



# **Addendum**

*to the*

Fresno County General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2018031066)

*for the*

# **Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates**

**August 2025**

### Report Prepared for:

#### County of Fresno

Department of Public Works and Planning  
Community Development Division  
2220 Tulare St. 6th Floor  
Fresno, CA 93721

#### Contact:

Yvette Quiroga, MPPA, Principal Planner  
(559) 600-4292

### Report Prepared by:

#### Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group

455 W Fir Avenue  
Clovis, CA 93611

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
1.1	Project Background .....	1-1
1.2	Previous Environmental Analysis and Approval .....	1-1
1.3	CEQA Addendum Regulations .....	1-1
<b>2</b>	<b>Project Description</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
2.1	Biola Community Plan Update .....	2-1
2.2	Del Rey Community Plan Update .....	2-6
<b>3</b>	<b>Impact Evaluation</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	Scope of Evaluation .....	3-1
3.2	Explanation of Evaluation Categories .....	3-1
3.3	Comparative Impact Checklist Discussion .....	3-2
3.3.1	Agricultural and Forestry Resources .....	3-3
<b>4</b>	<b>Determination</b> .....	<b>4-1</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1:	Existing Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram .....	2-3
Figure 2-2:	Proposed Biola Community Plan Land Use Changes .....	2-4
Figure 2-3:	Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram .....	2-5
Figure 2-4:	Existing Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram .....	2-7
Figure 2-5:	Proposed Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Changes .....	2-8
Figure 2-6:	Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram .....	2-9

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1:	Biola Community Plan Expansion Areas .....	2-2
Table 2-2:	Biola Northwest Reserve Overlay Site Land Use Amendments .....	2-2
Table 2-3:	Del Rey Community Plan Expansion Areas .....	2-6

## ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Fresno County Board of Supervisors adopted the revised 2024 Fresno County General Plan and approved an updated Zoning Ordinance on February 20, 2024. The Board of Supervisors also certified the related Fresno County General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2018031066) on February 20, 2024. While the 2024 Fresno County General Plan applies throughout unincorporated Fresno County, the unincorporated communities within the County are also guided by individual community plans, which augment the goals and policies contained in the General Plan. The unincorporated community plans identify land uses specific to that community and contain additional community-specific goals, policies, and implementation programs which refine, but are consistent with, General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The County of Fresno initiated updates to two of these community plans, the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan, in December 2023. The Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates (Project) are discussed in further detail in [Section 2.1](#) and [Section 2.2](#), respectively, including an overview of the proposed land use changes within each community.

## 1.2 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND APPROVAL

To analyze effects from and facilitate implementation of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan, the County prepared a PEIR, which was certified February 20, 2024 (SCH No. 2018031066). The PEIR analyzed buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan at a programmatic level based on growth projections through the year 2042, including buildout of the unincorporated communities of Biola and Del Rey. The growth projections include a forecast of 234,591 people and 120,019 employees in the unincorporated County, representing an increase of approximately 33,607 people and approximately 20,745 employees through 2042. Several environmental resource categories including Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Cultural, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Transportation, Tribal Cultural, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire were found to have impacts that would be significant and unavoidable. For these impacts the required Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were adopted with the certification of the PEIR.

## 1.3 CEQA ADDENDUM REGULATIONS

For streamlining purposes, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines encourage the preparation of later environmental documents to be “tiered” from previously certified EIRs under prescribed circumstances. Section 15164 provides that a lead agency shall prepare an *addendum* to a previously certified EIR if only some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162(a), calling for preparation of a *subsequent EIR*, have occurred.

Section 15162(a) states that “when an EIR has been certified...for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts; or

- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
- (A) The project will have one or more significant impacts not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant impacts previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”

As this Addendum states in additional detail, the proposed updates to the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan will not result in the occurrence of any of the conditions found in Section 15162(a). As the updates to the Biola Community Plan and the Del Rey Community Plan refine, but remain consistent with, the goals, policies, and implementation programs, and constitute only minor changes to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated in the PEIR, an addendum to the previously certified PEIR is the appropriate level of environmental analysis. The updates are being addressed within this single Addendum for consistency with the scale of analysis conducted within the PEIR.

## 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Biola and Del Rey Community Plans identify goals, policies, and implementation programs specific to the unincorporated communities of Biola and Del Rey, respectively, and will not apply to other unincorporated communities in the County. These goals, policies, and implementation programs are in addition to the goals, policies, and implementation programs adopted in the 2024 Fresno County General Plan, which will continue to apply within the communities of Biola and Del Rey. Both the current Biola and Del Rey Community Plans were adopted in 1976 and have not been comprehensively updated since their original adoption. The last major change to the Biola Community Plan occurred in 1990, with a map and text amendment. The last major change to the Del Rey Community Plan occurred in 2012, with a map amendment. Minor changes were made in 2024 to reflect the County's updated Housing Element.

The County of Fresno initiated updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans in December 2023. The Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates (Project) are discussed in further detail in [Section 2.1](#) and [Section 2.2](#), respectively, including an overview of the proposed land use changes within each community. Related actions that would occur concurrent with or following approval of the updated Biola Community Plan and updated Del Rey Community Plan include the rezoning of properties within the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan boundaries for consistency with the adopted land use designations. Amendment to the Biola Community Services District (CSD) Sphere of Influence (SOI) and Del Rey CSD SOI as well as expansion of the Biola CSD and Del Rey CSD service area boundaries to align with the amended SOIs are also anticipated as subsequent actions. These anticipated subsequent actions have been addressed through the analysis contained herein. However, any future development proposed within the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan areas would be required to undergo separate environmental analysis, as applicable, for the use proposed and the site for which it is proposed on.

### 2.1 BIOLA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

The Biola Community Plan area currently encompasses approximately 201 acres, as shown in [Figure 2-1](#). The Project includes an expansion of the Biola Community Plan boundary to encompass a total of 213.2 acres and would amend land use designations within the expanded boundary, as shown in [Figure 2-2](#), and described in further detail below. The Project also includes revisions to the goals, policies, and implementation programs identified in the Community Plan. The Biola Community Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs are specific to the Biola community and refine but are consistent with the Fresno County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The Project would add four parcels totaling approximately 13.5 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and amend the planned land use designation of these parcels as identified in [Table 2-1](#) and as shown on [Figure 2-2](#). The variation in the total acreage added and the difference between the old and new boundary totals is due to corrections in the mapping to address a shifted data set.

**Table 2-1: Biola Community Plan Expansion Areas**

APN <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Existing GPLU	Proposed GPLU	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential	Non-Residential <sup>2</sup>
016-020-13ST (portion) 016-020-15ST (Parcel 1)	4.33	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Orchard/ Wastewater Treatment Facility	--	Wastewater Treatment Facility <sup>3</sup>
016-300-28ST (Parcel 2)	5.02	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Vacant/ Stormwater Drainage Basin	--	Stormwater Drainage Basin <sup>3</sup>
016-300-21S (Parcel 3)	4.15	Agriculture	Industrial: Limited	Orchard	--	Manufacturing Uses: 67,790 square feet 110 employees
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.5</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>67,790 square feet 110 employees</b>

<sup>1</sup> See Figure 2-2 for the location of Parcels 1 through 3.

<sup>2</sup> Non-residential buildout for Limited Industrial based on 37.5 percent maximum floor area ratio and 615 square feet per employee.

<sup>3</sup> Treatment facilities and basins are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

Additionally, the planned land use designation for approximately 16.5 acres within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary will be redesignated as identified in Table 2-2 and as shown on Figure 2-2. The Project would also redesignate additional parcels, totaling approximately 17.2 acres, within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary, not including the acres identified in Table 2-1 or Table 2-2. The changes include removal of the “Reserve Overlay” designation for approximately 14.4 acres within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary as shown on Figure 2-2. The underlying land use designation is not being amended so there would be no change to the buildout assumptions as previously analyzed for these parcels. Additional amendments, also shown on Figure 2-2, would redesignate approximately 2.8 acres primarily to reflect existing developed uses on-site where no additional development is anticipated.

The proposed Biola Community Plan land use diagram, reflective of the identified land use amendments, is shown on Figure 2-3 below.

**Table 2-2: Biola Northwest Reserve Overlay Site Land Use Amendments**

APN <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Existing GPLU <sup>2</sup>	Proposed GPLU	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential <sup>3</sup>	Non-Residential <sup>4</sup>
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 4)	8.5	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Commercial: Service/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	--	Commercial Uses: 92,565 square feet 184 employees
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 5)	3	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Park/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	--	Park <sup>5</sup>
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 6)	5	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Residential: Medium High Density/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	73 units	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>16.5</b>	--	--	--	<b>73 units</b>	<b>92,565 square feet 184 employees</b>

<sup>1</sup> See Figure 2-2 for the location of Parcels 4 through 6.


<sup>2</sup> Distribution of land uses will be implemented in accordance with Policy LU-P-2 of the Biola Community Plan.

<sup>3</sup> Residential buildout based on 80 percent of maximum density allowed and 4.24 persons per household.

<sup>4</sup> Non-residential buildout for Service Commercial based on 25 percent maximum floor area ratio and 504 square feet per employee.


<sup>5</sup> Parks are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

Figure 2-1: Existing Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram




11/6/2024 G:\Fresno\_County-of-1297\139724001-Community Plans Update\400 GIS\Map\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update.aprx

Figure 2-2: Proposed Biola Community Plan Land Use Changes



S:\G\2025 G\1\Fresno\_County\_of-1397\139724001-Community Plans Update\400 GIS\Map\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update.aprx

Figure 2-3: Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram



## 2.2 DEL REY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

The Del Rey Community Plan area currently encompasses approximately 333.5 acres, as shown in **Figure 2-4**. The Project includes an expansion of the Del Rey Community Plan boundary to encompass a total of 374.3 acres and amend the land use designations within the expanded boundary, as shown in **Figure 2-5**, and described in further detail below. The Project also includes revisions to the goals, policies, and implementation programs identified in the Del Rey Community Plan. The Del Rey Community Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs are specific to the Del Rey community and refine but are consistent with the 2024 Fresno County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The Project would add two parcels totaling approximately 37.5 acres to the Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels as identified in **Table 2-3** and shown on **Figure 2-5**.

**Table 2-3: Del Rey Community Plan Expansion Areas**

APN <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Existing GPLU	Proposed GPLU <sup>2</sup>	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential <sup>3</sup>	Non-Residential <sup>4</sup>
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	5	Agriculture	Commercial: Service Commercial	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	--	Commercial Uses: 54,450 square feet/ 108 employees
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	6.8	Agriculture	Residential: Medium Density	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	40 dwelling units/ 169 persons	--
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	6.8	Agriculture	Residential: Medium High Density	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	99 dwelling units/ 419 persons	--
350-230-03T (Parcel 2)	18.9	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Vineyards	--	Wastewater Treatment Facility <sup>5</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.5<sup>6</sup></b>	--	--	--	<b>139 dwelling units/ 588 persons</b>	<b>54,450 square feet/ 108 employees</b>

<sup>1</sup> See **Figure 2-2** for the location of Parcels 4 through 6.

<sup>2</sup> Distribution of land uses will be implemented in accordance with Policy LU-P-2 of the Del Rey Community Plan.

<sup>3</sup> Residential buildout based on 80 percent of maximum density allowed and 4.24 persons per household.

<sup>4</sup> Non-residential buildout based on 25 percent maximum floor area ratio and 504 square feet per employee.

<sup>5</sup> Treatment facilities are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

<sup>6</sup> Total acres do not include right-of-way.

The Project would also redesignate additional parcels, totaling approximately 46.3 acres, within the existing Del Rey Community Plan boundary. The changes include removal of the “Reserve Overlay” designation for approximately 42.9 acres within the existing Del Rey Community Plan boundary as shown on **Figure 2-5**. The underlying land use designation is not being amended so there would be no change to the buildout assumptions as previously analyzed for these parcels. Additional amendments, also shown on **Figure 2-5**, would redesignate approximately 3.4 acres to reflect existing developed uses on-site where no additional development is anticipated.

The proposed Del Rey Community Plan land use diagram, reflective of the identified land use amendments, is shown on **Figure 2-6** below.

Figure 2-4: Existing Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram






Figure 2-5: Proposed Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Changes



12/27/2024 G:\fresno County of 1397\139724001-Community Plans Update\400 GIS\Map\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update.aprx

Figure 2-6: Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram



4/11/2025 G:\Fresno\_County\_of-1397\139724001-Community Plans Update\400 GIS\Map\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update\FresnoCounty\_Community\_Plans\_Update.aprx

## 3 IMPACT EVALUATION

### 3.1 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

As described in [Chapter 2 Project Description](#), the proposed updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans would make minor modifications to the boundaries for each Community Plan area and amend some land use designations within each boundary. To evaluate whether these proposed updates would require additional analysis, a comparative impact checklist was prepared for each Community Plan update as they relate to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR. The Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist are included as [Attachment A](#) and include the full range of questions as presented in the current version of Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The columns of the checklists have been modified from Appendix G to help answer required questions pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental resource category, but rather that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact as analyzed and addressed in the PEIR. For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the Project were adequately addressed in the PEIR, and the conclusions about environmental impact significance from the previous PEIR still apply. A “yes” answer indicates a change in circumstance that warrants additional discussion to determine if the impact of the Project results in a new or more significant impact not previously addressed in the PEIR. The purpose of each column of the checklist is described in [Section 3.2](#) below.

Only those resource categories resulting in a “yes” are discussed further in [Section 3.3](#) with the scope of evaluation completed under this Addendum being limited to comparing the circumstances and potential impacts resulting from the Project with the circumstances and impacts discussed as part of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR.

### 3.2 EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The purpose of the columns included in the Comparative Impact Checklists, as included in [Attachment A](#) and [Section 3.3](#), are as follows:

#### **Where Impact was Analyzed in Previous Analysis**

This column provides a cross-reference to the Draft and Final version of the PEIR (DEIR and FEIR) where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental resource listed.

#### **Level of Significance**

This column provides the level of significance based on analysis of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan buildout as contained in the PEIR.

#### **Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis**

This column identifies the goals, policies, and mitigation measures (MM) that were identified through the PEIR to reduce the potential for impacts to occur as a result of the buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan relative to the environmental resource listed.

#### **New or More Significant Impacts?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates whether there are substantial changes in circumstances under which the Project is undertaken that have occurred subsequent to the certification of the PEIR that would result in the current Project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior document or having substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

“New” includes things that were previously found to have a no impact designation or a less than significant designation, but now, in consideration of what the Project proposes, could result in significant impacts to the environment if not mitigated. A “more significant” impact is one that was previously identified with a “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” designation, or a “Significant and Unavoidable” designation, with the significance or scope of the impact increasing significantly further as a result of the Project.

#### **New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?**

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available, requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. If the new information shows that any of the following conditions are met, the question would be answered “yes”, requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects or the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or, (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

However, if the additional analyses completed as part of this comparative evaluation indicate that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified significant environmental impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, the question would be answered “no” and no additional EIR documentation (subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR) would be required.

#### **Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?**

This column indicates whether the PEIR and adopted CEQA Findings provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. A “yes” response will be provided in this instance. If “Not Applicable” is indicated, this evaluation concludes that there was no impact, or the impact was less than significant and, therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. Should the previous analysis and mitigation address and/or resolve the potential impacts of the proposed Project, no further environmental analysis is warranted.

### **3.3 COMPARITIVE IMPACT CHECKLIST DISCUSSION**

As noted in [Section 3.1](#), only those resource categories resulting in a “yes” answer on the comparative impact checklists included as [Attachment A](#) are discussed below. Only the Agricultural and Forestry Resources category warranted further discussion to determine if the impact of the Project results in a new or more significant impact not previously addressed in the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR. As indicated above in [Section 3.1](#), resource categories with a “no” answer indicate that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact as analyzed and addressed in the PEIR, as identified on the comparative impact checklists included as [Attachment A](#). For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the Project were adequately addressed in the PEIR, and the conclusions about environmental impact significance from the previous PEIR still apply. Therefore, no additional analysis was warranted.

### 3.3.1 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis <sup>1</sup>	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable
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))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis <sup>1</sup>	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21  FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable

<sup>1</sup> Policies noted with an (MM) are identified in the PEIR as mitigation measures.

### 3.3.1.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- a) Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Impact AG-1 of the PEIR evaluated potential effects of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan regarding the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique, Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and determined the impact to be significant and unavoidable. The PEIR acknowledged that full buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan could result in a loss of agricultural lands, including those mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique, Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. General Plan policies as listed in the above table were identified in the PEIR analysis, including General Plan Policies LU-A.23 and LU-A.24 which serve as mitigation measures, that would reduce the impact. Additional General Plan policies, including Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.2, LU-A.12, LU-A.13, OS-B.1, OS-B.6, and OS-B.7 were also cited as policies that would further reduce the impact; however, it was concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Biola Community Plan update would add four parcels totaling approximately 13.5 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and amend the planned use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Public Facilities (APNs 016-020-15ST, 016-020-13ST [portion], and 016-300-28ST) and Industrial: Limited (APN 016-300-21S), as shown in [Figure 2-2](#). All four parcels consist of land designated as Prime Farmland as well as land designated as Urban and Built-Up Land; approximately 4 acres of the 13.5 total acres consist of Prime Farmland.

The Del Rey Community Plan update would add approximately 40.8 total acres to the Del Rey Community Plan boundary and amend the planned land use designation of two parcels totaling 37.5 acres from Agriculture to Service Commercial (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium High Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), and Public Facilities (APN 350-230-03T), as shown in [Figure 2-5](#). The remainder of the expansion area is existing road right-of-way. The two parcels consist of both Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance.

As discussed in the PEIR, there are approximately 1,162,708 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the County, accounting for about 54% of the total acreage. The combined conversion acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance between both the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan would be approximately 41.5 acres. This would not be a new significant impact nor would impacts be substantially more severe than the significant impacts previously identified and addressed through the 2024 Fresno County General Plan policies noted above. Therefore, the conclusions and findings of the PEIR remain valid, and no further analysis is required. Further, as an informational note, of the 1,162,708 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the County, this would represent a conversion of just under 0.004% of such lands in the County.

**b) Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

Impact AG-2 of the PEIR evaluated potential conflicts of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract and determined the impact to be significant and unavoidable. General Plan policies as listed in the above table were identified in the PEIR analysis, including General Plan Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.16, and LU-A.17, that would reduce the impact; however, it was concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Biola Community Plan update would add four parcels totaling approximately 13.5 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Public Facilities (APNs 016-020-15ST, 016-020-13ST [portion], and 016-300-28ST) and Industrial: Limited (APN 016-300-21S). The Del Rey Community Plan update would add two parcels totaling approximately 37.5 acres to the Del Rey Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Service Commercial (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), and Public Facilities (APN 350-230-03T). None of the six parcels are currently under a Williamson Act contract; however, rezoning of the parcels would ultimately occur to align with the amended land use designations.

As discussed in the PEIR, rezoning of land for consistency with land use designations was anticipated and evaluated as part of the analysis, including the rezoning of land from an agricultural zone district to a zone district to allow for non-agricultural uses. The additions to the Biola Community Plan and the Del Rey Community Plan boundaries would result in the eventual rezoning of approximately 42.8 acres from an agricultural zone district to a non-agricultural zone. However, the rezoning would be limited to only those properties located within the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan boundaries for consistency with the land use designations. No additional land beyond the boundaries would be rezoned. As such, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur from those previously identified and addressed through the 2024 Fresno County General Plan policies noted above. Therefore, the conclusions and findings of the PEIR remain valid, and no further analysis is required.

**3.3.1.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

2024 Fresno County General Plan Policies LU-A.23 and LU-A.24 were cited as mitigation measures in the PEIR for Impact AG-1, identified under impact discussion (a) above. Several additional General Plan policies were also cited to reduce both Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, identified under impact discussions (a) and (b) above, including Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.2, LU-A.12, LU-A.13, LU-A.16, LU-A.17, OS-B.1, OS-B.6, and OS-B.7.

## 4 DETERMINATION

As discussed in Chapters 1 through 3 above, this Addendum to the PEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 201803106), certified by the County of Fresno on February 20, 2024, supports the conclusion that the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates constitute only minor changes to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated and that no further environmental analysis is required. This determination is appropriate because only minor changes or additions to said PEIR are needed to consider the modifications proposed under the Community Plan updates, and these changes or additions do not require preparation of a subsequent EIR for the reasons set forth below. The reasons set forth correspond to items 1 through 3 as enumerated in [Section 1.3 CEQA Addendum Regulations](#) and pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

- (1) The updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans would not result in the major revision of the PEIR due to the involvement of a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The impacts identified to agricultural resources, as identified in [Section 3.3.1 Agricultural and Forestry Resources](#), would be no more substantial than the impacts to these resources as previously analyzed in the PEIR. All mitigation identified within the PEIR shall apply to the proposed Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates.
- (2) The circumstances under which the update to the Project will be undertaken have not substantially changed from those described in the PEIR, and therefore major revisions of the PEIR are not required due to involvement of new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.
- (3) There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the PEIR was certified as complete.
  - (A) The Project will not result in any new significant impacts beyond those evaluated in the PEIR.
  - (B) The Project will not result in any impacts that would be substantially more severe than those evaluated in the PEIR.
  - (C) There were no mitigation measures or alternatives found by the PEIR to be infeasible that would in fact be feasible that would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of resulting from the Project.
  - (D) There are no mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the PEIR that would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts on the environment that the County declines to adopt for the Project.

Based upon the statements above, and in conjunction with the evaluation further discussed in [Chapter 3](#), none of the conditions described in Section 15162(a) calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines; California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.) and specifically Section 15164 regarding preparation of addendums to an environmental impact report or negative declaration, the County of Fresno has determined that the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates constitute a minor change to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated and that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the Guidelines would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR.

## **Attachment A:**

Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and  
Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist

# 1 BIOLA COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

## 1.1 AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	DEIR: Impact AES-1, pgs. 4.1-17 to 4.1-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-K Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	DEIR: Impact AES-2, pg. 4.1-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-L Policy OS-L.3 Policy OS-L.6 Policy OS-L.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact AES-3, pgs. 4.1-20 to 4.1-22	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-L.4 Policy LU-B.11 Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	DEIR: Impact AES-4, ph. 4.1-22 to 4.1-23	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 1.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable.	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
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))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM)	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21  FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23		Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7			significant and unavoidable.

### 1.3 AIR QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	DEIR: Impact AQ-1, pgs. 4.3-17 to 4.3-19  FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS- G.12 and AQ- 2	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy TR-A.14 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
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?	DEIR: Impact AQ-2, pgs. 4.3-19 to 4.3.21  FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS- G.12 and AQ- 2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy EJ-A.2 Policy EJ-A.3 Policy LU-H.7 Policy HS-A.7 Policy OS-G.1 through OS-G.15	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	DEIR: Impact AQ-3, pgs. 4.3-22 to 4.3-26  FEIR: Pgs. 592-594, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ- 3	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy EJ-A.15 (MM) Policy OS-G.14 (MM) Policy EJ-A.5	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	DEIR: Impact AQ-4, pg. 4.3-26  FEIR: Pgs. 595, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ- 4	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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.	DEIR: Impact BIO-1, pgs. 4.4-24 to 4.4-26  FEIR: Pgs. 595-596, revisions to Policy OS- E.19	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Policy OS-E.19 (MM) Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal OS-F Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.9 Policy OS-F.4 Policy OS-F.10 Policy OS-F.11	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
Fish and Wildlife Service?						
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-3, pg. 4.4-27	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6 Policy OS-D.5 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.13 Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.14 Policy OS-E.15	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	DEIR: Impact BIO-4, pg. 4.4-28	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.20 Policy OS-F.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-5, pgs. 4.4-28 to 4.4-29	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-E Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.5 Policy OS-E.12 Policy OS-E.13	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

### 1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.2 (MM) Policy ED-A.7 Policy LU-D.2 Policy OS-J.1 Policy OS-J.3 Policy OS-J.4 Policy OS-J.7 Policy OS-J.10	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.4. (MM) Goal OS-J Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.7	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	DEIR: Impact CR-3, pg. 4.5-16	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 1.6 ENERGY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	DEIR: Impact E-1, pgs. 4.6-10 to 4.6-15	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal HS-G Policy HS-G.1 Policy HS-G.4 Policy LU-H.7 Policy PF-F.11 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Policy TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.5 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2 Policy OS-G.6 Policy OS-G.7 Policy OS-G.8 Policy OS-G.9 Policy OS-G.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	DEIR: Impact E-2, pgs. 4.6-15 to 4.6-17	No impact	No mitigation required.	No	No	Not applicable

## 1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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.	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.3 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.A	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.12	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Landslides?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	DEIR: HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9; Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17	Less than Significant	Policy HS-D.9  No mitigation required. Policy LU-A.19 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16; Impact GEO-3, pgs. 4.7-17 to 4.7-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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 wastewater?	DEIR: Impact GEO-4, pgs. 4.7-18 to 4.7-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological	DEIR:	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-J	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible,

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
resource or site or unique geological feature?	Impact GEO-5, pgs. 4.7-19 to 4.7-20		Policy OS-J.4			however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## 1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	DEIR: Impact GHG-1, pgs. 4.8-16 to 4.8-18  FEIR: Pg. 596, revisions to Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy HS-H.10 (MM) Policy HS-H.11 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	DEIR: Impact GHG-2, pgs. 4.8-18 to 4.8-21	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.4 Policy TR-A.22 Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.3 Policy OS-G.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-2, pg. 4.9-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-3, pg. 4.9-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-F.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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	DEIR: Impact HAZ-4, pg. 4.9-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-E Policy HS-E.2 Policy HS-E.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
working in the project area?						
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-5, pg. 4.9-23	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-21; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Significant and Unavoidable.	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.

## 1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	4.10-7 to 4.10-9		Policy OS-A.24 Goal LU-C Goal OS-A Goal PF-C Goal PF-D Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal HS-F			than significant.
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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:						
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9; Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Policy HS-D.9 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.11 Policy PF-E.13 Policy PF-E.16 Policy PF-E.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
	2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17					
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-5, pgs. 4.10-14 to 4.10-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.12 Policy PF-E.9 Policy PF-E.20 Policy HS-C.2 Policy HS-C.9 Policy HS-C.10 Policy HS-C.11 Policy HS-C.12 Policy HS-C.16 Policy HS-C.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

### 1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Physically divide an established community?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.2 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the	DEIR: Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-A Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17 Goal LU-B Goal LU-C Goal LU-D Goal LU-E Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.8 Goal LU-G Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-G.6 Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E			

## 1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
the region and the residents of the state?	to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1					
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?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

### 1.13 NOISE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact N-1, pgs. 4.12-28 to 4-12.29; Impact N-2, pgs. 4.12-30 to 4.12-34	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies HS-H.1 through HS-H.9 Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policies TR-B.1 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.1 Policy TR-E.5 Policy TR-E.6 Policy EJ-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	Policy HS-H.12 (MM) Policy HS-H.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
ground borne noise levels?	Impact N-3, pgs. 4.12-35 to 4.12-36  FEIR: Pgs. 596-597, revisions to Mitigation Measure N-1		Policy LU-F.30 Policy EJ-A.1			
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?	DEIR: Impact N-4, pg. 4.12-37	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-H.9 Policy HS-H.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

### 1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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)?	DEIR: Impact PH-1, pgs. 4.13-10 to 4.13-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies LU-A.1 through LU-A.22 Policies LU-B.1 through LU-B.14 Policies LU-C.1 through LU-C.12 Policies LU-D.1 through LU-D.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policies LU-E.1 through LU-E.24 Policies LU-F.1 through LU-F.11			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	DEIR: Impact PH-2, pg. 4.13-12	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.5 Policy LU-H.1 Policy LU-H.4 Policy LU-G.A.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

### 1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
i) Fire protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-1, pgs. 4.14-16 to 4.14-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-H Policy PF-H.2	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policy PF-H.7 Policy PF-H.8 Policy LU-A.1			
ii) Police protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-2, pgs. 4.14-18 to 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-G Policies PF-G.2 through PF-G.6 Policy LU-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Schools?	DEIR: Impact PS-3, pg. 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies PF-I.1 through PF-I.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Parks?	DEIR: Impact PS-4, pg. 4.14-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-I.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
v) Other public facilities?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 1.16 RECREATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22		Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E			than significant.

### 1.17 TRANSPORTATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21; Impact T-1, pgs. 4.15-12 to 4.15-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.7 Policy TR-A.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.7 Goal TR-C Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	DEIR: Impact T-2, pgs. 4.15-15 to 4.15-20  FEIR: Pg. 597, revisions to Policy TR-A.25	Significant and Unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure T-1: VMT Policy Policy TR-A.25 (MM) Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policy TR-A.24 Policies TR-B.2 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8			
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	DEIR: Impact T-3, pgs. 4.15-20 to 4.15-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.1 Policy TR-A.4 Policy TR-A.6 Policy TR-A.10 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	DEIR: Impact T-4, pgs. 4.15-23 to 4.15-24	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-C Goal HS-A Policy HS-A.1 Policy HS-A.2 Policy HS-A.3 Policy HS-A.8 Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.5	No	No	Yes, mitigation remains unnecessary.

### 1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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, cultural landscape that is geographically defined						

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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 the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## 1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact UTL-1, pgs. 4.17-15 to 4.17-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-A Policies PF-A.1 through PF-A.5 Goal PF-B Policy PF-B.1 Policy PF-B.3 Policy PF-B.4 Goal PF-D Policy PF-D.1 Policy PF-D.2 Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.5 Policy PF-D.6 Policy PF-D.7 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.6 Policy PF-E.7 Policy PF-E.8 Goal PF-J Policies PF-J.1 through PF-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	DEIR: Impact UTL-2, pgs. 4.17-21 to 4.17-24	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-A Policy OS-A.1 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.3 Policy OS-A.4 Policy OS-A.9 Policy OS-A.10	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) 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	DEIR: Impact UTL-3, pgs. 4.17-24 to 4.17-26	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation.	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
provider's existing commitments?						
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?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## 1.20 WILDFIRE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact WFR-1, pgs. 4.18-11 to 4.18-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-A Policies HS-A.1 through HS-A.13 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.6 Policy HS-B.7 Policy HS-B.8 Policy HS-B.9 Policy HS-B.19 Policy HS-B.20 Policy HS-B.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
			Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.30 Policy HS-B.31			
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 uncontrollable spread of wildfire?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.
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?	DEIR: Impact WFR-3, pgs. 4.18-20 to 4.18-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2 DEL REY COMPARITIVE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

### 2.1 AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	DEIR: Impact AES-1, pgs. 4.1-17 to 4.1-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-K Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	DEIR: Impact AES-2, pg. 4.1-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-L Policy OS-L.3 Policy OS-L.6 Policy OS-L.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact AES-3, pgs. 4.1-20 to 4.1-22	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-L.4 Policy LU-B.11 Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	DEIR: Impact AES-4, ph. 4.1-22 to 4.1-23	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21  FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable.	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
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))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2,	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21  FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23		Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7			

### 2.3 AIR QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	DEIR: Impact AQ-1, pgs. 4.3-17 to 4.3-19  FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS-G.12 and AQ-2	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy TR-A.14 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
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?	DEIR: Impact AQ-2, pgs. 4.3-19 to 4.3.21  FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS-G.12 and AQ-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy EJ-A.2 Policy EJ-A.3 Policy LU-H.7 Policy HS-A.7 Policy OS-G.1 through OS-G.15	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial	DEIR:	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy EJ-A.15 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
pollutant concentrations?	Impact AQ-3, pgs. 4.3-22 to 4.3-26  FEIR: Pgs. 592-594, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-3		Policy OS-G.14(MM) Policy EJ-A.5			significant than previously identified.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	DEIR: Impact AQ-4, pg. 4.3-26  FEIR: Pgs. 595, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-4	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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.	DEIR: Impact BIO-1, pgs. 4.4-24 to 4.4-26  FEIR: Pgs. 595-596, revisions to Policy OS-E.19	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Policy OS-E.19 (MM) Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal OS-F Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.9 Policy OS-F.4 Policy OS-F.10 Policy OS-F.11	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
Fish and Wildlife Service?						
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-3, pg. 4.4-27	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6 Policy OS-D.5 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.13 Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.14 Policy OS-E.15	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	DEIR: Impact BIO-4, pg. 4.4-28	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.20 Policy OS-F.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact BIO-5, pgs. 4.4-28 to 4.4-29	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-E Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.5 Policy OS-E.12 Policy OS-E.13	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.2 (MM) Policy ED-A.7 Policy LU-D.2 Policy OS-J.1 Policy OS-J.3 Policy OS-J.4 Policy OS-J.7 Policy OS-J.10	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.4 (MM) Goal OS-J Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.7	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	DEIR: Impact CR-3, pg. 4.5-16	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.6 ENERGY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	DEIR: Impact E-1, pgs. 4.6-10 to 4.6-15	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal HS-G Policy HS-G.1 Policy HS-G.4 Policy LU-H.7 Policy PF-F.11 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Policy TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.5 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2 Policy OS-G.6 Policy OS-G.7 Policy OS-G.8 Policy OS-G.9 Policy OS-G.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	DEIR: Impact E-2, pgs. 4.6-15 to 4.6-17	No impact	No mitigation required.	No	No	Not applicable

## 2.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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.	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.3 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.A	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.12	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Landslides?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9:	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-A.19 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
	Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17					
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?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16; Impact GEO-3, pgs. 4.7-17 to 4.7-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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 wastewater?	DEIR: Impact GEO-4, pgs. 4.7-18 to 4.7-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	DEIR: Impact GEO-5, pgs. 4.7-19 to 4.7-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-J Policy OS-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## 2.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	DEIR: Impact GHG-1, pgs. 4.8-16 to 4.8-18  FEIR: Pg. 596, revisions to Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy HS-H.10 (MM) Policy HS-H.11 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	DEIR: Impact GHG-2, pgs. 4.8-18 to 4.8-21	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.4 Policy TR-A.22 Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.3 Policy OS-G.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?						
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-2, pg. 4.9-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-3, pg. 4.9-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-F.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-4, pg. 4.9-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-E Policy HS-E.2 Policy HS-E.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or	DEIR: Impact HAZ-5, pg. 4.9-23	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
emergency evacuation plan?						
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-21; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Significant and Unavoidable.	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.

## 2.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Goal LU-C Goal OS-A Goal PF-C Goal PF-D Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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:						
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9; Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Policy HS-D.9 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.11 Policy PF-E.13 Policy PF-E.16 Policy PF-E.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	4.10-13 to 4.10-14		Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21			
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-5, pgs. 4.10-14 to 4.10-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.12 Policy PF-E.9 Policy PF-E.20 Policy HS-C.2 Policy HS-C.9 Policy HS-C.10 Policy HS-C.11 Policy HS-C.12 Policy HS-C.16 Policy HS-C.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Physically divide an established community?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.2 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-A Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.7 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17 Goal LU-B Goal LU-C Goal LU-D Goal LU-E Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.8 Goal LU-G Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-G.6 Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable
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?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

## 2.13 NOISE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact N-1, pgs. 4.12-28 to 4.12.29; Impact N-2, pgs. 4.12-30 to 4.12-34	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies HS-H.1 through HS-H.9 Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policies TR-B.1 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.1 Policy TR-E.5 Policy TR-E.6 Policy EJ-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

<p>b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</p>	<p>DEIR: Impact N-3, pgs. 4.12-35 to 4.12-36</p> <p>FEIR: Pgs. 596- 597, revisions to Mitigation Measure N-1</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>	<p>Policy HS-H.12 (MM) Policy HS-H.6 Policy LU-F.30 Policy EJ-A.1</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, impacts remain less than significant.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>DEIR: Impact N-4, pg. 4.12-37</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation required. Policy HS-H.9 Policy HS-H.3</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, impacts remain less than significant.</p>

## 2.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<p>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</p>	<p>Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis</p>	<p>Level of Significance</p>	<p>Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis</p>	<p>New or More Significant Impact?</p>	<p>New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?</p>	<p>Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?</p>
<p>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)?</p>	<p>DEIR: Impact PH-1, pgs. 4.13-10 to 4.13-11</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation required. Policies LU-A.1 through LU-A.22 Policies LU-B.1 through LU-B.14 Policies LU-C.1 through LU-C.12 Policies LU-D.1 through LU-D.4 Policies LU-E.1 through LU-E.24 Policies LU-F.1 through LU-F.11</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, impacts remain less than significant.</p>

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	DEIR: Impact PH-2, pg. 4.13-12	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.5 Policy LU-H.1 Policy LU-H.4 Policy LU-G.A.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
i) Fire protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-1, pgs. 4.14-16 to 4.14-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-H Policy PF-H.2 Policy PF-H.7 Policy PF-H.8 Policy LU-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Police protection?	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-G	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

	Impact PS-2, pgs. 4.14-18 to 4.14-19		Policies PF-G.2 through PF-G.6 Policy LU-A.1			than significant.
iii) Schools?	DEIR: Impact PS-3, pg. 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies PF-I.1 through PF-I.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Parks?	DEIR: Impact PS-4, pg. 4.14-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-I.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
v) Other public facilities?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.16 RECREATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

## 2.17 TRANSPORTATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21; Impact T-1, pgs. 4.15-12 to 4.15-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.7 Policy TR-A.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.7 Goal TR-C Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	DEIR: Impact T-2, pgs. 4.15-15 to 4.15-20  FEIR: Pg. 597, revisions to Policy TR-A.25	Significant and Unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure T-1: VMT Policy Policy TR-A.25 (MM) Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policies TR-B.2 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	DEIR: Impact T-3, pgs. 4.15-20 to 4.15-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.1 Policy TR-A.4 Policy TR-A.6 Policy TR-A.10 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

	Impact T-4, pgs. 4.15-23 to 4.15-24		Goal TR-C Goal HS-A Policy HS-A.1 Policy HS-A.2 Policy HS-A.3 Policy HS-A.8 Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.5			than significant.
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	-------------------

## 2.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
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, 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 the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
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	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..

subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## 2.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	DEIR: Impact UTL-1, pgs. 4.17-15 to 4.17-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-A Policies PF-A.1 through PF-A.5 Goal PF-B Policy PF-B.1 Policy PF-B.3 Policy PF-B.4 Goal PF-D Policy PF-D.1 Policy PF-D.2 Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.5 Policy PF-D.6 Policy PF-D.7 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.6 Policy PF-E.7 Policy PF-E.8 Goal PF-J Policies PF-J.1 through PF-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development	DEIR: Impact UTL-2, pgs. 4.17-21 to 4.17-24	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-A Policy OS-A.1 Policy OS-A.2	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however

during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			Policy OS-A.3 Policy OS-A.4 Policy OS-A.9 Policy OS-A.10			impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) 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?	DEIR: Impact UTL-3, pgs. 4.17-24 to 4.17-26	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation.	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
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?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## 2.20 WILDFIRE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact WFR-1, pgs. 4.18-11 to 4.18-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-A Policies HS-A.1 through HS-A.13 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

			Policy HS-B.7 Policy HS-B.8 Policy HS-B.9 Policy HS-B.19 Policy HS-B.20 Policy HS-B.24 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.30 Policy HS-B.31			
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 uncontrollable spread of wildfire?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.
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?	DEIR: Impact WFR-3, pgs. 4.18-20 to 4.18-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
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?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.