		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	. No		
1 1	Issues  ESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact		
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	511 2 1099, Would	lile project.		<b>V</b>		
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				<ul><li>✓</li></ul>		
c)	In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from 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?				~		
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				~		
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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 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 nonagricultural use?				~		
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 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?				<b>~</b>		
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?				~		
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution							
a)	control district may be relied upon to make the following determin Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	ations. Would the	e project.		~		
b)	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?			~			
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				~		
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				•		

With Potentially Less Than Mitigation Significant Significant No Incorporated Impact Impact Issues Impact IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? 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? Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? 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: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5? Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? Disturb any human remains, including thoseinterred outside of dedicated cemeteries? VI. ENERGY. Would the project: Result in 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? VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides? Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			V	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				~
e) F	lave 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?		<b>~</b>		
VIII	. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			~	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			~	
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proj	ect:			
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?		<b>v</b>		
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				<b>v</b>
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?				<b>v</b>
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				•
f)	project area? Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			~	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		<b>v</b>		
X. ł	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surfaceor ground water quality?		<b>~</b>		
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			~	
c)	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:				~

		Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i)	result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				<b>~</b>
	ii)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite;				~
	iii)	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; or				<b>v</b>
	iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?				<b>~</b>
d)		ood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of utants due to project inundation?				<b>~</b>
e)	Con	iflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality trol plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				~
XI.	LAN	D USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	Phy	sically divide an established community?				<b>~</b>
b)	any	use a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the cose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				~
XII.	MIN	ERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)		sult in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would be a value to the region and the residents of the e?				<b>v</b>
b)	resc	sult in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral ource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, cific plan or other land use plan?				~
XIII		ISE. Would the project resultin:				
a)	in a	neration of a substantial temporary or permanent increase mbient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess tandards established in the local general plan or noise nance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		~		
b)		neration of excessive groundborne vibration or undborne noise levels?				~
c)	an a ado airp	a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been pted, within two miles of a public airport or public use ort, would the project expose people residing or working in project area to excessive noise levels?				V
XIV		PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a)	eith bus	uce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, er directly (for example, by proposing new homes and inesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of ds or other infrastructure)?				~
b)	nec	place substantial numbers of existing people or housing, essitating the construction of replacement housing where?				<b>v</b>
a)	Res the facil facil env serv	BLIC SERVICES. Would the project: sult in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of new or physically altered governmental lities, need for new or physically altered governmental lities, the construction of which could cause significant ironmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable vice ratios, response times, or other performance			V	

	Issues Fire protection? Police protection? Schools?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Parks?	Ħ		<b>V</b>	H
	Other public facilities?			V	
XVI	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 occuror 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?				~
	I. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				~
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				~
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				<b>'</b>
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				<b>V</b>
XVI	II. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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:		V		
	<ul> <li>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</li> </ul>		V		
	ii) 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 § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		V		
	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, ortelecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				~

		Potentially	Less Than Significant With	Less Than	
	Issues	Significant Impact	Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impost
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project	illipact	Incorporated	impact	Impact
	and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				<b>~</b>
c)	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?				<b>V</b>
d)	Generate 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?				~
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				~
XX.	<b>WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or land project:	s classified as ve	ery high fire hazard	severity zones, wo	ould the
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				•
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to				~
	pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				Ш
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergencywater				
	sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				<b>V</b>
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of				
	runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				•
XXI	. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?	Ш			