

4.11 MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Issues & Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the Project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.11.1 Environmental Setting

No mineral resources are present at the areas affected by construction at either the Old River or Connection Slough sites (Contra Costa County 2005, San Joaquin County 1992). Peat removal occurs in some areas, but has not been identified as a use at the Project sites.

4.11.2 Regulatory Setting

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) includes a process called “classification-designation.” The purpose of this process is to provide local agencies with information about the location, need for, and importance of mineral resources within their jurisdictions. Pursuant to SMARA, the California State Mining and Geology Board uses the Mineral Resource Zone system to classify California’s mineral resources. These zones are based on the presence of significant aggregate deposits. Aggregates are used in the production of building materials, such as concrete, asphalt, and cement.

The Contra Costa [County \(2005\)](#) and [San Joaquin County \(1992\)](#) General Plans contain policies intended to protect mineral resources.

4.11.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.11.3.1 No Project

The No Project alternative would not result in impacts on mineral resources because no development would occur.

4.11.3.2 2-Gates Project

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state

No Impact. No impacts would occur because no mineral deposits are present at either of the Project sites.

b. 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

No Impact. No impacts would occur because no mineral deposits are present at either of the Project sites.

c. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans

No Impact. The Project would require energy during construction and operations (e.g., to power the lights in the operator house, flood lights, and operate the gates), but it would not use energy in a wasteful manner and would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans.

4.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

No cumulative impacts would occur because no mineral deposits are present at either of the Project sites.