

Culvert Rehabilitation Project

State Routes 1, 20, and 101 in Mendocino County

01-MEN-1, 20, 101-Various Locations

EA 01-36432

Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration



Prepared by the
State of California Department of Transportation

January 2010



General Information About This Document

What's in this document?

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has prepared this Initial Study, which examines the potential environmental impacts of alternatives being considered for the proposed project located in Mendocino County, California. The document describes the proposed project, the existing environment that could be affected by the project, potential impacts from the project, and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

What should you do?

- Please read this Initial Study. Additional copies of this document as well as the technical studies are available for review at the Caltrans District 3 Office of Environmental Management, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901 and the Mendocino County Library, 499 Laurel Street, Fort Bragg, CA 95437.
- We welcome your comments. If you have any concerns regarding the proposed project, please send your written comments to Caltrans by March 8, 2010. Submit comments via U.S. mail to Caltrans at the following address:

Sandra Rosas, Senior Environmental Planner
Environmental Management Branch M-2
California Department of Transportation
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901

- Submit comments via email to: sandra_rosas@dot.ca.gov.
- Submit comments by the deadline: March 8, 2010.

What happens next?

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, Caltrans may 1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, 2) perform additional environmental studies, or 3) abandon the project. If the project is given environmental approval and funding is appropriated, Caltrans could design and construct all or part of the project.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, large print, on audiocassette, or computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to Caltrans, Attn: Sandra Rosas, Senior Environmental Planner, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901; (530) 741-4017 Voice, or use the California Relay Service TTY number, 1-800-735-2929.

Culvert Rehabilitation Project
State Routes 1, 20, and 101 in Mendocino County
01-MEN-1, 20, 101-Various Locations
EA 01-36432

INITIAL STUDY with Proposed Negative Declaration

Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, California Resources Code
(Federal) 42 USC 4332(2)(C)

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Transportation

January 25, 2010

Date of Approval



John Webb, Chief

North Region Environmental Services
California Department of Transportation

Proposed Negative Declaration

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to rehabilitate 49 culverts on State Routes (SR) 1, 20, and 101 in Mendocino County. The project proposes to remove and replace or rehabilitate culverts along SR 1 between post mile (PM) 3.87 near the town of Anchor Bay and PM 47.19 near the town of Little River; on SR 20 between PM 13.76 near Fort Bragg and PM 31.99 west of Willits; and on SR 101 at PM 48.90 north of Willits. Other proposed work includes replacing or adding drainage inlet and outlet features at these locations.

Determination

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study for this project and, pending public review and comments, expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

- The project would have minimal or no effect on aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazardous materials, land use, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation, traffic patterns, and utilities.
- Potential impacts to storm water and water quality would be avoided or minimized through the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures.
- Potential impacts to Point Arena mountain beaver (*Aplodontia rufa nigra*), California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), Central California Coast coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), California Coastal Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), Northern California steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS) (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), and migratory birds would be avoided or minimized through the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures.
- Impacts to waters of the U. S. and waters of the State would be offset through the restoration of the project area to pre-project conditions.

John Webb, Chief
North Region Environmental Services
California Department of Transportation

Date

Initial Study

Project Title

Culvert Rehabilitation Project

Lead Agency Name and Address

State of California Department of Transportation - Caltrans
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901

Contact Person

Sandra Rosas, Senior Environmental Planner
Environmental Management Branch M-2

Project Location

The project is located on State Route (SR) 1 between the towns of Anchor Bay and Little River; SR 20 between Fort Bragg and Willits; and SR 101 north of Willits in Mendocino County.

Project Sponsor's Name and Address

State of California Department of Transportation - Caltrans
John Webb, Chief
North Region Office of Environmental Services
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to rehabilitate damaged and substandard culverts that convey storm water under the roadway and to reduce the likelihood of culvert failure during future storm events.

Description of Project

Caltrans proposes to rehabilitate 49 culverts on SR 1, 20, and 101 in Mendocino County. The project proposes to remove and replace or rehabilitate culverts along SR 1 between post mile (PM) 3.87 near the town of Anchor Bay and PM 47.19 near the town of Little River; on SR 20 between PM 13.76 near Fort Bragg and PM 31.99 west of Willits; and on SR 101 at PM 48.90 north of Willits. Other proposed work includes replacing or adding drainage inlet and outlet features at these locations.

The majority of the culverts proposed for rehabilitation will be replaced with similar sized alternative pipe culverts using half-width trenching construction, which involves trenching across one-half of the roadway while maintaining one-way traffic by keeping the other lane(s) open. Three culverts will be rehabilitated, by inserting high-density polyethylene plastic pipe liners into the existing culverts on SR 1 at PM 4.11 and 8.01 and on SR 20 at PM 27.32.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Land use within the project vicinity includes farming, scattered communities, rural residential, recreational use, and commercial timberlands.

Permits and Approvals Needed

The following environmental permits are required for this project:

- Section 404 permit from U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for work in jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U. S.
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Section 1602 Stream and Lakebed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game.
- Concurrence with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect Determination from U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act.
- Concurrence with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect Determination from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries under Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act.
- Coastal Development Permit from the County of Mendocino.

These permits/concurrences may contain restrictions or additional mitigation measures that would be incorporated into the project.

Zoning

The project is located within the coastal zone and areas that are designated under the 2009 Mendocino County General Plan as forest land, public land, range land, and remote residential.

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
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards and 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

Impacts Checklist

The impacts checklist starting on the next page identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act impact levels include “potentially significant impact,” “less than significant impact with mitigation,” “less than significant impact,” and “no impact.”

A brief explanation of each California Environmental Quality Act checklist determination follows each checklist item. The checklist is followed by a focused discussion of the biological and water quality/storm water issues as they are related to this project.

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS — Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Hydro-seeding/mulching will be used where necessary to minimize storm water impacts.

- 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 that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

“No Impact” determination in this section is based on the Visual Impact Assessment, July 2007.

II. AGRICULTURE 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. 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) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the Air Quality Analysis, January 2010.

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Impacts in this section are based on the Natural Environmental Study (NES), December 2009. Discussion of impacts is included in the “Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation” section of this Initial Study.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on a review the Historic Property Survey Report, March 2005.

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:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

iv) Landslides?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite 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?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based the scope and location of the project.

VII. 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 that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

“No Impact” determination in this section is based on review an Initial Site Assessment, July 2009. Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Aerially Deposited Lead are present within the project limits. Impacts will be avoided through with the use of Standard Special Provisions 15-027 and 19-910, and Specification 5-750.

VIII. 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 that 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?

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 that would result in flooding on- or offsite?

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?

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?

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that 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) Result in inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the Water Quality Analysis, December 2009.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

X. 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?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

XI. 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?

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the Noise Analysis, January 2010.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES —

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?

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

XIV. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on conversations with Project Engineer, July 2009.

XVI. UTILITY 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 that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

“No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope and location of the project.

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. 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 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------