5.10 Mineral Resources

This section evaluates the potential impacts of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative on mineral resources. This evaluation includes an assessment of the direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, and cumulative effects of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative on known mineral resources and locally important mineral resource recovery sites. This evaluation is based on a review of *Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region* (CDMG 1982).

5.10.1 Affected Environment

The SV 50K study area would be a subset of the larger SV 100K study area, and the Moosa 50K study area would be a subset of the larger Moosa 100K study area. Therefore, the following discussion refers to Section 3.10.1 (Proposed Action) and Section 4.10.1 (Moosa 100K Alternative) for information on the Affected Environment as it applies to the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative.

5.10.1.1 Environmental Setting

The SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would construct a smaller dam raise at the existing San Vicente Dam and a new, smaller dam in Moosa Canyon encompassing Turner Reservoir. Section 2.3.3 of this EIR/EIS describes the improvements included with the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative. In general, the environmental setting for the SV 50K component of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would be the same as described in Section 3.10.1.1 for the Proposed Action, and the setting for the Moosa 50K component would be the same as described in Section 4.10.1.1 for the Moosa 100K Alternative. Please refer to those sections for the general environmental setting information for the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative.

5.10.1.2 Regulatory Setting

Refer to Section 3.10.1.2 for a discussion of the regulatory setting that applies to both the SV 50K and Moosa 50K components of this alternative.

5.10.2 Project Design Features

There are no General Conditions and Standard Specifications or Project Design Features that specifically address reducing potential impacts on mineral resources.

5.10.3 Direct and Indirect Effects

5.10.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

Thresholds used to evaluate potential mineral resources impacts for the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would be the same as those used to evaluate impacts for the Proposed Action and the Moosa 100K Alternative. The thresholds are based on applicable criteria in the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR §§15000-15387), Appendix G and the ESP EIR/EIS. A significant impact on mineral resources would occur if the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would:

1. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

5.10.3.2 Impact Analysis

Methodology

The methodology used to evaluate impacts on mineral resources at the SV 50K footprint is the same as described in Section 3.10.3.2 (Mineral Resources for the Proposed Action) of this EIR/EIS, and the methodology used to evaluate impacts on mineral resources at the Moosa 50K footprint is the same as described in Section 4.10.3.2 (Mineral Resources for the Moosa 100K Alternative) of this EIR/EIS.

Analysis

Threshold 1: Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan

SV 50K

As discussed in Section 3.10.3 for the Proposed Action, aggregate obtained from the marina, southwest quarry, or off-site quarry options would be in an area mapped as MRZ-2. This would not be considered a loss of availability of the resource, because making the mineral resources available for a public water storage project would be considered a designated, valid use. In addition, the Proposed Action would not conflict with any mapping delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other local land use plan. Similar conditions would apply to the SV 50K component, with less excavation of aggregate needed for the smaller dam raise. Therefore, impacts on mineral resources from the SV 50K component would be less than significant.

Moosa 50K

As discussed in Section 4.10.3 for the Moosa 100K Alternative, aggregate obtained from within the proposed inundation area would be in areas mapped as MRZ-3 and MRZ-4. No areas mapped as MRZ-2 would be affected. Also, there are no known important mineral resource

recovery sites delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan, including the General Plan and Valley Center Community Plan, located within the Moosa 100K study area. Similar conditions would apply to the Moosa 50K component, with less excavation of aggregate needed for the smaller dam raise. Therefore, impacts on mineral resources from the Moosa 50K component would be less than significant.

Combined Impacts

On-site excavation for aggregate supply for both dams would result in use of mineral resources from two separate locations. However, mineral resources would be in MRZ-2 locations only at the SV 50K site, and a smaller extent of excavation would be required for the SV 50K component at this location. No MRZ-2-classified areas would be affected at the Moosa 50K site. In addition, any excavation would be a valid use of those resources and not represent a loss of availability of designated mineral recovery sites or locally important mineral resources at either site. Therefore, the combined impacts of the SV 50K and Moosa 50K components would be less than significant.

The SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources associated with the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative. Impacts would be less than significant.

5.10.3.3 Mitigation Measures

Impacts on mineral resources would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

5.10.3.4 Residual Impacts after Mitigation

No residual impacts would occur.

5.10.4 Cumulative Effects

5.10.4.1 Other CIP Projects

CIP projects that would contribute to cumulative mineral resources impacts of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would include those projects that would also impact the Proposed Action and the Moosa 100K Alternative identified in Sections 3.10.4.1 and 4.10.4.1, respectively. These projects would include the Slaughterhouse Terminal Reservoir, Hubbard Hill Flow Regulatory Structure, North County Distribution Pipeline Flow Regulatory Structure, and Second Crossover Pipeline. The PEIR for the Regional Water Facilities Master Plan concluded that these CIP projects may be located in a mineral rich zone and would have the potential to cause cumulative mineral resources impacts. However, the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would not result in significant mineral resources impacts. The above conclusions

regarding cumulative mineral resources impacts for the four CIP projects described above are incorporated into the cumulative mineral resources analyses in Section 5.10.4.3.

5.10.4.2 ESP Projects

ESP projects that would be in the vicinity of the SV 50K component would include the San Vicente Pipeline, the San Vicente Pump Station, and the San Vicente Surge Control Facility. The ESP EIR/EIS did not address mineral resources impacts. However, based on the mineral resources impacts conducted above, it is expected that mineral resources impacts for ESP projects in the vicinity of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would be less than significant. The above conclusions regarding mineral resources impacts for the ESP projects are incorporated into the cumulative mineral resources analyses in Section 5.10.4.3.

5.10.4.3 Other Planned Projects with CIP and ESP Projects

This section evaluates the cumulative mineral resources impacts of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative when considered in conjunction with the other planned projects listed in Table 5.2-1, and incorporates the cumulative mineral resources impacts associated with the CIP and ESP projects in the vicinity of the SV 50K and Moosa 50K project sites. The following cumulative mineral resources analysis addresses the significance threshold listed in Section 5.10.3 above.

Cumulative Threshold 1: Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan

Excavation of mineral resources to obtain aggregate for the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative would be a valid use of these resources. Other cumulative projects in the vicinity of the SV 50K study area primarily include five mining projects and a number of residential subdivisions. Other cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Moosa 50K study area primarily include several small and large subdivisions along with a few small commercial, institutional and industrial developments. As discussed in Sections 3.2 and 4.2, construction impacts related to these projects are assumed to occur within the same timeframe as construction of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative. These projects may affect mineral resources. If significant mineral resources are found to occur in any of the cumulative project areas or within CIP or ESP project areas, it is expected that appropriate project design features or mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the impacts to less than significant. In addition, the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative mineral impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, cumulative mineral resources impacts due to construction and operation of the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative, when combined with impacts from the CIP, ESP, and other planned cumulative projects listed above, would be less than significant.

The SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative is not expected to reduce the availability of significant mineral resource deposits in the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, cumulative mineral resources impacts due to the SV 50K/Moosa 50K Alternative, when combined with mineral resources impacts associated with the CIP and ESP projects listed above, and other planned cumulative projects listed in Table 5.2-1, would be less than significant.