## NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

1195 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 210 Napa, Calif. 94559 707.253.4417

## **Initial Study Checklist**

	1.	Project Title:
	2.	Property Owner:
	3.	Contact person, phone number and email:
	4.	Project location and APN:
	5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
	6.	General Plan Description:
	7.	Current Zoning:
	8.	Project Description:
	9.	Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:
	<u>10.</u>	_ <del>10.</del> —Other agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
	<del>10.</del> ]	11. California Native American tribal consultation: Have tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?
The standard source prepared to the standard source prepared t	cor ndar rces pare	ONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: aclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current acts of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, other of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the er's personal knowledge of the area, and where necessary visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further ation see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.
On	the	basis of this initial evaluation:
	N I no th I	find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a EGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an NVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

[Type textProject Title]

	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially signific	cant impact" or "potentially significant
	unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one eff	ect 1) has been adequately analyzed in
	an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and	1 2) has been addressed by mitigation
	measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attac	hed sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL
	IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must only analyze only the e	ffects that remain_to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequate	ely in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE
	DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have	Ų I
	that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revi	sions or mitigation measures that are
	imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	
Sign	nature	Date
	(N) 1704	-
rin	nt Name and Title	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, w 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) In non-urbanized areas, Ssubstantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				
Disci	d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) a)—Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				

	b)	b)—Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
	c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?				
	d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?				
	e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
Discus	ssion:	<del>!</del>				
Discu	ssion	<u>n:</u>				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AI	R QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria		•		
III.	est air	R QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria tablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the llowing determinations. Would the project:		-		
III.	est air	ablished by the applicable air quality management <u>district</u> or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the				
III.	est air fol	cablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the llowing determinations. Would the project:  Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
III.	est air fol a)	rablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the flowing determinations. Would the project:  Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to				
III.	est air fol a) b)	rablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the flowing determinations. Would the project:  Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  Description Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed)				
III.	est air fol a) b) e)b	rablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the flowing determinations. Would the project:  Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  Pesult in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
III.	est air fol a) b) e)b	rablished by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the flowing determinations. Would the project:  Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  Po Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?  Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  Create objectionable Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
BIC	DLOGICAL 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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, 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?				
sion	<b>:</b>				
CI	ITURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	- /				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined inpursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				
	a) b) c) f)	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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, 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?  CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:  a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined inpursuant to CEQA Guidelines	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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, 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?  Potentially Significant Impact  CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:  a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined inpursuant to CEQA Guidelines	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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 101 of the Clean Water-Act-fincluding, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, 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?  c) Cultural Resources. Would the project:  a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined inpursuant to CRQA Guidelines	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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wellands as defined by Section 494 of the Clean Water-Act-(including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, 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, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?  Significant Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation  CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:  a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined appursuant to CEQA Guidelines

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				
	<del>c)</del>	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				
	<del>d)</del> <u>c</u>	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
Discu	ssior	1:				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	<u>No</u> <u>Impact</u>
VI.	EN	ERGY. Would the project:		<u> </u>		
		Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?  Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				
<u>Discu</u>	ssior	<u>u</u>				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V <u>I</u> I.	GE	OLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:		incorporation		
	a)	Expose people or structures to Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
		i) 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.				
		ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
		iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
		iv) Landslides?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		Incorporation		
	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 (1997), creating substantial direct or indirect 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?				
	f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
Discus	sior	ı:				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i)	GI	REENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a)	exc Qu Re	enerate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in cess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air nality Management District or the California Air sources Board which may have a significant impact on e environment?				
b)	an	onflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or other applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for e purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
Discus	sior	n:				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII <u>IX</u> . H	AZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:		•		
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 reasonable 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 Section 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 or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				
<del>f)</del>	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
<u>fg</u>	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
gł	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?				

Discussion:

]	₹X. HYE	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				
	b)	b)—Substantially deplete-decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basinthere 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)?				
	<u>c)</u>	e)—Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:  result in substantial erosion or siltation on—or off site?				
		i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
		symbol surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 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?				
 		which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?; or				
	<del>ii)</del> —	iii) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<del>iii)</del>	iv)	<del>v)</del>	<del>vi)</del>
		iv) 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?	viii) ix)— x)———	<del>xi)</del> — <del>xii)</del> — xiii) —	<del>xiv)-</del> <del>xv)-</del> <del>xvi)-</del>	<del>xvii)</del> <del>xviii)</del>   <del>xix) [</del>
	<del>vii)</del>	v)iv) h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
		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?				

	d) Inundation by In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche, tsunami, or mudflow zones, risk release of pollutants due to project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<ul> <li>inundation?</li> <li>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</li> </ul>				
Discus	ssion:				
X <u>I</u> .	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
_	a) Physically divide an established community?				
	b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a Cconflict 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?				
Discus	ssion:				
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI <u>I</u> .	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?				
Discus	ssion:				

<b>X</b>	αι <u>ι</u> .	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		a) Exposure of persons to or gGeneration of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
		b) Exposure of persons to or gGeneration of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne 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 the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or 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?				
Ι	Discus	sion:				
	(IVIII.	POPULATION and HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		a) Induce substantial <u>unplanned</u> population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
		b) Displace substantial numbers of existing <u>people or</u> housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
		c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
Ι	Discus	sion:				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:		incorporation		
	a) 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 public services:				
	i) Fire protection?				
	ii) Police protection?				
	iii) Schools?				
	iv) Parks?				
	v) Other public facilities?				
Discu	ssion:				
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV <u>I</u> .	RECREATION. Would the project:		r		
	a) a) 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)—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?				
Discu	ssion:				
XV <u>I</u> I.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	<u>No</u> <u>Impact</u>
	Significant Impact  Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant With Impact Mitigation Incorporation  Less Than Significant Significant Impact With Mitigation Impact With Mitigation Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation

Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or  a) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.  Discussion:				
VIVVIII LITH ITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS World the project.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIXVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:  a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
a) b)—Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
b) c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c)b) d)—Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry yearsfrom existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
d)c) 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?				
e)d) f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needsGenerate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
<u>f)e) g)</u> —Comply with federal, state, and local <u>management and</u> <u>reduction</u> statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  Discussion:				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	<u>No</u> Impact
XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:		<u>Incorporation</u>		
	a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan emergency evacuation plan?	or			
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerba wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolle spread of a wildfire?	<u>to</u>			
	c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate firm risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	er re			
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a resure of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	_			
Discu	ussion:				
XVIIX	I. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish of wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to droubelow self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant of animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate importance examples of the major periods of California history of prehistory?	or op  or of nt			
	b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limite but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a proje are considerable when viewed in connection with the effect of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	ly $\square$ ct ts			
	c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly indirectly?				



**Summary of Mitigation Measures:**