# **Appendix A1**

# Deep Gulch and Sheridan Creek Rehabilitation Project Environmental Screening Checklist

This Environmental Screening Checklist was prepared to satisfy in part the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines using the format provided in Appendix G of the guidelines and includes the following 16 environmental topics:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality

- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

The checklist was used to identify issues that should be carried forward for further evaluation in the environmental assessment/initial study (EA/IS) and to eliminate topics or resources for which no impacts are anticipated. For each checklist question, the proposed rehabilitation activities were assessed to determine if impacts are anticipated or if the project would clearly not result in any impacts. Previous analyses in the *Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration Environmental Impact Statement/Report* (Trinity River EIS/EIR, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service et al. 2000) and *Channel Rehabilitation and Sediment Management Activities for Remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 Sites, Part 1: Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Part 2: Environmental Assessment/Final Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR and EA/EIR, Regional Water Board and Reclamation 2009)* were considered in this assessment. If new information available since the previous analyses reveals the potential for an impact that was not previously evaluated or was dismissed, that issue will be carried forward in the EA/IS. For each checklist question, one of the following determinations was made:

- Further Evaluation Needed: The proposed rehabilitation activities could result in an impact on the environmental topic or create an issue associated with the topic, and the topic will be further evaluated in the EA/IS. The topic may also require further evaluation due to new information becoming available since the previous analyses. Mitigation measures from the Master EIR (Appendix B) will be considered in the analysis to mitigate impacts, and if necessary additional mitigation measures would be proposed to reduce the significance of the impact under CEQA.
- No Further Evaluation Needed: The proposed rehabilitation activities would not result in an impact on the resource topic, or the issue is not a concern at the rehabilitation site or for the rehabilitation activities. Further evaluation of the environmental topic or issue is not necessary. The rationale behind this conclusion is that either the environmental topic is not present in or near the rehabilitation site or the nature of the project would clearly not result in an impact. Also, if

the previous analyses thoroughly evaluated the issue and dismissed it, no further evaluation is needed.

Further Evaluation

No Further

I.	<b>AESTHETICS</b> — Would the project:	Needed	Evaluation Needed
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?		
a)	The Trinity River, as it flows through the Deep Gulch and Sherida a wild and scenic river. Further evaluation is needed to assess im river corridor and visual changes associated with the rehabilitation recreationists using the river corridor.	pacts on the wild	l and scenic
b)	The rehabilitation sites are not near a state scenic highway. The r not affect scenic resources along a scenic highway.	ehabilitation acti	ivities would
c)	The rehabilitation activities would take place along a wild and scenarior further evaluation is necessary to assess impacts on the visual characteristics.		
d)	The rehabilitation activities would not involve new sources of light restricted to daylight hours, and no construction lighting would be		would be
II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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 by 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 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?		

- a, b) The rehabilitation sites are along the Trinity River and are not used for agricultural purposes. The rehabilitation activities would not convert farmland or conflict with agricultural zoning.
- c) The rehabilitation sites are not zoned for timber production.
- d) Upland areas on the left side of the Sheridan Creek site contain mixed conifer forests on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Mature conifers and hardwoods would be removed at two upland activity areas to provide a stable location for disposal of excavated material. All wood removed from these areas would be used on-site for channel rehabilitation improvements. No forest resources would be sold or removed from the site.
- e) The rehabilitation activities would occur on upland, floodplain and riverine features in a manner that would enhance the diversity and complexity of vegetation.

III.	AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS — 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:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	$\boxtimes$	
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)?		
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		
f)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		
g)	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		

- a, g) The rehabilitation activities would result in temporary construction emissions and fugitive dust and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of California's air quality or greenhouse gas plans or policies.
- b) Impacts associated with temporary construction emissions and fugitive dust will be further evaluated.
- c) The proposed rehabilitation activities in combination with other rehabilitation activities or projects in the vicinity of the rehabilitation sites could result in cumulative air quality impacts,

- depending on their implementation schedules. Cumulative impacts on air quality will be further evaluated.
- d) Recreationists and other sensitive receptors could be affected by temporary air quality impacts, such as from diesel emissions and exhaust, and these impacts will be further evaluated.
- e) The use of construction equipment would generate odors from exhaust fumes during rehabilitation activities, but the odors would dissipate quickly and would not have the potential to affect a substantial number of people.
- f) The rehabilitation activities would result in temporary emissions that would not contribute to regional greenhouse gas emissions or global climate change, as discussed in the Master EIR.

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, 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?		

- a) The rehabilitation activities could affect federally and state-listed species, other special-status plants or wildlife, or their habitat. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.
- b) The rehabilitation activities would involve activities in riparian habitat, including the removal of riparian habitat along the Trinity River and modifications to the floodplain. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.
- c) The rehabilitation activities would involve activities in wetlands and the Trinity River, a water of the United States. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.

- d) In-channel rehabilitation activities could impede movement of fish and other aquatic organisms through the rehabilitation sites. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed. No wildlife corridors or nursery sites are present; these topics are not further evaluated.
- e) The rehabilitation activities would not conflict with Trinity County policies for protecting biological resources.
- f) No habitat conservation plans or other similar types of plans apply to the rehabilitation activities or sites.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as identified in Section 15064.5?	$\boxtimes$	
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	$\boxtimes$	
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 formal cemeteries?		
e)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?		

- a, b) The rehabilitation activities could affect cultural resources associated with historic mining activities or other prior uses of the rehabilitation sites. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.
- c) The rehabilitation sites are not known to support unique paleontological or geologic resources.
- d) Although not expected, human remains may be encountered during rehabilitation activities. Further evaluation of this impact is necessary.
- e) Previous uses of the rehabilitation sites may have included tribal uses, and further evaluation of impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources is needed.

VI.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)		pose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, luding 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?		
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?		$\boxtimes$
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		$\boxtimes$
	iv)	Landslides?		$\boxtimes$

VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	$\boxtimes$	
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, creating substantial risks to life or property?		
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		
a)	The rehabilitation activities would not cause or contribute to seisn landslides.	nic-related hazar	ds or
b)	The rehabilitation activities would require soil excavation along the erosion. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.	ne floodplain and	l could increase
c)	Activities along the floodplain could influence geomorphic change conditions. Further evaluation of soil impacts is needed.	es along the rive	r, affecting soil
d)	The rehabilitation activities would not create risks to life or proper	rty due to expans	sive soils.
e)	The rehabilitation activities do not include the use of septic tanks	or wastewater sy	rstems.
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the	Further	No Further
	project:	Evaluation Needed	
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	$\boxtimes$	
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?		
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?		

VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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?		
a, b)	Some hazardous materials would be transported to the rehabilitation construction. Further evaluation of impacts associated with these		-
c–f)	The rehabilitation sites are not near schools, known hazardous site is located on an adjacent private property and is occasionally used not pose a hazard to activities in the project area.	•	
g)	The rehabilitation activities would not require lane or road closure interfere with emergency responses or evacuations in the area.	es or other activi	ties that could
h)	The rehabilitation activities would not increase the potential for w people or properties from wildfires based on their location along to		
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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 that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	$\boxtimes$	

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the

VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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 of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		$\boxtimes$
a)	The rehabilitation activities would take place along and in the Trir water quality. A detailed evaluation of impacts is needed.	nity River and co	ould affect
b)	The rehabilitation activities could affect the groundwater table. <i>A</i> is needed.	A detailed evalua	tion of impacts
c, d, h)	The rehabilitation activities would involve changes to the Trinity lincreased erosion downstream or modified drainage patterns along evaluation of impacts is needed.		
e)	The rehabilitation activities would not affect stormwater runoff in storm drainage facilities.	a manner that w	ould exceed
f)	The rehabilitation activities would involve grading that could incredischarge of storm water runoff. A detailed evaluation of impacts		potential
g, i, j)	The rehabilitation activities do not include housing and would not The rehabilitation sites are not prone to seiche, tsunami, or mudflo		s of flooding.
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Physically divide an established community?		$\boxtimes$
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?		
a)	The rehabilitation sites are not in an established community. They of the 1987 Junction City Community Plan, and private parcels in	•	-

are subject to this plan.

- b) Some of the rehabilitation activities would take place on lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and would need to comply with the Redding Resource Management Plan, as amended. Further evaluation of the consistency of the activities with the plan is needed.
- c) No habitat conservation plans or other similar types of plans apply to the rehabilitation activities or sites.

X.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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?	$\boxtimes$	
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?		

a, b) The southern portion of the Deep Gulch Rehabilitation Site overlaps with an active mining claim on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Further evaluation of impacts on the claim is needed.

XI.	NOISE — Would the project result in:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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?		
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 of 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?		

- a, b, d) The rehabilitation activities would result in temporary noise that could affect nearby recreationists or other sensitive receptors. A detailed evaluation of this impact is needed.
- c) The rehabilitation activities would not result in a permanent increase in noise levels.
- e, f) The rehabilitation sites are not near an airport, and use of the nearby private airstrip would not expose people to excessive noise levels based on its infrequent use.

XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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?		
a-c)	The rehabilitation activities would not affect population or housing	ng in Trinity Cou	inty.
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	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?		
a)	The rehabilitation activities would not affect public services in Tri	inity County.	
XIV.	RECREATION — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		
c)	Degrade the quality of recreation activities or impede the use of recreation areas?		
a, b)	The rehabilitation sites do not contain recreation facilities, and the not affect recreation facilities or parks in the county.	rehabilitation a	ctivities would

The Trinity River is used for various recreational purposes, and the rehabilitation activities could

affect recreational access or use of the river. A detailed evaluation of this impact is needed.

c)

XV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?		
d)	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?		
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		
a)	Increased truck and equipment traffic for the rehabilitation activities and highways. A detailed evaluation of this impact is necessary.	es could affect r	nearby roads
b)	Traffic associated with the rehabilitation activities would be tempo work day and would not change the level of service of nearby road		ic during the
c)	The rehabilitation activities would not affect air traffic.		
d)	The rehabilitation activities would not create traffic hazards.		
e)	The rehabilitation activities would include temporary access roads access to the river while not affecting emergency access outside the	-	
f)	All parking associated with the rehabilitation activities would be of parking on federal or private lands.	on-site and would	d not affect
g)	The rehabilitation activities would not affect alternative forms of t	ransportation.	
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		$\boxtimes$
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?		

XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:	Further Evaluation Needed	No Further Evaluation Needed
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?	$\boxtimes$	
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		

- a-e) The rehabilitation activities would not affect utilities or service systems in Trinity County.
- f) All excavated material and waste disposal associated with the rehabilitation activities would be on-site in designated spoils areas or at an approved landfill. The disposal of materials off-site will be further evaluated to ensure the disposal site can receive the material.
- g) All disposal of solid waste would comply with applicable statutes and regulations.

# **Appendix A2**

# Deep Gulch and Sheridan Creek Rehabilitation Project Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title: Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites: Deep Gulch

and Sheridan Creek (River Mile 81.6-82.9)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

550 Skylane Blvd., Suite A, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Gil Falcone, (707) 576-2830

4. Project Location: Junction City, Trinity County, California

5. Project Sponsor's Names: Bureau of Reclamation

Trinity River Restoration Program

6. General Plan Designation:

■ Trinity County General Plan – Open Space, Specific Unit Development, Scenic Conservation

BLM 1993 Redding Resource Management Plan — Other (Matrix)

7. **Zoning:** Open Space

8. Description of Project:

 See Chapter 2 of the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for the Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites: Deep Gulch and Sheridan Creek (River Mile 81.6-82.9) Project (EA/IS)

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: See Section 3.2.1 of the EA/IS

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Bureau of Land Management, Redding Field Office (special use permit)

- Trinity County Department of Transportation (Floodplain development permit, FEMA compliance)
- U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Clean Water Act, Section 404 compliance)

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

Printed Name		For the Lead Agency		
Signature		Date		
and certified, subsequ	ent projects which the lead agence bject to only limited environmen	15177, after a Master EIR <sup>1</sup> has been prepared by determines as being within the scope of the tal review. Mitigation measures from the Master		
potentially significant DECLARATION pure that earlier EIR or NE imposed upon the pro	effects (a) have been analyzed as suant to applicable standards, and GATIVE DECLARATION, incl posed project, nothing further is	•		
unless mitigated" imp an earlier document p measures based on the	act on the environment, but at leasursuant to applicable legal standa e earlier analysis as described on	ly significant impact" or "potentially significant ast one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in ards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL y the effects that remain to be addressed.		
ENVIRONMENTAL	IMPACT REPORT is required.	t effect on the environment, and an		
not be a significant ef	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there we not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.			
	d project COULD NOT have a s RATION will be prepared.	ignificant effect on the environment and a		
On the basis of this initial ev	valuation:			
DETERMINATION: (TO	BE COMPLETED BY T	HE LEAD AGENCY)		
Transportation/Traffic	Utilities/Service Systems	<ul><li>Mandatory Findings of Significance</li></ul>		
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation		
Land Use/Planning	Mineral Resources	Noise		
Biological Resources Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Cultural Resources Hazards & Hazardous Ma	Geology/Soils  Hydrology/Water Quality		
Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry			
		fected by this project, involving at least one ne checklist on the following pages.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2009. Channel rehabilitation and sediment management for remaining Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Master environmental impact report, environmental assessment/ environmental impact report. Trinity River Restoration Program. August 2009. SCH#2008032110

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Each of these environmental factors listed above was fully evaluated and one of the following four determinations was made:

- **No Impact:** No impact to the environment would occur as a result of implementing the proposed project.
- Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change to the environment and no mitigation is required.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** Implementation of the proposed project could result in an impact that has a "substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382).
- Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: A "potentially significant impact", as described above, that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of project-specific mitigation measures.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS — Would the project:				
Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$	
Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			$\boxtimes$	
Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				$\boxtimes$
	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime	AESTHETICS — Would the project:  Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime	AESTHETICS — Would the project:  Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime	AESTHETICS — Would the project: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime

#### **Discussion of Impacts**

- (a) Refer to section 3.4.2 of the EA/IS
- (b) Refer to section 3.4.2 of the EA/IS
- (c) Refer to section 3.4.2 of the EA/IS
- (d) Not Applicable

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures described in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.5-1a-1e], [4.5-2a-2c], [4.5-3a-3c], 4.5-1e] and [4.8-1a]

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	AGRICULTURAL 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 Department 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 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))?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
Discu	ussion of Impacts				
(a)	Not applicable				

(b)

Deep Gulch and Sheridan Creek Rehabilitation Sites Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

- (c) Not applicable
- (d) Not Applicable
- (e) Not Applicable

# **Mitigation Measures**

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?			$\boxtimes$	
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)?		$\boxtimes$		
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\boxtimes$
Disc	ussion of Impacts				
(a)	Refer to Section 3.7.2 of EA/IS				
(b)	Refer to Section 3.7.2 of EA/IS				
(c)	Refer to Section 3.7.2 of EA/IS				
(d)	Refer to Section 3.7.2 of EA/IS				
(e)	Not applicable				

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures described in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.11-a-1a], [4.11-2a]

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any 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?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		$\boxtimes$		
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?		$\boxtimes$		
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?		$\boxtimes$		
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
Disc	ussion of Impacts				
(a)	Refer to sections 3.12.2 and 3.13.2 of the EA/I	IS			
(b)	Refer to sections 3.12.2 and 3.13.2 of the EA/I	IS			
(c)	Refer to sections 3.12.2 and 3.13.2 of the EA/I	IS			
(d	Refer to sections 3.12.2 and 3.13.2 of the EA/I	IS			
(e)	Not applicable				
(f)	Not applicable				

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for fisheries described in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.6-1a, 1b], [4.6-4a-4e], [4.6-4f], [4.6-5b], and EC FR-5 [4.6a-6d].

See CEQA mitigation measures for vegetation, wildlife and wetlands described in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.3-2b], [4.7-1a], [4.7-7 a-d], [4.7-8a-d], [4.7-9a-c], [4.7-5a-d], [4.7-6a-e], [4.7-13a-g], and [4.7-1b].

		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 identified in Section 15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
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 formal cemeteries?		$\boxtimes$		

- (a) Not applicable
- (b) Not applicable
- (c) Not applicable
- (d) Refer to Section 3.5.2 of the EA/IS

## **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for cultural resources in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.10-2a] and [4.10-2a].

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\boxtimes$
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				$\boxtimes$
	iv) Landslides?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
c)	Be located on strata 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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
Discu	ussion of Impacts				
(ai)	Not applicable				
(aii)	Not applicable				
(aiii)	Not applicable				
(aiv)	Not applicable				
(b)	Refer to Section 3.9.2 of the EA/IS				

Deep Gulch and Sheridan Creek Rehabilitation Sites Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

- (c) Not applicable
- (d) Not applicable
- (e) Not applicable

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for geomorphology and soil resources in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.3-2a] and [4.3-2b].

VII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			$\boxtimes$	

- (a) Refer to Section 3.7.2 of the EA/IS
- (b) Refer to Section 3.7.2 of the EA/IS

## **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for air quality in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.11-a-1a] and [4.11-2a].

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

(a-h) Hazards to the public were addressed in the 2009 Master EIR, and no issues were identified. Indirect public health or safety concerns are addressed under air quality, noise, recreation, and transportation and traffic.

## **Mitigation Measures**

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 should 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 of 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 storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		$\boxtimes$		
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?			$\boxtimes$	
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
j)	Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				<b>⊠</b> -

- (a) Refer to Section 3.11.2 of EA/IS
- (b) Not Applicable
- (c) Refer to Section 3.11.2 of EA/IS
- (d) Refer to Section 3.11.2 of EA/IS
- (e) Refer to Section 3.11.2 of EA/IS
- (f) Refer to Section 3.11.2 of EA/IS
- (g) Refer to Section 3.10.2 of EA/IS
- (h) Refer to Section 3.10.2 of EA/IS
- (i) Refer to Section 3.10.2 of EA/IS
- (j) Not applicable

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for water quality in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.5-1a, b], [4.5-1c], [4.5-1d], [4.5-1e, 4.5-2a-2c], [4.5-3a-3c] [4.11-a-1a] and [4.11-2a].

No mitigation required for Hydrology and Flooding.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Х.	LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$

(a-c) Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the EA/IS

## **Mitigation Measures**

XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\boxtimes$

(a, b) Refer to Section 3.9 of the EA/IS

## **Mitigation Measures**

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		$\boxtimes$		
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 of 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?				
Discu	ussion of Impacts				
(a)	Refer to Section 3.8.2 of the EA/IS				
(b)	Refer to Section 3.8.2 of the EA/IS				
(c)	Not applicable				
(d)	Refer to Section 3.8.2 of the EA/IS				
(e)	Not applicable				
(f)	Not applicable				

#### **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for noise in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.14-1a] and [4.14-1b].

XIII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

(a-c) No populations would be affected, nor would replacement housing be required.

## **Mitigation Measures**

<b>.</b>		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:				
a)	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?				$\boxtimes$
	Parks?				$\boxtimes$
	Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$

(a) Public services were addressed in the Master EIR, and no issues associated with the increased demand or disruption of public services was identified. Access-related issues are addressed under transportation and traffic.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

XV.	RECREATION —	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

(a, b) Refer to Section 3.3.2 of the EA/IS

#### **Mitigation Measures**

Not applicable to listed impacts, however the EA/IS does include CEQA mitigation measures to address water quality related to recreational use of the Wild and Scenic River: [4.5-1a-1e], [4.5-2a – 2c], [4.5-3a-3c], and [4.5-1e].

Less than

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	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 standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d)	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				$\boxtimes$
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		$\boxtimes$		
f)	Conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				
Discu	ussion of Impacts				
(a)	Not applicable				
(b)	Not applicable				
(c)	Refer to Section 3.6.2 of the EA/IS				
(d)	Not applicable				
(e)	Refer to Section 3.6.2 of the EA/IS				
(f)	Not applicable				

## **Mitigation Measures**

See CEQA mitigation measures for traffic and transportation in Appendix B of the EA/IS: [4.16-2a] and [4.16-5a].

		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?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
Discı	ssion of Impacts				
(a)	Not applicable				
(b)	Not applicable				
(c)	Not applicable				
(d)	Refer to Section 2.1.15 and Appendix B (Proj	ect Design	Elements) of	the EA/IS	
(e)	Not applicable				
(f)	Not Applicable				
(g)	Refer to Appendix B (Project Design Element	ts) of the EA	A/IS		

# **Mitigation Measures**

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI	II. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
(To l	be filled out by Lead Agency if required)				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of 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)?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
Disc	ussion				
(a)	Refer to Sections 3.12.2, 3.13.2 and 3.5.2 of t	the EA/IS			
(b)	Refer to Chapter 4 of the EA/IS				
(c)	Refer to Chapters 3 and 4 of the EA/IS				