

REVISED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CITY OF HIGHLAND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: HOUSING ELEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY & ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT, AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT



Prepared for:

City of Highland
27215 Base Line
Highland, CA 92346
Contact: Lawrence A. Mainez

Prepared by:



3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Suite C310
Ontario, CA 91764

DECEMBER 2021

1. Introduction

This document is the Revised Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration for the City of Highland General Plan Amendment: Housing Element, Public Health, Safety, and Environmental Justice Element, and Circulation Element. This document incorporates, by reference, the Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration for the City of Highland General Plan Amendment: Housing Element, Public Health, Safety, and Environmental Justice Element, dated October 2021 and outlines the additions to constitute the Revised Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration. As outlined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15073.5 (c)(4), revisions to a negative declaration are not required to be recirculated if “new information is added to the negative declaration which merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to the negative declaration.” The revisions added to the October 2021 Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration enclosed herein, include only minor deletions to the Circulation Element of the General Plan and constitute “insignificant modifications to the negative declaration,” that do not identify any new significant environmental impacts. Revisions to add text to the Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration are shown in underline and removed text is shown in ~~striketrough~~.

2. Project Description

In addition to the Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration for the City of Highland General Plan Amendment: Housing Element, Public Health, Safety, and Environmental Justice Element Project Description, the following addition is made in this Revised Draft Initial Study/ Negative Declaration for the following minor amendments to the Circulation Element of the City of Highland General Plan:

Page 3-31, ***Roadway Classification Consistency with Other Agencies***

San Bernardino County, the City of San Bernardino and the City of Redlands have different functional classifications for some of the roadway segments illustrated on the City of Highland proposed General Plan. The roadway segments with different functional classifications include:

- Del Rosa Drive between 3rd Street and Base Line;
- Del Rosa Avenue between 3rd Street and Pacific Street;
- Palm Avenue between Base Line and Pacific Street;
- 5th Street between Shirley Avenue and Palm Avenue;
- Base Line between Church Avenue and Boulder Avenue
- 3rd Street between Sterling Avenue and Church Avenue;
- Boulder Avenue between Highland Avenue and Orange Street
- ~~Cone Camp Road extension, and~~
- ~~Greenspot Road extension to Bryant Avenue.~~

Table 3.3 shows the roadway segments with different functional classifications

among different jurisdictions.

Page 3-32, **Table 3.3: General Plan Circulation Element Comparison**

Table 3.3: General Plan Circulation Element Comparison						
Street	From	To	City of Highland General Plan Designation	City of SB General Plan Designation	City of Redlands General Plan Designation	County of SB General Plan Designation
Del Rosa Drive	3 rd Street	Base Line	Secondary Highway (4D)	Major Arterial (6D)	N/A	Major Highway (4D)
Del Rosa Avenue	3 rd Street	Base Line	Collector Street (2U)	Not Shown	N/A	Secondary Highway (4U)
Palm Avenue	Base Line	Pacific Street	Special Collector (2U)	Major Arterial (6D)	N/A	Major Highway (4D)
5 th Street	Shirley Avenue	Palm Avenue	Major Highway (4D)	Major Arterial (6D)	N/A	Major Highway (4D)
Base Line	Church Avenue	Boulder Avenue	Primary Arterial (6D)	Major Arterial (6D)	N/A	Major Highway (4D)
3 rd Street	Sterling Avenue	Church Avenue	Major Highway (4D)	Major Arterial (6D)	N/A	Not Proposed
Boulder Avenue	Highland Avenue	Orange Avenue	Modified Primary Arterial (6D)	Major Arterial (6D)	Minor Arterial (4D)	Major Highway (4D)
Cone Camp Road Extension			Collector Street (2U)	N/A	Not Proposed	N/A
Greenspot Extension to Bryant Street			Special Secondary Highway (2D)	N/A	Not Proposed	N/A

Numbers of lanes per designation are identified in parentheses, e.g., (4D); “D” or “U” indicates whether the roadway is divided or undivided.

N/A – Not Applicable

Figure 3-2 Roadway Network

Revised to remove Cone Camp Road, south of Greenspot Road, and to remove Special Secondary Highway south and east of Greenspot Road and the Santa Ana River to Bryant Street.

Insert Revised GP page 3-32, Table 3.3

Insert Revised GP Figure 3-2 Roadway Network

3. Initial Study Checklist

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS.				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				R
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				R
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (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?				R
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-d. No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to scenic resources within a state highway. No aesthetic impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. 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 the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? R
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? R
- 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))? R
- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? R
- 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? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-e. No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to Farmland, forest land or timberland. No agricultural or forestry impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

3. AIR QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			R	
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?			R	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			R	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors affecting a substantial number of people?				R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

a-c. Less than Significant Impact. d: No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to air quality. No air quality impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			R	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			R	
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?			R	
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?			R	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			R	
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?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

4a-f. Less than Significant Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no

actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to biological resources. No biological resource impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?			R	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			R	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

5a-c. Less than Significant Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to cultural resources. No cultural resource impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. ENERGY.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				R
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

6a-b. No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in consumption of energy. No energy impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.				
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.			R	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			R	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			R	
iv) Landslides?			R	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			R	
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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			R	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			R	
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?			R	
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

7a-f. Less than Significant Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to from geologic or soil hazards. No geology or soils impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

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

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

8a-b Less than Significant Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in greenhouse gas emissions. No greenhouse gas impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				R
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?				R
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				R
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?			R	

- 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? R
- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? R
- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

9a-c and e-g: No Impact. d: Less Than Significant Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. No hazard or hazardous impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			R	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				R
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, which would;			R	
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			R	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;			R	

- 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 R
- iv) impede or redirect flood flows? R
- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? R
- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

10a,c-d: Less than Significant Impact. b and e: No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to hydrology or water quality. No hydrology or water quality impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				R
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

11a: No Impact. b: Less than Significant. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to physically dividing an existing community and would have less than significant impacts related to conflict with any land use plan, policies, or regulations for avoiding environmental effects. Less than significant impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. 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?				R
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?				R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

12a-b No Impact: The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in the loss of availability of mineral resources. No mineral resource impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE.				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			R	
b) Generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			R	
c) 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 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?				R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

13a-b: Less Than Significant Impact. c: No Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in the generation of noise or groundborne vibration. No noise impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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)?			R	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

14a-b: Less than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would induce population growth. No population and housing impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Fire protection?			R	R
b) Police protection?			R	R
c) Schools?			R	R
d) Parks?			R	R
e) Other public facilities?			R	R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

15a(i-v): Less than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to the need for public services. No public services impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

16. RECREATION.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			R	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

16a-b: Less than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in increased use of recreational facilities. No recreation impacts would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

17. TRANSPORTATION.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			R	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?			R	

- c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? R

- d) Result in inadequate emergency access? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

17a-d: Less the Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment would result in less than significant impacts related to the circulation system, generation of vehicle miles traveled, increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Less than significant impacts related to transportation would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

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

Would the project 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, 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:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>a) 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), or</p> | R |
| <p>b) 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.</p> | R |

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

18a-b: Less than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes and would result in less than significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. Less than significant impacts related to tribal cultural resources would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

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

Would the project:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> | R |
|---|---|

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? R
- c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? R
- d) 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? R
- e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

19a-c and e: No Impact. d: Less than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not include changes that would result in impacts to the need for new or expanded utilities, water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, or conflict with regulations related to solid waste. The Circulation Element amendment would have less than significant impacts related to the generation of solid waste. Less than significant impacts related to utilities and services systems would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

20. WILDFIRE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			R	
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?			R	
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?			R	

- 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? R

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

20a-d: Less Than Significant Impact. The minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment would result in less than significant impacts related to wildfire. Less than significant impacts to wildfire would occur from the adoption of this amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
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?			R	
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)?			R	
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			R	

Explanation of Checklist Judgements:

21a-c: Less than Significant Impact. As discussed throughout the above portions of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, the minor amendment to the Circulation Element would not produce environmental impacts. The Circulation Element amendment would have no actual development, rezoning, or construction. The Circulation Element amendment does not, therefore, have the potential to result environmental impacts,

either limited or cumulative, affecting habitat; plant or animal communities; rare, endangered or threatened species; historic resources; or human beings. As discussed in 3.1 through 3.20 of this Initial Study/Negative Declaration, impacts associated with the adoption of the Circulation Element amendment would either result in no negative impacts, or less than significant impacts.

DETERMINATION

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.
- R 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.

Kim Stater, Assistant Community Development Director

Date