

### 3.11 Mineral Resources

Table 3.11-1 Mineral Resources Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.11.1 Setting

The project route would extend just over 40 miles and pass through unincorporated and incorporated areas of Butte, Yuba, and Sutter counties. Mineral resources along the project route consist of oil and gas and deposits of rock, sand, and gravel (CGS 2002; DOGGR 2001; DOGGR 2008).

#### Regulatory Setting

Under the California State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975, Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) are classified by the State Geologist to classify land according its level of significance as a mineral resource. MRZs are used to help identify and protect state mineral resources from urban expansion or other irreversible land uses that might preclude mineral extraction. The MRZ categories used to classify land include:

- SZ: Areas containing unique or rare occurrence of rocks, minerals, or fossils that are of outstanding scientific significance.
- MRZ-1: Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
- MRZ-2: Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence.
- MRZ-2a: Areas underlain by mineral deposits where geologic data show that significant measured or indicated resources are present.
- MRZ-2b: Areas underlain by mineral deposits where geologic information indicates that significant inferred resources are present.
- MRZ-3: Areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.
- MRZ-4: Areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ.

In Butte County, the State Geologist has not yet mapped mineral resources (Butte County 2007). No MRZ designations have been identified within the County. The State Geology Board is currently reviewing petitions for the classification of two locations in Butte County, but the project route does not cross either of them (Butte County 2007).

In Yuba County, the Yuba Goldfields area and the Western World Mining Company Copper-Zinc Deposit have been classified under the MRZ system. The Yuba Goldfields area is classified MRZ-2 for its cement and concrete aggregate deposits. The Yuba Goldfields area extends from the town of Smartville west to Marysville and would be crossed by the project route. The point at which the project route would cross the Yuba Goldfields area is at the Yuba River. Yuba County, in addition to recognizing MRZ classifications, has acknowledged that the Yuba Goldfields area is a locally-important mineral resource. The Western World Mining Company Cooper-Zinc Deposit would not be crossed by the project route (Yuba County 1996; 2008).

No significant or substantial mineral deposits have been identified within Sutter County (Sutter County 2008).

### 3.11.2 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

*a. Would the project 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?*

*LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.* Mineral extraction operations exist near the project area; however, the only segment of the project route that would cross a known mineral resource is near Marysville at the Yuba Goldfields area. The area is designated MRZ-2, but no mineral extraction is currently underway. Construction and operation of the project would not obstruct or affect future ability to access the deposits. There are no productive oil or coal developments or geothermal resources along the project route. Additionally, the project involves the reconstruction of an existing transmission line along an existing right-of-way. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, and impacts would be less than significant under this criterion.

*b. Would the project 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?*

*LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.* The only segment of the project route that would cross a known mineral resource is at the Yuba River, which is part of the Yuba Goldfields area. Though Yuba County has acknowledged that the Yuba Goldfields area is a locally-important mineral resource, the project route does not cross the Yuba Goldfields area at a location that is currently used to extract mineral resources. In addition, since the project involves the reconstruction of an existing transmission line along an existing right-of-way, the crossing is not new. It is part of the existing system. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, and impacts would be less than significant under this criterion.

### References

- Butte County. 2007. Butte County General Plan Update 2030, Setting and Trends Report. <http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/SettingandTrends/default.asp>. Accessed November 6, 2008.
- CDC (California Department of Conservation). 2000. California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures: State Mining and Geology Board in cooperation with Office of Mine and Reclamation and Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 5. Third Revision, January.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. Executive Officer's Report, Agenda Item No. 7: Report on the Mineral Land Classification and Designation Program Under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975: State Mining and Geology Board. June 14.
- CGS (California Geologic Survey). 2002. California Geomorphic Provinces: California Geological Survey Note 36.
- City of Oroville. 2008. Oroville 2030 General Plan, Public Review Draft.  
<http://www.cityoforoville.org/index.aspx?page=302>. Accessed November 6, 2008.
- DOGGR (California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources). 2001. Online Oil and Gas and Geothermal Maps. <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DOG>. Accessed November 6, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Geothermal Map of California: Department of Conservation, Map 617.
- Sutter County. 2008. General Plan Update: Technical Background Report.
- Yuba County. 1996. Yuba County General Plan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. General Plan Update: Technical Background Report.

*This page intentionally left blank*