AGENDA

Three Rivers Community Plan Update
Community Meeting
Monday April 11, 2016 6:00 P.M.
Three Rivers Veterans Memorial Building
43490 Sierra Drive
Three Rivers, CA

... service with pride.
Resource Management Agency

1. Welcome and Introduction.

2. Discussion of Future Schedule and Project Status.

   (a) Future Schedule Discussion & Project Status, (This Meeting is the Conclusion of Regular Monthly Meetings that started in February 2014).

   (b) March 14, 2016 Summary Meeting Notes.

   (c) April 11, 2016 Agenda Information.

3. Discussion of Special Topics.

   (a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Considerations.
   For your consideration, please see CEQA Guidelines Appendix G included in the agenda package to assist in identifying topical areas for discussion regarding preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Three Rivers Community Plan Update.

4. Other Topics as Related.

5. Topics for the Next Meeting.

   (a) CEQA Considerations

6. Next Steps. Future Community Meetings are anticipated to be held during 2016 to review the Draft Community Plan and Related Documents. Specific Dates and Times for these meetings have not been determined at this time. Notification for these meetings will be transmitted via e-mail notification and will be posted on the Three Rivers Community Plan Website address listed below in advance of the meetings.

7. Adjournment: Next Meeting, TBD

Three Rivers Community Plan Website address:
http://www.tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/planning/three-rivers-community-plan-update/

2. Discussion of Future Schedule and Project Status.

(a) Future Schedule Discussion & Project Status.

Three Rivers Community Plan Update
Future Schedule Discussion and Project Status
Three Rivers Veterans Memorial Building
43490 Sierra Drive
Three Rivers, CA

... service with pride.
Resource Management Agency

Project Schedule

The April 11, 2016 is the conclusion of Three Rivers Community Plan Update regular monthly meetings that were initiated in February 2014. Future Community Meetings are anticipated to be held during 2016 to review the Draft Community Plan and related documents. The tentative date for the Draft EIR Scoping Meeting is May 9, 2016, and the tentative date to review the Draft Three Rivers Community Plan Update document is August 8, 2016. Notification for these meetings will be transmitted via e-mail notification and will be posted on the Three Rivers Community Plan Website address listed below in advance of the meetings.

Three Rivers Community Plan Background (Existing Adopted Plan)

The Three Rivers community plan was adopted on May 20, 1980, is over 35 years old, and has been amended by the following General Plan Amendments (GPA): 81-01, 81-07, 83-05/5A 85-05B, 87-01, 87-14A/B, 90-02, 94-03. The 1980 Three Rivers Community Plan is a collection of goals, objectives, and policies for the physical development of the community. The primary purpose of the plan was to outline community goals regarding physical development and to promote the general welfare of the community. The plan (GPA 80-01) serves as a general guide for both public and private decisions affecting the community, and provides for the overall direction, density, and type of growth consistent with the needs of the community.

Three Rivers Community Plan Update Project Background

The Three Rivers Community Plan Update Project was initiated by the Board of Supervisors on January 28, 2014.

The purpose of the Three Rivers Community Plan Update is to preserve and protect the vision, values, character and assets of the community, including preservation of its historical rural character and valuable natural resources while ensuring that economic growth remains vibrant and sustainable consistent with the desired character of the community.

The Community Plan is an important tool for protecting Three Rivers' assets and character, and guiding future growth and development. Tulare County decision makers will use the Community Plan in considering land use and planning decisions. County staff will use the Plan on a day-to-day basis to administer and regulate land use and development activity. Residents can use the Plan to understand the community's approach to regulating development, protecting resources, and upholding values.

The Community Plan will help to guide public and private decisions affecting the community and provides for the overall direction, density, and type of growth and protection of the natural environment that is consistent with the needs and desires of the Three Rivers community. The Community Plan will help to maintain a rural atmosphere, while ensuring the appropriate type and scale of development and adequate community context sensitive infrastructure.

Three Rivers Community Plan Update Project Summary Progress to Date

February 2014-March 2014

Introduction to the project, initiation of discussion, review of general community vision, community attributes, goals and special interest topics. Review of Compatible development and related topics.

April 2014-April 2015

Review and discussion of Draft Three Rivers Community Plan Update Goals, Objectives and Policies.

May 2015-November 2015

Discussion of Oak Woodland Management Plan Draft Outline.

December 2015- April 2016 (Special Discussion Topics)

December 14, 2015
Land Use Plan Update
Transportation and Circulation Plan Update

January 11, 2016
Flooding (FEMA/Zoning)
Emergency Preparedness and Access

February 8, 2016
Development on Slopes
Development Standards

March 14, 2016
Water Quality and Quantity
Noise

April 11, 2016
CEQA Appendix G Considerations

Next Steps

- Completion of Draft Community Plan, Draft Oak Woodland Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report.
- Community Meetings are anticipated to be held during 2016 to review the Draft Community Plan and related documents.

- Public Hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in 2017.

Three Rivers Community Plan Website address:
http://www.tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/planning/three-rivers-community-plan-update/

(b) March 14, 2016 Summary Meeting Notes.

Three Rivers Community Plan Update Meeting Notes-March 14, 2016

Staff appreciated the excellent feedback that we got from the community members who attended the meeting. The following is a summary of some of the major points that were discussed and information that was communicated to staff during the meeting:

Water Quality and Quantity.

- A brief presentation was made by Ken Bowers and Allison Shuklian from Tulare County Environmental Health regarding County domestic water, septic and sewage disposal requirements.
- All new water wells require a permit.
- In September 2014, the Governor signed a three-bill package known as the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. The three bills that make up SGMA are AB 1739, SB 1319 and SB 1168. The act requires the formation of local groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) that must assess conditions in their local water basins and adopt locally-based management plans.
- The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act provides local GSAs with tools and authority to:
    - Require registration of groundwater wells
    - Measure and manage extractions
    - Require reports and assess fees
    - Request revisions of basin boundaries, including establishing new sub basins
- Concerns were presented by some of the local water system providers regarding contaminant levels of arsenic and uranium and the ability to blend water from different wells in order to meet the water quality standards. It was recommended that any questions regarding domestic water systems should be directed to Chad Fisher at State Department of Water Resources office in Fresno.
- Onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS). On 19 June 2012, State Board adopted Resolution No. 2012-0032, which includes the Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation and Maintenance of OWTS. The OWTS Policy adds new focus on water quality protection, and has a risk-based approach for new, replacement, and failing OWTS. Four risk tiers require increasing Regional Board oversight of Local Agencies: Tier 0 covers properly functioning, existing OWTS up to 10,000 gallons per day of projected flow. These require no changes in local codes and ordinances. Tier 1 covers low-risk new and replacement OWTS up to 3,500 gallons per day with conservative, largely prescriptive standards. Tier 2 covers new and replacement OWTS up to 10,000 gallons per day that do not meet Tier 1 standards. For these, Local Agencies have the option to propose Local Agency Management Programs (LAMPs) for Regional Board approval. These are alternative standards overall as protective of human health and water quality as Tier 1. Tier 3 are OWTS

less than 600 feet from Clean Water Act 303(d) listed impaired water bodies. For such areas, LAMPs must include Advanced Protection Management Programs. Tier 4 covers failing OWTS, for which the policy specifies minimum corrective actions. Tier 2 LAMPs are the OWTS Policy's key focus. LAMPs are conditional waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements. Subject to California Water Code §13269, LAMPs must be consistent with Basin Plans, in the public interest, and not to exceed five years in duration. Section 9 of the OWTS Policy provides minimum standards; considerations for siting and design, record keeping, and reports to Regional Boards. The Central Valley has 30 Local Agencies, most of whom will submit draft LAMPs; these are due 13 May 2016. Our Regional Board must consider and approve all LAMPs by 13 May 2017. Local Agencies will have a one-year adjustment period, and implement approved LAMPs beginning 13 May 2018.

- It was recommended that all new regulations should be reflected in the community plan update and that cumulative impacts related to water supply and water quality be evaluated in the community plan update.
- It is not anticipated at this time that water meters will be required before the year 2020.

Noise.

- Staff provided a brief a brief introduction regarding the approach taken to conduct a noise evaluation for the Community Plan update. It was requested that the methodology utilized to conduct a noise study be reviewed in advance of the noise study being performed. Concerns over stationary noise sources, weekend and evening noise, and the canyon sound effect were mentioned as concerns.

(c) April 11, 2016 Agenda Information.

AGENDA INFORMATION

Three Rivers Community Plan Update
Community Meeting
Monday April 11, 2016 6:00 P.M.
Three Rivers Veterans Memorial Building
43490 Sierra Drive
Three Rivers, CA

3. Discussion of Special Topics.

(a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Considerations.

Background/Overview:
An Initial Study will be prepared to determine whether the Three Rivers Community Plan Update project could have a significant effect on the environment, and will be prepared under the direction of the County of Tulare, Resource Management Agency. The County of Tulare is the lead agency under CEQA, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and Title 14 of the California Administrative Code, as revised.

The CEQA Appendix G Environmental Checklist includes 18 Environmental Factors that may be affected by the project and are listed below:

1. Aesthetics
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources
3. Air Quality
4. Biological Resources
5. Cultural Resources
6. Geology and Soils
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
9. Hydrology and Water Quality
10. Land Use and Planning
11. Mineral Resources
12. Noise
13. Population and Housing
14. Public Services
15. Recreation
16. Transportation/Traffic
17. Utilities and Service Systems
18. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Discussion.
The listing of Environmental Factors above is intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of potential environmental impacts that may be associated with the Three Rivers Community Plan Update project.

Technical Studies.
The following technical studies and general tasks are currently identified for the Three Rivers Community Plan Update project.

1. Oak Woodland Study and Biological Assessment, Bobby Kamansky, Principal, Kamansky's Ecological Consulting.

1. Oak woodland study in the Three Rivers UDB.
a. field work, mapping, inventory and ground-truthing oak woodlands;
b. Work with County GIS staff on the mapping and methodology;
c. Written methodology for the inventory and oak survey;
d. Thresholds of significance regarding development impacts in the UDB.
2. Biological Assessment/Reconnaissance-level biological survey investigating the habitat and presence of various special status species potentially occurring in the UDB, and the potential impacts from development.
a. field work and project review and history;
b. Reconnaissance-level biological survey report.

2. Cultural Resources Assessment, Planning Study Area for the Three Rivers Community Plan Update- C. Kristina Roper, M.A., RPA Principal Archaeologist / Owner Sierra Valley Cultural Planning.

Preparation of the Cultural Resources Assessment for the planning study area is divided into three phases:

(1) Pre-field research to assess the potential sensitivity of the planning study area for historic and prehistoric cultural resources and traditional cultural properties, including a complete records search with the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, local historical/museum society archives, and the Sacred Lands Files at the Native American Heritage Commission. Consult with local Native American groups, as necessary, regarding known areas of Native American concern;

(2) A windshield survey of the planning study area to ground truth records search results and identify potentially sensitive localities for both archaeological resources and the built environment (potential historic buildings, structures and features). All documented resources will be visited and records updated as appropriate;

(3) Preparation of a Cultural Resources Assessment detailing the results of the results of pre-field research, Native American consultation, and windshield inspection; and discussion of potential cultural resources constraints and recommendations for mitigation of potential effects on important cultural resources per CEQA review guidelines.

3. Traffic Circulation and Noise Impact Assessment, Georgiena M. Vivian, President VRPA Technologies, Inc.

PURPOSE

This Scope of Work, prepared by VRPA Technologies, Inc (VRPA) is intended to meet the requirements of Tulare County for a traffic circulation analysis and noise impact assessments for the Three Rivers Community Plan Update. This will include analysis of existing and future traffic and noise conditions and effects of future development on the Three Rivers Community Plan area.

TRAFFIC CIRCULATION ANALYSIS

TASK 1 AGENCY COORDINATION AND MEETING ATTENDANCE

Task 1.1 Agency Coordination

Consultant will meet with County staff and the consultant team to discuss components of the approved Scope of Services. VRPA intends to also discuss relevant transportation/circulation issues or concerns associated with the Project to ensure that they are addressed during development of tasks described below. Traffic issues and concerns include:

1. Assessment of off-street parking adequacy including ingress and egress to existing businesses along SR 198.
2. Analysis and determination regarding the adequacy of existing speed limits on SR 198.
3. Analysis of queuing problems on SR 198 associated with summer traffic entering Sequoia National Park.
4. Emergency ingress and egress for the community including recommendations for secondary access.

To insure that affected agency transportation/circulation needs and issues are addressed, we recommend review of current Circulation Analysis documents with the Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) and Caltrans, District 6 representatives. In addition, representatives of the following organizations should be invited to participate in a meeting with the consultant team:

- *Tulare County Area Transit*
- *Other representatives, as appropriate, including the Building Industry Association of Tulare County, local environmental justice representatives, the National Park Service and others interested in transportation issues in Three Rivers.*

Deliverable: On-going coordination.

Task 1.2 Meetings and Public Participation Hearings

VRPA staff will attend a maximum of four (4) meetings over the duration of the Project. The meetings are described below and referenced in the appropriate tasks in this Scope of Services.

- *1 meeting with County RMA and Caltrans staff to review the proposed Scope of Services and gather input, information, data, reports and documents*
- *1 meeting with the Three Rivers Community to review traffic and noise issues of interest to the community*
- *1 meeting with the Planning Commission to review/approve the General Plan including the Circulation Analysis documents*
- *1 meeting at the County Board of Supervisors to review and approve the General Plan document*

Deliverable: Four (4) meetings described above.

TASK 2 IDENTIFY ISSUES / DOCUMENT REVIEW

VRPA Technologies will collect background information, data, and documents/studies during the first month of the Project. Data collected and analyzed will be applied to update, reflect and document the Regional Setting and to update/assess existing transportation issues and conditions in the community. In addition, the data and analysis will be used to help refine the traffic model output, to aid in development of the future year analysis, and to help determine the benefits from various improvement projects.

Deliverable: In-house review of existing documents.

TASK 3 PLAN DOCUMENT

Task 3.1 Draft Plan – Circulation Analysis

Task 3.1.1 Existing Transportation/Circulation Conditions

VRPA will coordinate with County RMA staff to identify current travel conditions. In order to supplement available traffic count data, it is proposed that AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts will be conducted at up to (2) intersections and eight (8) roadway segments in the study area during the peak summer season. The analysis of those two intersections will include an assessment of safety issues. It is expected that the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) will provide current year model files or output to VRPA to update the model volumes and level of service conditions. In addition to model results, VRPA will document the Functional Classification System and roadway geometries. Based upon the model and other information referenced above, level of service analysis will be conducted for up to two (2) intersections and eight (8) roadway segments within the community.

Deliverable: Background Technical Report.

Task 3.1.2 Future Transportation/Circulation Conditions

Projected future traffic roadway conditions will be updated using the Future Year 2040 Traffic Model results or files to be provided by TCAG. It is understood that VRPA will provide TCAG with the revised socioeconomic data (reflective of the proposed Community Plan Land Use Plan) and transportation network. Based upon results of the future year model analysis, VRPA will document future travel demand within the community, and development of projected traffic volumes and LOS conditions.

This proposal assumes that future conditions will be analyzed for Future No Build conditions and up to three (3) project alternatives

In addition to highways and roads, projected conditions related to public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians be reviewed.

Deliverable: Draft Future Conditions Document.

Task 3.1.3 Transportation Plan

Based upon results of Task 3.1.2, VRPA will identify appropriate improvement projects to address future transportation and circulation needs within the community. An emphasis will be placed on improvement projects and programs that can be readily implemented.

Deliverable: Draft Transportation Plan.

Task 3.1.4 Transit Policies

VRPA will reflect recommended policies for transit service in the Three Rivers Community developed in consultation with Tulare County Area Transit.

Deliverable: Memorandum of Recommended Transit Policies including appropriate graphics and supportive data.

Task 3.2 Plan Document Revisions and Final Plan

VRPA will assist with the Final Circulation Analysis in consultation with County RMA staff and incorporate revisions to reflect input from the community. The Final Circulation Analysis will comply with applicable provisions of relevant state laws and will be comprised of a Background Technical Report.

Deliverable: Final Circulation Analysis comprised of Background Technical Report, Future Conditions Document, Transportation Plan, and Implementation Document in format consistent with and suitable for incorporation into the Community Plan document. Appropriate graphics and data tables will be included with the following:

☐ *Relationships to other documents including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and other regional documents, County General and other Community Plan Elements, and modal studies*
☐ *Description of highways, streets and roads including a description and review of regionally significant roads, the roadway Functional Classification System, and the LOS analysis*
☐ *Assessment of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel*

NOISE ANALYSIS

TASK 1.0 PROFILE EXISTING AND FUTURE NOISE CONDITIONS

Task 1. 1 Review Existing Documents

VRPA will collect the information, data, and documents/studies described below during the first month of the Project. Data collected and analyzed will be applied to reflect and document the Regional Setting and to assess existing noise conditions in the community. In addition, the data and analysis will be used to help refine the noise model output, to aid in development of the future year analysis, and to help determine the benefits from the project and other project alternatives.

It will be important to assess development and transportation data and information contained in current state, regional and local planning documents referenced in Circulation Analysis tasks. Each of these documents will be reviewed by VRPA to identify current and future noise conditions.

Deliverable: Draft Background/Technical Report.

Task 1. 2 Data Collection

VRPA will conduct a maximum of five (5) traffic noise level measurements and use concurrent traffic counts along the affected roadways at the exterior of houses or other sensitive receptors. The purpose of the measurements is to determine if adjustments to the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model would be required. The FHWA Model is the standard methodology for calculating traffic noise levels.

If a secure location for equipment is available, VRPA will conduct continuous traffic noise level measurements for 24 hours or more during the peak summer season along major roads and at selected stationary sources within the Community including:

- *Lions Club Roping Arena (Events)/Heliport located near the old airport area when the event is in session*
- *Three Rivers Hideaway/SR 198*
- *River View Restaurant/SR 198*

- *Buckeye Tree Lodge/SR 198*
- *Lower SR 198 area Village Market area/Motels/RV Park/SR 198*
- *White Horse Inn/SR 198*

The purpose of the 24-hour measurements is to obtain the day/night proportions of traffic noise, which is used to calculate noise exposure in terms of the Ldn. If a secure location is not available, VRPA will utilize standard practices for calculating Ldn using peak hour noise levels. The analysis will also capture of impacts due to Canyon sound transmission effects and stationary sources of noise.

Deliverable: Document Data Collection results.

Task 1. 3 Calculate Existing & Future Noise Levels

VRPA will determine existing and future traffic noise exposure using the FHWA Model. Traffic noise exposure will be calculated in terms of Ldn, which is used by affected agencies to determine noise compatibility. Traffic data used in the FHWA Model will be provided from the Traffic and Circulation Analysis described above. Noise contours will be prepared illustrating existing noise impacts. Significance will be based on the standards and policies developed as part of the Noise Element. Noise analysis will be conducted for a future no build condition and up to three (3) project alternatives. Mitigation measure will be recommended as necessary to mitigate project impacts.

Deliverable: Draft Noise Technical Report.

3. Discussion of Special Topics.

(a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Considerations.

(a) CEQA Guidelines Appendix G

CEQA APPENDIX G:
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

NOTE: The following is a sample form and may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

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: _____ 7. Zoning: _____
8. 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. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of 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 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 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ 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.

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____ _____
Signature Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each 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 should be 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 must take account of the whole 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) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with 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 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:				

Courtesy of the Association of Environmental Professionals

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US 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, 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	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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:	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐
XI. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐
XVIII. 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 o restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2009