

# **APPENDIX A**

## **CEQA Initial Study Environmental Checklist**

---

## REGULATORY GUIDANCE

A CEQA Environmental Checklist (Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines [14 CCR Sections 15000-15387]) for the Proposed Project has been prepared and is provided below. Detailed descriptions of the physical environment and existing conditions that could be affected by the Proposed Project, as well as the environmental consequences, including cumulative and growth-inducing effects, consistent with CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR §15063 (d)(3)) are included in the separate Draft EA/IS. Chapters 3 and 4 of the Draft EA/IS provide the explanations of responses made to the questions on the environmental checklist. Chapter 2 describes measures that have been incorporated into the Proposed Project to avoid or reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Reference to the appropriate resource discussions presented in the Draft EA/IS and the determinations of potential impacts also are provided in the CEQA Environmental Checklist below.

The following terminology is used to evaluate the level of significance of the Environmental Checklist impact topics:

- ❑ A finding of *no impact* is made when the analysis concludes that the proposed project would not affect the environment with respect to the resource at issue, relative to the basis of comparison.
- ❑ An impact is considered *less than significant* if the analysis concludes that there would be no substantial adverse change in the environment, relative to the basis of comparison, and that no mitigation is needed.
- ❑ An impact is considered *less than significant with mitigation* if the analysis concludes that there would be no substantial adverse change in the environment, relative to the basis of comparison, with the incorporation of the mitigation measures into the proposed project (identified in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of the Draft EA/IS).
- ❑ An impact is considered *potentially significant* if the analysis concludes that there could be a substantial adverse effect on the environment.

An initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, an EIR must be prepared if an initial study indicates that the proposed project under review may have a significant impact on the environment. A Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead, if the lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons why the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore, why it does not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, subdivision (a), a Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when

*"[t]he initial study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment[.]"* Under subdivision (b) of section 15070, a Mitigated Declaration shall be prepared when"

[t]he initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but...

[r]evisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid

the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur and...

[t]here is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.”

## CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

The information provided below is based on the environmental checklist form that is provided in Appendix G of the 2013 CEQA Guidelines.

1. Project Title: M&T Chico Ranch/Llano Seco Rancho Fish Screen Facility Short-term Protection Project
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Ms. Katherine Hill, (916) 358-2935
4. Project Location:  
The M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility is located immediately downstream of the confluence of Big Chico Creek and the Sacramento River, on the east bank of the Sacramento River just south of the Bidwell-Sacramento River State Park at RM 193, approximately six miles southwest of the City of Chico. The Project Area includes areas upstream, adjacent to, and immediately downstream of the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility, and is located in both Glenn and Butte counties. A portion of the Proposed Action/Project also would be located on the Capay Unit of the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge (SRNWR), and what is now The Nature Conservancy’s Stile property immediately south of the Capay Unit. See Chapter 2, Project Description for additional project location information.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:

M&T Chico Ranch 3964 Chico River Road Chico, CA 95928	Llano Seco Rancho P.O. Box 1039 Chico, CA 95927
---	---
6. General Plan Designation:
  - Butte County – Agriculture and Open Water
  - Glenn County – Public Use and Institutions
7. Zoning:
  - Butte County – Agriculture
  - Glenn County – Agricultural Preserve Zone and Farmland Security Zone

---

8. Description of Project:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), along with the M&T Chico Ranch and Llano Seco Rancho, are proposing to implement interim measures to protect and maintain the viability of the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility to meet existing CDFW and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) fish screen criteria and to deliver a reliable water supply to farmland, Federal wildlife management areas, and a CDFW wildlife area. These areas include the eastern portion of the Llano Seco Rancho, which is under conservation easement and is served by the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility. The facility provides Sacramento River water to wetlands and associated habitats owned or managed by USFWS, CDFW and Llano Seco Rancho, which creates wetland habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other wetland-dependent and special-status species. In addition, rice fields owned by CDFW are flooded annually during the fall, providing an energy supply for waterfowl and irrigated pasture provides habitat for sandhill crane and other species.

Sediment deposition has posed, and continues to pose, a threat to the normal operation of the existing M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility and the City of Chico's wastewater treatment plant outfall. As a result of continued sediment deposition in the vicinity of the intake screens on the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility, there is an imminent threat of inundation by encroaching sediment and the ability to maintain sufficient sweeping velocities parallel to the screen, which would render the screens out of compliance with CDFW and NMFS fish screen criteria, and potentially result in adverse impacts to anadromous salmonids in the Sacramento River and/or impacts to water deliveries by the ranches. Additionally, although river meander away from the pumping facility is being controlled by the temporary rock-toe and tree revetment that was installed during 2007, the continued presence of the revetment is necessary until further technical and environmental evaluations are completed to determine whether this short-term measure should be incorporated as part of a long-term solution. A Federal action would be required to authorize the continued presence of the temporary revetment on the USFWS Capay Unit and the Stile property, as well as activities that may be required to maintain the revetment, until a long-term solution is developed and completed.

The Proposed Project includes: (1) a time extension for the continued presence of the rock-toe and tree revetment on the USFWS Capay Unit of the SRNWR and TNC fee title property until a long-term solution is developed and completed; (2) ongoing maintenance of the revetment; and (3) implementation of an additional maintenance dredging operation. These measures in concert are intended to sustain the viability of the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps Facility, including meeting existing fish screen criteria, and water supply and delivery responsibilities.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project setting is located in both Glenn and Butte counties, just west of the confluence of Big Chico Creek on the Sacramento River. The setting area is rural and surrounded by agricultural lands, a national wildlife refuge, a California State park, and undeveloped land (Figure 1-1 in the Draft EA/IS provides a project vicinity map).

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

Chapter 6 of the Draft EA/IS describes the Federal and State laws which have directed, limited or guided the NEPA and CEQA analyses and decision-making associated with the Proposed Project. Development of the Proposed Project has been coordinated with the following public agencies, non-governmental organizations, and interested/affected parties:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Boating and Waterways
- California State Lands Commission
- California State Parks
- California Department of Water Resources
- City of Chico
- Butte County Air Quality Management District
- Glenn County Air Pollution Control District
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Ducks Unlimited
- The Nature Conservancy
- Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
- Sacramento River Preservation Trust

**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.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing                | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance   |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Katherine A Hill  
Signature

12/13/13  
Date

Katherine A Hill  
Printed Name

CDFW  
For

---

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

See Section 3.8 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Aesthetic Resources associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.10 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.3, Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and Section 3.4, Terrestrial Resources (Botanical and Wildlife) of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Biological Resources associated with the Proposed Action/Project. Also see the discussion regarding biological resources that is provided in Section XVIII – Mandatory Findings of Significance of this checklist.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.9 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Cultural Resources associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

### 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.	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion

See Section 3.7 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Geology, Geomorphology, and Soils associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

## VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

See Section 3.10 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

## 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.11 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.6 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

### X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

### XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

### 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.13 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Noise associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

## XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

## XV. RECREATION AND NAVIGATION SAFETY – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

See Section 3.5 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Recreation and Navigation Safety associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

See Section 3.12 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential impacts to Traffic and Circulation associated with the Proposed Action/Project.

### **XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

None required (see Section 3.2 – Resources Not Evaluated in Detail of the Draft EA/IS).

### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Discussion

Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in long-term impacts on the quality of the environment, including fisheries resources, wildlife, and plant species (including special-status species), or prehistoric or historic cultural resources. However, the Proposed Project does have the potential to result in minor, temporary adverse effects that could degrade the quality of the environment. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project would result in temporary impacts to air quality in Butte and Glenn Counties that could be potentially significant. Although impacts on other environmental resources are expected to be less than significant, environmental commitments are nonetheless proposed for several other resources to ensure that any potential impacts remain less than significant. These environmental resources include cultural resources, fisheries resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, terrestrial resources and traffic. For all resources, the identified potential impacts are considered less than significant with implementation of the BMPs, environmental commitments and mitigation measures identified in the Draft EA/IS. For a comprehensive discussion of potentially affected species and habitats within the Project Area, as well as proposed environmental commitments and mitigation measures that are incorporated into the Proposed Project, please refer to the Draft EA/IS.

With respect to the inquiries set forth in item XIII(a) above, a comprehensive discussion of potentially affected species and habitats within the Project Area, technical analyses and related environmental commitments that are incorporated into the Proposed Project is presented in Section 3.3 – Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and in Section 3.4 – Terrestrial Resources (Botanical and Wildlife). See Section 3.9 – Cultural Resources for a discussion of prehistoric or historic cultural resources. By implementing the protective measures designed to avoid and minimize project-related effects, potential impacts to biological resources and cultural resources would clearly be reduced to less than significant levels.

For analysis relevant to the inquiries set forth in item XIII(b) above, see Chapter 4 of the Draft EA/IS for the discussion of potential cumulative and growth inducing impacts associated with the Proposed Project, as summarized below.

- In consideration of both construction-related and habitat alteration effects, the Proposed Project will have a less-than-significant impact to fisheries and terrestrial biological resources.
- Although air quality emissions modeling suggests that an air quality threshold (NO<sub>x</sub>) would be exceeded under the Proposed Project prior to mitigation, implementation of the environmental commitments and the mitigation measure identified in Section 3.10.4 would clearly reduce potential NO<sub>x</sub>-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- In the event of an unanticipated discovery of a historic or cultural resource during construction activities, the Proposed Project has a potential to impact cultural resources and to uncover

unknown or undocumented buried cultural resources. With implementation of the environmental commitments identified in Section 3.9.4, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project is not cumulatively considerable with respect to cultural resources and is therefore less than significant.

- ❑ Because the Proposed Project would implement site-specific mitigation consistent with the CWA and RWQCB programs, the incremental effect of the Proposed Action/Project on water quality is not cumulatively considerable and therefore is considered a less than significant impact.

Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts that are individually or cumulatively considerable. Potential project effects are temporary and construction-related, and all potential impacts would be less than significant or clearly reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation incorporated as part of the Proposed Project. No impacts would result in a substantial contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

Information relevant to item XIII(c) above is discussed throughout the environmental document, with the specific resource evaluations presented in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA/IS. The Proposed Project does have the potential to result in minor, temporary adverse effects on human beings from increased noise, dust, and traffic during construction. However, these potential impacts are considered less than significant because the impacts would be temporary and would be mitigated with the BMPs, environmental commitment and additional mitigation measures identified in the Draft EA/IS. Therefore, as discussed in Chapter 3, the Proposed Project will not induce environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.