

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECK LIST FORM

- 1. Project Title:
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
- 4. Project Location:
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
- 6. General Plan Designation:
- 8. Description of Project:

7. Zoning:

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Land Use
North			
South			
East			
West			

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| " Land Use and Planning | " Transportation/Circulation | " Public Services |
| " Population and Housing | " Biological Resources | " Utilities & Service Systems |
| " Geological Problems | " Energy & Mineral Resources | " Aesthetics |
| " Water | " Hazards | " Cultural Resources |
| " Air Quality | " Noise | " Recreation |
| " Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis on this initial evaluation:

- " I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- " I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- " I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- " I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but must analyze only the effect that remains to be addressed.
- " I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is provided in the Discussion section for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." Mitigation measures are described and how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.
6. Where ever possible, references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) are incorporated into the checklist. Where appropriate, a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated is included. A source list is attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, are cited in the discussion.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	"	"	"	"
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	"	"	"	"
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	"	"	"	"
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	"	"	"	"
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	"	"	"	"
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	"	"	"	"
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	"	"	"	"
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	"	"	"	"
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	"	"	"	"
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	"	"	"	"

Name of Project Goes Here

Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration

Date Goes Here

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	"	"	"	"
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	"	"	"	"

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	"	"	"	"
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	"	"	"	"
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	"	"	"	"
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	"	"	"	"
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	"	"	"	"
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	"	"	"	"

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	"	"	"	"
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	"	"	"	"
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	"	"	"	"
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	"	"	"	"

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:	"	"	"	"
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	"	"	"	"
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	"	"	"	"
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	"	"	"	"
4) Landslides?	"	"	"	"
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	"	"	"	"
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	"	"	"	"
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	"	"	"	"
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	"	"	"	"

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	"	"	"	"
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	"	"	"	"
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	"	"	"	"
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code ' 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	"	"	"	"
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	"	"	"	"
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	"	"	"	"
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	"	"	"	"
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	"	"	"	"

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	"	"	"	"
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	"	"	"	"
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	"	"	"	"
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	"	"	"	"
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	"	"	"	"
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	"	"	"	"
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	"	"	"	"
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	"	"	"	"
l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	"	"	"	"
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	"	"	"	"

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

a) Physically divide an established community?	"	"	"	"
------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	"	"	"	"
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	"	"	"	"

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. 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?	"	"	"	"
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?	"	"	"	"

XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	"	"	"	"
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	"	"	"	"
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	"	"	"	"
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	"	"	"	"
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	"	"	"	"
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	"	"	"	"

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | " | " | " | " |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | " | " | " | " |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | " | " | " | " |

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a) Fire protection? | " | " | " | " |
| b) Police protection? | " | " | " | " |
| c) Schools? | " | " | " | " |
| d) Parks? | " | " | " | " |
| e) Other public facilities? | " | " | " | " |

XIV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | " | " | " | " |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | " | " | " | " |

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	"	"	"	"
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	"	"	"	"
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	"	"	"	"
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	"	"	"	"
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	"	"	"	"
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	"	"	"	"
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	"	"	"	"

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	"	"	"	"
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	"	"	"	"
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	"	"	"	"
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	"	"	"	"
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	"	"	"	"
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	"	"	"	"

XVII MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	"	"	"	"
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	"	"	"	"
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	"	"	"	"

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

- a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- d. Create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

- c. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses?

III. AIR QUALITY

- a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

- b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

- b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

- c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetland, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?**

- d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

- e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

- f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?**

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?**

- b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?**

- c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

- d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a. **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:**
 - 1. **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?**
 - 2. **Strong seismic ground shaking?**
 - 3. **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
 - 4. **Landslides?**
- b. **Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**
- c. **Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**
- d. **Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a. **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?**
- b. **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**
- c. **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**
- d. **Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Name of Project Goes Here

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Date Goes Here

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g. Would the project impair implementation of physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

- h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?**
- i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**
- j. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?**

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a. Would the project physically divide an established community?**
- b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**
- c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

- 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?**
- 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?**

XI. NOISE

- a. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?**
- b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?**
- c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**
- d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
 - b. Fire protection?
 - c. Police protection?
 - d. Schools?
 - e. Parks?
 - f. Other public facilities?

XIV. RECREATION

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- b. Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

V. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a. Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- e. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- g. Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, the effects of probable future projects.

- c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

SOURCE REFERENCES