

**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**DATE:** April 10, 2019

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Monowitz, Community Development Director

**SUBJECT:** INFORMATIONAL ITEM: California Environmental Quality Act  
Guidelines Update

County File Number: PLN 2019-00123

**PROPOSAL**

Passed in 1970, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) codified a statewide policy of environmental protection and requires all state and local agencies to consider the effects of projects on the environment, to provide environmental protections through mitigation and avoidance, and allow the public to comment on such impacts. The CEQA Guidelines (Guidelines) are the administrative regulations implementing CEQA which include a step-by-step guide to the environmental review process (e.g., Initial Study Checklist).

The State has undertaken a comprehensive five-year update to the Guidelines resulting in technical, substantive, and efficiency improvements (i.e., consistency with legislative changes, court decisions, and rules governing the CEQA process while eliminating duplicative analysis). The updated State Guidelines were approved on December 28, 2018. Local jurisdictions must comply with the amendments within 120 days following the State's approval, by April 28, 2019.

The purpose of the Information Item is to provide the Planning Commission with an overview of the modifications made to the County's Implementation Procedures for Adminstrating the California Environmental Quality Act (Procedures) and Initial Study Checklist (Checklist) resulting from the update and to inform the Commission that environmental documents drafted prior to the April date may continue to be processed using the prior Procedures and Checklist. Projects for which environmental documents are yet to be drafted will utilize the updated Procedures and Checklist.

**BACKGROUND**

Report Prepared By: Melissa Ross, Senior Planner, 650/599-1559

Location: Countywide (Unincorporated)

Environmental Evaluation: Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3): *The activity is covered by the common sense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.*

## **DISCUSSION**

### A. PREVIOUS COUNTY ACTION

On February 26, 2013, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution, amending the San Mateo County Implementing Procedures for Administrating the California Environmental Quality Act and adopted a new Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist. As part of the County's Implementing Procedures, the State's CEQA Guidelines (including the Initial Study Checklist) are incorporated by reference. Thus, amendments to the County's Procedures and Checklist resulting from State amendments do not require a separate Board action.

### B. SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

#### *Procedures*

In amending the Guidelines, the State has provided additional clarification on criteria for analysis of thresholds of significance, transportation impacts, and greenhouse gas emissions, among others, that the County must consider when drafting environmental documents. These modifications are incorporated into the County's Procedures and will be considered and addressed by staff when completing the revised Initial Study Checklist for environmental documents that have yet to be drafted.

Due to document length, the following link is provided for further information regarding the modifications to the State Guidelines (California Natural Resources Agency):

[http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/2018\\_CEQA\\_FINAL\\_TEXT\\_122818.pdf](http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/2018_CEQA_FINAL_TEXT_122818.pdf)

A brief summary of these modifications is outlined below along with the CEQA section number for reference.

*Thresholds of Significance.* When using established thresholds, the County must discuss compliance with such threshold. In addition, *compliance with the threshold does not relieve a lead agency of the obligation to consider substantial evidence indicating that the project's environmental effects may still be significant.* [CEQA Section 15064]

*Transportation Impacts.* New section that replaces Level of Service with Vehicle Miles Traveled for transportation analysis resulting from Senate Bill 743 (2013) and identifies that, with exception to roadway capacity transportation projects, *a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact.* Additionally, *projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.*  
 [CEQA Section 15064.3]

*Greenhouse Gas Emissions.* Analysis of a project's reasonably foreseeable incremental contribution to the effects of climate change. *A lead agency may consider a project's consistency with the State's long-term climate goals or strategies* as well as an adopted local plan to which the lead agency has discretion to select the most appropriate model or methodology.  
 [CEQA Section 15064.4]

*Initial Study Checklist*

The following table summarizes the changes to the County's Initial Study Checklist resulting from the State's updates. Checklist questions previously adopted that discuss environmental impacts/resources specific to San Mateo County have been retained (e.g., *For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?*)

Initial Study Checklist Modifications Summary		
Section	Category	Modifications
All	Document-wide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where identified, replaced <i>significant</i> with <i>substantial</i></li> <li>- Where identified, section headers and numbering updated.</li> <li>- Minor grammatical modifications (e.g., <i>State to state</i>)</li> </ul>
1	Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification of non-urbanized areas and impacts on existing visual character and quality of public views, as opposed to private views.</li> <li>- Explanation of public views as experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.</li> <li>- In urbanized areas, analysis of regulations governing scenic quality is added.</li> </ul>
2	Agricultural and Forest Resources	No modifications.
3	Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of duplicative analysis regarding violations of air quality standards while retaining compliance with applicable air quality plan and project generation of non-attainment criteria pollutant.</li> <li>- Analysis of <i>other emissions</i> resulting in odors added.</li> </ul>
4	Biological Resources	- Removal of qualifier that federally protected wetlands are defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act but retaining the provision to protect federally protected wetlands as well as adding state protected wetlands.
5	Cultural Resources	No substantial modifications (relocation of geologic resource question to Section 7).
6	Energy [New Section]	- Addition of two questions regarding potentially significant impacts of inefficient energy resource consumption during project construction or

		operation, and conflict or obstruction of a state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan.
7	Geology and Soils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Modification of language from exposure <i>of people or structures</i> to the project's <i>direct or indirect cause</i> of potential adverse seismic, liquefaction, landslides, erosion, or cliff/bluff instability effects.</li> <li>- Additional question regarding <i>directly or indirectly destroying a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature</i>.</li> </ul>
8	Climate Change	No modifications.
9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional language to include impacts of <i>excessive noise</i> on people residing or working in the project area when located within an adopted airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport.</li> <li>- <i>Removal</i> of references to wildland fires and inclusion of that analysis in Section 20 [new section].</li> </ul>
10	Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional language regarding the project effects on surface or ground water quality, ground water supplies, sustainable groundwater basin management, and alteration of drainage patterns through additional impervious surface.</li> <li>- Addition of two questions regarding <i>flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation and conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan</i>.</li> </ul>
11	Land Use and Planning	Removal of repetitive language
12	Mineral Resources	No modifications.
13	Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expanding on potential noise levels in excess of established standards, to include <i>temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project</i>.</li> <li>- Expanding the public airport/public use airport to also include the <i>vicinity of a private airstrip</i>.</li> </ul>
14	Population and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification of population growth in an area to a <i>substantial unplanned population growth in an area</i>.</li> <li>- Expanding analysis of <i>low or moderate income housing</i> to the displacement of <i>substantial numbers of existing people or housing</i>.</li> </ul>
15	Public Services	No modifications.
16	Recreation	No modifications.
17	Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of repetitive language and clarifying analysis to focus on comprehensive circulation system program, ordinance, or policy.</li> <li>- Removal of analysis of a congestion management program and, instead, consistency with CEQA Section 15064.3(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts which bases a project's transportation impacts on Vehicle Miles Traveled, instead of Level of Service, and proximity to an existing major transit stop/high quality transit corridor.</li> </ul>
18	Tribal Cultural Resources	No modifications.
19	Utilities and Service Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expanding analysis of new water or wastewater treatment to include relocation and expansion of water, wastewater, storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.</li> <li>- Expanding water supply availability analysis to include <i>reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years</i>.</li> <li>- Removal of landfill capacity serving the project to the project's <i>generation of solid waste in excess of State or location standards, or in excess of local infrastructure capacity, or impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals</i>.</li> </ul>
20	Wildfire [New Section]	- New section added to address project's proximity to state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.

		- Questions include the project's impacts on: <i>adopted emergency plans/emergency evacuation plan; increased wildfire risks due to slope or prevailing winds thus exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled wildfire; require the installation of associated infrastructure (e.g., fuel breaks)</i>
21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	No modifications.
N/A	Responsible Agencies List	- Added State Department of Fish and Wildlife to agency list.
N/A	Mitigation Measures and Determination	No modifications.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3): *The activity is covered by the common sense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.*

D. REVIEWING AGENCIES

County Counsel

ATTACHMENTS

A. Revised Initial Study Checklist

MAR:ann – MARDD0142\_WNU.DOCX



**County of San Mateo - Planning and Building Department**

# **ATTACHMENT A**

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

**INITIAL STUDY  
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST**  
(To Be Completed by Planning Department)

1. **Project Title:**
2. **County File Number:**
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
5. **Project Location:**
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:**
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):**
9. **General Plan Designation:**
10. **Zoning:**
11. **Description of the Project:** *(Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)*
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:**
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** *(NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2.). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality).*

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Significant Unless Mitigated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Energy		Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Air Quality		Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation
	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Climate Change		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Cultural Resources		Noise		Wildfire
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Mandatory Findings of Significance

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an



earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a. **Earlier Analysis Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. **Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances).** Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  7. **Supporting Information Sources.** Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i><b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b></i>	<i><b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b></i>	<i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i>	<i><b>No Impact</b></i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change				

<p>in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>1.d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				

<p><b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> 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:</p>				
	<i><b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b></i>	<i><b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b></i>	<i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i>	<i><b>No Impact</b></i>
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, 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?			
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>Source:</b></p>				
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?			
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>Source:</b></p>				
2.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 or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?			
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>Source:</b></p>				
2.d.	For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?			

<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
2.f.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (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))?  <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>			
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
		<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
3.a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					
3.b.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					

<b>Source:</b>				
3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.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>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands				

(including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				

<b>6. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.				
<b>Discussion:</b>				

**Source:**

**7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
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?  <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>				

**Discussion:**

**Source:**

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:**

**Source:**

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				
--	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:**

**Source:**

iv. Landslides?				
-----------------	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:**

**Source:**

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?  <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future,</i>				
--	--	--	--	--



<i>potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
7.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, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
7.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?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>8. CLIMATE CHANGE.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.f. Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped				

on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
9.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<p>9.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?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b></p>				
<p>9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</p>				

<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
9.j. 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?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
	<i><b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b></i>	<i><b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b></i>	<i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i>	<i><b>No Impact</b></i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				

<b>Source:</b>					
10.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					
10.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a.	Physically divide an established community?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					
11.b.	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					
11.f.	Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				
<b>Discussion:</b>					
<b>Source:</b>					

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
12.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?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>13. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
13.e. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been				



adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned 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>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?				
15.b. Police protection?				
15.c. Schools?				

15.d. Parks?				
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>16. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>17. TRANSPORTATION.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				

<b>Source:</b>				
17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i> ?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<b><i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i></b>	<b><i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i></b>	<b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b>	<b><i>No Impact</i></b>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				

**Discussion:**  
**Source:**

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)				
--	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:**  
**Source:**

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.b. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				

**Discussion:**  
**Source:**

19.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
--	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:**  
**Source:**

19.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?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
19.f. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
19.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				

<b>20. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
	<i><b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b></i>	<i><b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b></i>	<i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i>	<i><b>No Impact</b></i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
<b>Discussion:</b> <b>Source:</b>				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				

<b>Source:</b>				
20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
21.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.)				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				
22.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
<b>Source:</b>				

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES.** Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District			
Caltrans			
City			
California Coastal Commission			
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)			
Other: _____			
Regional Water Quality Control Board			
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)			
Sewer/Water District:			
State Department of Fish and Wildlife			
State Department of Public Health			
State Water Resources Control Board			
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)			
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)			
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service			

<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.		
Other mitigation measures are needed.		
The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:		

**DETERMINATION** (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.

\_\_\_\_\_

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_ND - Initial Study Checklist (04-03-19).dotx