# **CEQA Environmental Checklist**

# PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Santa Gertrudis Creek Trail
Trojoct ride.	Santa Gentradis Creek Trail
Lead agency name and address:	City of Temecula 41000 Main Street Temecula, CA 92590
Contact person and phone number:	Matt Peters – Senior Planner City of Temecula; (951) 694-6408
Project Location:	Temecula, CA
Project sponsor's name and address:	City of Temecula, CA
General plan description:	Pedestrian/bicycle trail extension and interconnect with existing trails
Zoning:	Open Space Conservation (OS-C)
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	The City of Temecula is proposing the creation of a new pedestrian/bicycle trail extension that would connect a new multi-purpose trail along Santa Gertrudis Creek.  The project was originally designed in 2014, but it did not progress at that time because of lack of funding for construction.  While the majority of the trail is within RCFC&WCD right-of-way, the undercrossing locations will encroach Caltrans (I-15) right-of-way, and City right-of-way at Ynez Road, Jefferson Avenue, and Winchester Road. The project is considered Categorically Exempt from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQA for the encroachments to Caltrans right —of-way proposed by the project.  The portion of the proposed trail extension that is along Santa Gertrudis Creek can be differentiated as two distinct sections based on the creek's physical characteristics. The first

	section is Ynez Road to the I-15 Freeway, and the second section is from the I-15 Freeway to Winchester Road. The characteristics that distinguish the two sections from each other are the available width for the trail along the top of the creek and the type of channel characterizing the creek bottom. Visible concrete channel lining occurs from approximately 200 feet upstream of the confluence of Murrieta Creek and Santa Gertrudis Creek and extends to a check dam near the I-15 southbound Winchester Road off-ramp. Upstream of the check dam to the upstream terminus of the project, the concrete channel lining, while present, is obscured by depositional sand and vegetation.
Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:	Developed commercial to the south and east, and open scrub habitat to the west.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW); Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA)
Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?	No, the project will not have an impact on tribal land, and a cultural resources survey has been completed and determined no effect.
Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that	

ſ	Dublic Decourage Code section 21002 2(a)
	Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c)
	contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

	1		W			
	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry		Air Quality	
	Biological Resources	$\boxtimes$	Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils	
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/Water Quality	
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise	
	Population/Housing		Public Services	$\boxtimes$	Recreation	
	Transportation/Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources		Utilities/Service Systems	
$\boxtimes$	Mandatory Findings of Significance					
	TERMINATION: he basis of this initial evalu			-		
Ц	a NEGATIVE DECLARAT	FION V				
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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.						
	I find that the proposed pu ENVIRONMENTAL IMPA		MAY have a significant effect of EPORT is required.	n the	e environment, and an	
	significant unless mitigate adequately analyzed in an has been addressed by m	ed" imp n earlic nitigation IRONI	MAY have a "potentially significe pact on the environment, but at the environment of the environment to application measures based on the ear MENTAL IMPACT REPORT is addressed.	leas able lier a	t one effect 1) has been legal standards, and 2) nalysis as described on	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.						
	N	,			1100	
Sig	nature: //www.li	den			Date: 2/1/12026	
Prin	ited Name: Nino	Abas	1		For:	

### **CEQA Environmental Checklist**

8/5956/15	6.7	1K060
DistCoRte.	P.M/P.M.	E.A.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on review of the project area and the results in the Community Impact Assessment (ICF International 2016a). There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources in the project area. The proposed project involves only minor changes in the existing roadway and would not degrade the existing rural character of the area. There would be temporary visual impacts resulting from construction (i.e., construction equipment), however, there would be no long-term impact on visual character. The project would not introduce new sources of light or glare.

#### II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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?				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
"No impact" determinations in this section are bachecklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are loc				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.  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				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.  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				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.  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				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.  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 non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative				
checklist (DEA 2020). No forest resources are local proposed project.  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 non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020). the Climate Change and MSAT Report (California Department of Transportation 2016b)

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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, 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?				
"No impact" and "Less than significant with mitig based on the IS/MND that accompanies this check			in this secti	on are
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
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 geologic feature?		$\boxtimes$		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				

"No impact" and "less than significant with mitigation" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).

#### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse X 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? Potentially Less Than Less Than No Significant Significant Significant Impact **Impact** with **Impact** Mitigation iv) 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? "No impact" and "less than significant impacts" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020). VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project: a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or Caltrans has used the best available information indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the based to the extent possible on scientific and factual environment? information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that may occur related to this project. The analysis included in the b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted climate change section of this document provides the for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? public and decision-makers as much information about the project as possible. It is Caltrans' determination that in the absence of statewideadopted thresholds or GHG emissions limits, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding an individual project's direct and indirect impacts with respect to global climate change. Caltrans remains committed to implementing measures to reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the climate

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).

change section of the document.

VIII. HAZARDS 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 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?				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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?				
"No impact" determinations in this section are bachecklist (DEA 2020).	sed on the	IS/MND tha	at accompan	ies this
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
i) 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) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow				
			_	
"No impact" determinations in this section are bachecklist (DEA 2020).	used on the	IS/MND tha	it accompan	ies this
	used on the	IS/MND tha	ய் accompan	ies this
checklist (DEA 2020).	ised on the	IS/MND tha	it accompan	ies this
checklist (DEA 2020).  X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	ised on the	IS/MND tha	it accompan	ies this
checklist (DEA 2020).  X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:  a) Physically divide an established community?  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	ised on the	IS/MND tha	at accompan	ies this
checklist (DEA 2020).  X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:  a) Physically divide an established community?  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				
checklist (DEA 2020).  X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:  a) Physically divide an established community?  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?  "No impact" determinations in this section are based or servation and the purpose of avoiding or natural community conservation plan?				
checklist (DEA 2020).  X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:  a) Physically divide an established community?  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?  "No impact" determinations in this section are bachecklist (DEA 2020).				

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).

XII. 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 applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				$\boxtimes$
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\boxtimes$
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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?				
"No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020).	sed on the	IS/MND tha	at accompan	ies this
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).

## XIV. 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 public services:				
Fire protection?				$\boxtimes$
Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
Schools?				$\boxtimes$
Parks?				$\boxtimes$
Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$
"No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020). The project does not includ of new or altered governmental facilities.			•	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. 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?				
"No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020).	sed on the	IS/MND tha	it accompan	ies this
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?						
"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).						
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
b) 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.						
the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource	sed on the l	S/MND tha	t accompani	ies this		
the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.  "No impact" determinations in this section are ba	sed on the l	S/MND tha	t accompani	es this		
the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.  "No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020).	sed on the l	S/MND tha	t accompani	ies this		
the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.  "No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020).  XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:  a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable	sed on the l	S/MND tha	t accompani	ies this		
the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.  "No impact" determinations in this section are ba checklist (DEA 2020).  XVIII. 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	sed on the	S/MND tha	t accompani	ies this		

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?						
"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020). Project does not include impacts associated with wastewater or potable water conveyance or treatment facilities. Project would not create a new source of solid waste.						
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
XIX. 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal 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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?						

"No impact" determinations in this section are based on the IS/MND that accompanies this checklist (DEA 2020).