructure

Pond 7

Construction. The original construction of Pond 7 in 2001 required 21 days of work and involved the use of a scraper, two bulldozers, compactor, water truck, excavator, and a grader. Ground disturbing activities likely caused dust emissions and scaring to the immediately surrounding lands. Construction activities and equipment were visible to local residents to the northeast and southwest, as well as to motorists on West Marlette Street and Old Stockton Road. Construction operations were temporary in nature, and Pond 7 is located far enough from any nearby roadways to not be in the foreground of motorists or nearby residents. The visual impact of the construction of Pond 7 was less than significant. No mitigation was required.

Repair work on Pond 7 was performed in 2006 after it was discovered that the pond was leaking. The repair of Pond 7 required 45 days of work and involved the use of two scrapers, two bulldozers, excavator, water truck, compactor, grader, and two hauling trucks. Ground disturbing activities likely caused dust emissions and scaring to the immediately surrounding lands. As with the original construction of Pond 7, construction activities and equipment during the repair work on Pond 7 were visible to local residents to the northeast and southwest, as well as and to motorists on West Marlette Street and Old Stockton Road. Construction operations were temporary in nature, and Pond 7 is located far enough from any nearby roadways to not be in the foreground of motorists or nearby residents. The visual impact of the repair of Pond 7 was less than significant. No mitigation was required.

Operation. Operation of Pond 7 caused slight visual impacts to adjacent residences, farms, and local motorists in the form of another pond to the City's existing treated wastewater percolation system. Pond 7 does not represent a significant visual change to the project site, and is relatively removed from the view of sensitive receptors. The visual impacts of the operation of Pond 7 are therefore less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Part I – Treatment

Phase One

Line or Partially Fill Ponds 5 and 6

Construction and Operation. Construction activities to line or partially fill Ponds 5 and 6 would take approximately 4 weeks and would involve the use of vehicles for equipment and materials delivery, dump trucks, pick-up trucks, trash truck, excavators, front loaders, and fueling and maintenance trucks. Impacts of construction activities on local residents and travelers along West Marlette Road and Old Stockton Road would be less than significant because of the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal localized disturbance. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would further reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Impacts from the construction of Ponds 5 and 6 would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation would be required.

Activated Sludge System

Construction. Construction of the activated sludge system would take approximately 12 to 14 months of work and would involve the use of construction equipment including vehicles for site work, concrete mix trucks, crane, fork lift, paving equipment, backhoe/ front loader, and excavators. Construction of the activated sludge system would occur in one of three locations, including the area immediately south of Ponds 1-4, the area that would be created by the partial fill of Ponds 5 and 6, or the vacant parcel to the immediate west of the existing tertiary WWTP. Construction would be partially visible to local residents and travelers along West Marlette Road, Old Stockton Road, and Five Mile Drive, but would have a less than significant impact on visual resources due to the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, the distance from the construction site to residences or other sensitive receptors, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal, localized disturbance. Construction fencing would further reduce visual impacts by screening the construction site from public view, but would not be necessary in order to mitigate the already less than significant visual impacts of construction. Recommended Measure-1 has been added as a suggestion for further reducing visual impacts of construction, but is not required for mitigation purposes.

Recommended Measure-1: During all phases of construction, the applicant shall install and maintain temporary fencing with a colored screen that is consistent with the surrounding environment to restrict or prevent public access and viewing of active on-site construction activities.

Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would reduce dust emissions from construction activities, and the project would therefore have a less than significant visual impact from dust emissions. .

Operation. Operation of the activated sludge system would have a minimal impact to sensitive viewers. The new activated sludge system would be designed to either place all of the treatment facilities underground and within a Class A industrial building, or place all of the treatment facilities on the surface on a smaller footprint than the existing secondary treatment facilities. The Class A office building for the underground option could be designed into an attractive building, which would reduce the impacts on the scenic quality. The aboveground option may be considered less aesthetically pleasing because it adds an industrial look to the area. The maximum height of any buildings or structures in the new activated sludge system would be 20 feet above ground. Either option would cause a change to the current scenic quality of the area. The presence of the facilities may cause a slight impact to sensitive viewers; however, the minimal number of surface facilities, the similarity between the existing facilities and the proposed facilities, the limited sensitive viewers, and the implementation of mitigation measure Aesthetics-1, would cause impacts to be less than significant.

Aesthetics-1: Post-construction, the applicant shall install and maintain fencing or screening vegetation around the above ground facilities to restrict or prevent public viewing of facilities and operation activities.

Close and Reclaim Ponds 1-4

Construction. Construction of the closing and reclamation of Ponds 1-4 would take approximately 4 weeks of work. Construction equipment would include dump trucks, trash trucks, excavators, front loaders, pick-up and delivery trucks, and fueling and maintenance trucks. The closure and reclamation of Ponds 1-4 would either result in the leveling of the existing berms and the return of the site to an approximation of its original terrain, or the City may choose to leave the empty ponds in place. In either case, the closure and reclamation of Ponds 1-4 may cause visual impacts to local residents and motorists along West Marlette Street and Old Stockton Road; however, impacts would be less than significant due to the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal, localized disturbance. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would further reduce visual impacts.

Pipelines between the Secondary and Tertiary WWTP Facilities

Construction. Construction of the pipelines would take approximately 4 weeks of work. Construction equipment would include delivery vehicles, a crane, pick-up trucks, dump truck, backhoe, and paving and stripping equipment. After construction of the pipeline is complete, any disturbed ground would be recontoured and reclaimed with a native seed mix. Impacts of construction along West Marlette Street and Old Stockton Road would be less than significant due to the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal, localized disturbance. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would further reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Impacts of pipeline construction would be less than significant and no additional mitigation would be necessary.

Operation. Operation of the pipelines would cause minimal impact to sensitive viewers. The pipeline would be located underground, except for a short segment which will cross Sutter Creek on the same bridge undercrossing as other existing pipelines. Visual impacts to sensitive viewers would be less than significant. No mitigation would be required.

Tertiary WWTP Expansion or New Construction

Construction. Construction of the expanded tertiary WWTP would take approximately eight months of work. Construction equipment would include dump trucks, pick-up trucks, excavators, front loaders/backhoe, concrete trucks, and a crane.

Two options exist for the expansion of tertiary treatment capacity in the City of Lone. The first option would be an expansion of the existing tertiary WWTP on the north side of Sutter Creek. The second option would be to construct a new tertiary treatment system adjacent to the new activated sludge system. A new tertiary WWTP could be located in one of three locations. One of the potential locations is the site of the filled in portions of Ponds 5 and 6, The second potential location is in the area immediately south of Ponds 1-4, and the final option is located at site of the existing tertiary WWTP on the north side of Sutter Creek. Impacts caused by construction to sensitive viewers along all of these potential locations would be less than significant because of the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal localized disturbance. In addition, the third option would involve minimal ground disturbance, as the site of the existing tertiary WWTP was previously paved in anticipation of facility expansion. No mitigation would be required.

Operation. Visual impacts from operation of the expanded tertiary WWTP would be similar to current impacts from the existing tertiary WWTP. A minor increase in the number of surface facilities may cause a less than significant impact to sensitive viewers. No mitigation would be required.

Phase Two

Expansion of Activated Sludge System and Tertiary Treatment System

Construction. The impact to the surrounding scenic quality from phase two project elements (expanding the activated sludge system from 0.80 MGD to 1.60 MGD capacity, and possibly also expanding the tertiary treatment system from 0.80 MGD to 1.60 MGD capacity) would be similar to those discussed above for phase one. Construction of the phase two project elements would have similar duration of the construction phase, equipment, and sensitive viewers. Operation of the phase two project elements as permanent additional structure would be consistent with surrounding existing buildings and setting. Impacts to surrounding scenic quality would be less than significant.

Part II – Disposal

Phase One

Pond 8

Construction. Construction of Pond 8 would take approximately three to four months of work. Construction equipment would include dump trucks, pick-up trucks, trash trucks, excavators, front loader, and fueling and maintenance trucks. Visual impacts caused by construction to sensitive viewers along Five Mile Road and Old Stockton Road would be less than significant because of the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal, localized disturbance. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would further reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. No additional mitigation would be required.

Operation. Operation of Pond 8 would cause a minor change in visual impacts to sensitive viewers and local motorists. Pond 8 would represent an increase in the amount of pond surface area in the project vicinity; however, the similarity between the existing ponds and the proposed pond, and the limited sensitive viewers in the area, would cause impacts to be less than significant. No mitigation would be required.

Phase Two

Disposal Option 1- Disposal to Pond 9

Construction. Construction of Pond 9 would likely take approximately three to four months of work. Construction equipment and impacts would likely be similar to those described for Pond 8. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would further reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Further CEQA analysis would be performed at the project level to determine the significance of the visual impacts of the construction of Disposal Option 1.

Operation. Operation of Pond 9 would likely cause a minor change in visual impacts to sensitive viewers and local motorists. The impacts would likely be similar to those described for Pond 8. Further CEQA analysis would be performed at the project level to determine the significance of the visual impacts of the operation of Disposal Option 1.

Disposal Option 2- Disposal to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine

Construction. The construction equipment for pipeline construction would include cranes, pick-up trucks, dump trucks, backhoe, paving equipment, and stripping equipment. Pipeline construction would take approximately three months. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would reduce the visual impacts from dust emissions. After the construction of the new pipeline is completed, any disturbed ground would be recontoured and revegetated with a native seed mix, where appropriate.

Visual impacts from the construction of the various pipeline route possibilities between the expanded tertiary WWTP and Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine would vary by pipeline route. Likely construction impacts are described below.

Construction of pipeline route could likely result in minor visual impacts to sensitive viewers along Five Mile Drive, Old Stockton Road, West Marlette Street, South Buena Vista Street, West Market Street, and Highway 104. Sensitive receptors could include schools, a library, cemetery, churches, hotel or inn, recreational facilities, and surrounding residents. Impacts would likely be less than significant because of the temporary nature of construction, limited sensitive viewers, and minimal effects to the overall scenic landscape due to the minimal localized disturbance. However, further analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resources impact of Disposal Option 2.

Operation. Routine operation of the disposal pipeline would have no impact on sensitive viewers, as the pipelines would be located underground or in the undercarriage of the bridge and would therefore not be visible. During pipeline maintenance activities, visual impacts would be similar to those described in the construction phase. Operation of Disposal Option 2 would likely have a less than significant visual impact, and no mitigation would be required. However, further CEQA analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resources impact of Disposal Option 2.

Disposal Option 3- Other Potential Disposal Options

Construction. Construction of Disposal Option 3 could include the construction of additional percolation ponds and/or the construction of pipelines to other potential end users of tertiary treated wastewater. Visual impacts caused by construction of the ponds would likely be similar to those described under the construction heading of Disposal Option 1, while the visual impacts caused by construction pipelines to alternative end users would likely be similar to those described under the construction heading of Disposal Option 2. Construction could result in visual impacts to sensitive viewers depending on the location of the percolation ponds or pipelines. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Further CEQA analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resources impact of Disposal Option 3.

Operation. Visual resource operation impacts of Disposal Option 3 would vary according to the location of the additional percolation ponds or pipeline routes, but would likely be similar to the impacts described for Disposal Options 1 and 2. The creation of additional disposal ponds could potentially have a beneficial impact to visual quality of the area by adding a water element to the existing landscape. Further analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resources impact of Disposal Option 3.

Part III – Storage

Preston Reservoir and the Lone Water Reservoir

Construction. The City of Lone may have the option of using existing pipelines to access Preston Reservoir and the Lone Water Reservoir, but if no pipeline connections are available to connect the tertiary WWTP to the reservoir, then new pipelines would need to be constructed. Construction of pipelines would likely require the use and presence of such construction equipment as delivery vehicles, a crane, pick-up trucks, dump truck, backhoe, paving and stripping equipment. After the construction of the pipelines is completed, any disturbed ground would likely be recontoured and revegetated with a native seed mix, where appropriate. Construction could result in visual impacts to sensitive viewers depending on the location of the pipelines. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Further analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resources impact of constructing pipeline connections between the tertiary WWTP and either Preston Reservoir or the Lone Water Reservoir.

Operation. Storage of wastewater at Preston Reservoir would likely result in no visual impacts to sensitive viewers. The reservoir is currently used by both ARSA and Mule Creek State Prison to store treated wastewater. Similarly, the Lone Water Reservoir is currently used by the AWA to store raw water. There would be no visual change to replace the existing stored water or wastewater with the City of Lone treated wastewater, and therefore there would be no impact to visual resources.

Other Water Reservoirs

Construction. Storing treated wastewater at a new reservoir would require construction of both the reservoir and the pipeline connections to the reservoir. Visual impacts of pipeline construction would likely be similar to those described above. Construction impacts of a new reservoir would be dependent on the size and location of the new reservoir. Compliance with ACAPCD rules for controlling fugitive dust would reduce visual impacts from dust emissions. Further analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resource impacts of the construction of a new wastewater storage reservoir.

Operation. Storage of wastewater at a new reservoir could result in visual impacts to sensitive viewers. Implementation of mitigation measures similar to Aesthetics-1 would likely reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Further analysis would be required at the project level to determine the visual resource impacts of the operation of a new wastewater storage reservoir.

Potential Impact 3.5-2: The potential to cause a substantial adverse effect on the scenic quality of the region by indirect effects to regional water-dependent vegetation and wetlands, as experienced by sensitive viewers

Overview of Impacts

Construction and operation of the project level elements would not have a substantial adverse indirect effect on the scenic quality of the region. Programmatic elements would likely have the same impact as the project level elements.

Construction. Construction impacts on the scenic quality of the region would be temporary in nature and located in the foreground or middleground of most views. Impacts would be localized to

the areas of the secondary and tertiary WWTPs and any proposed pipelines. Visual impacts of the construction of project-level elements are discussed under Potential Impact 3.5-1, and no larger regional impacts to visual resources are expected from project construction. Impacts on water-dependent vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant, as explained in Section 3.1, Hydrology and Water Quality. The visual impacts of the construction of programmatic-level elements is speculative at this time, and will need to be evaluated in a subsequent environmental analysis should the City of Lone choose to pursue such elements in the future.

Operation. Visual impacts of the operation of project-level elements are discussed under Potential Impact 3.5-1, and no larger regional impacts to visual resources are expected from project operation. The analysis of the visual impacts of the operation of programmatic-level elements is speculative at this time, and would need to be evaluated in a subsequent environmental analysis should the City of Lone choose to pursue such elements in the future.

Potential Impact 3.5-3: The potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect neighboring properties or the nighttime sky in the area

Overview of Impacts

Construction of the project level elements would only occur during daytime hours and would not be a cause of light or glare. Operation of the project level elements would include minimal lighting for security and maintenance activities, and impacts would be less than significant. Construction and operation of the programmatic elements of the project would likely have similar impacts as the project level elements.

Construction. Construction of the project-level elements would only occur during daylight hours and no lighting would be required. No impacts from lighting or glare would occur. Construction impacts from the programmatic-level elements to create glare or substantial light would likely be similar to those impacts described for the project-level elements, but determination of significance is speculative at this time, and would need to be evaluated in a subsequent environmental analysis should the City of Lone choose to pursue such elements in the future.

Operation. Operation of the project-level elements would require lighting at the surface facilities for security and nighttime emergency maintenance only. All lighting would be directed and shielded to prevent light from spilling onto nearby properties or roadways or into the nighttime sky. Pond 8 could have the potential to be a source of a minor amount glare; however, impacts would be considered less than significant level as the pond would not create enough glare to cause a harmful impact.

Operation impacts from the programmatic-level elements to create substantial light or glare would likely be similar to those lighting and glare impacts of the project-level elements. Determination of significance is speculative at this time, and would need to be evaluated in a subsequent environmental analysis should the City of Lone choose to pursue such elements in the future.

This page is intentionally left blank