

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Commercial Planned Development Permit CP-07-17
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Alhambra
111 South First Street
Alhambra CA 91801
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Michael Martin, 626-570-5034
4. **Project Location:** 2121 West Main Street
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Raymond & Main Retail LLC
c/o Panattoni Development
1640 Sepulveda Boulevard, #530
Los Angeles CA 90025
6. **General Plan Designation:** Automobile Commercial
7. **Zoning:** CPD-AC
8. **Description of the Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)

A Commercial Planned Development Permit and Variance to construct a 41,486 square foot retail center on a 3.22 acre site in the Commercial Planned Development-Automobile Commercial zone.
9. **Surrounding Land uses and Setting:** (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

The project is located on a major arterial street and is surrounded primarily by commercial and high density residential uses. The area in the vicinity of the site is fully developed.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).**

None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

	Aesthetics		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Agriculture Resources		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Air Quality		Land Use/Planning	X	Transportation/Traffic
	Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Cultural Resources		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency).
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

November 14, 2007

Date

Scott Lee

Printed Name

Development Services Department
City of Alhambra

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in its explanation following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e. g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e. g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address the site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
The project calls for the construction of a single story development with a maximum height of 39 feet. The most prominent scenic vista is an already partially obstructed view of the San Gabriel Mountains to the northeast. The project would have little impact on this view for properties in the area, since the proposed construction is of similar height to the existing development on the site.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway				X
There will be no impact on scenic resources.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
The site is currently developed with a vacant auto dealership and operating body shop.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
Although the project may generate new light from various sources, it is located in a fully developed commercial area where such light is commonly found.				
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
The project will not affect farmland or agricultural resources as the site is located in a fully urbanized and developed area.				
3. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
The project will not conflict with the implementation of the air quality plan.				

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

Implementation of the project will not result in the violation of any air quality standards.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The amount of vehicular traffic resulting from the project will not be of sufficient magnitude to cause significant emissions or concentrations of air pollutants.

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

The project is not likely to generate any objectionable odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not have any adverse impacts on endangered or threatened species.

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 Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not impact any natural habitat or community.

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project is located in a fully developed urban area. There are no wetlands in the vicinity.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not have any adverse impacts on migratory fish or wildlife.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

The project will not conflict with any local policies regarding protection of biological resources.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No such plans apply to the project site.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

There are no affected historic resources on the project site.

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

There are no known archaeological resources on or near the project site.

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

There are no known unique paleontological or geologic features on or near the project site.

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

There are no known human burial sites on or near the project site.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
--	--	--	--	---

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
--	--	--	--	---

iv) Landslides?				X
-----------------	--	--	--	---

Any changes to the soil conditions of the site will be so minor as to preclude an increase in risk of loss, injury, or death due to: earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

There will be no soil erosion or loss of topsoil as the site will be developed with buildings and a parking lot.

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The site is not located on unstable or expansive soil.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Sewers are available for waste water, thus septic tanks and alternative waster water disposal systems will not be needed.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
---	--	--	--	---

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
---	--	--	--	---

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Development of the project will not result in any hazard or potential hazard to human health. People will not be exposed to potential health hazards as a result of the project. Any hazardous materials used in the normal operation of the project will be strictly monitored and controlled in accordance with applicable laws.

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

There are no airports or airstrips within the general vicinity.

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

There are no airports or airstrips within the general vicinity.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

The project will not adversely impact emergency response or evacuation plans. In fact, implementation of such plans may be enhanced due to the proposed street improvements which will be constructed as part of the project.

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

There will be no risk of wildland fires from the project. The site is located in a fully developed urbanized area.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will comply with all requirements in these areas.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Any excavation for the project will not be deep enough to affect ground water.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
--	--	--	--	---

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Development of the site will result in no perceptible change to water absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff. Drainage patterns may change due to the new arrangement of buildings on the site. In addition, all drainage will be to the street and not to adjacent properties.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Storm water drainage systems in the vicinity of the project are capable of handling runoff.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not impact or degrade water quality.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
--	--	--	--	---

No housing is being built or proposed as part of this project.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
---	--	--	--	---

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
--	--	--	--	---

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not increase flood hazards.

k) Have the potential to impact storm water runoff during construction?				X
---	--	--	--	---

l) Have the potential to impact storm water runoff during post-construction activity?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will be monitored and best management practices implemented to contain storm water runoff during and after construction

m) Have the potential for discharge of storm water from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?				X
---	--	--	--	---

n) Have the potential for the discharge of storm water which would impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit?				X
--	--	--	--	---

o) Have the potential for the discharge of storm water which could cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies?				
--	--	--	--	--

All vehicle servicing and maintenance will occur in roofed areas. Best management practices and monitoring will be utilized to ensure that daily operations of the business do not discharge storm water.

p) Have the potential to cause significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff that can cause environmental harm?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project design, monitoring and best management practices will ensure that storm water runoff will be adequately and safely handled.

q) Have the potential to cause significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not increase erosion on the site or in the surrounding area.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project will be located in the middle of an established commercial area and will not create any physical divisions.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

The project complies with all applicable land use ordinances and plans.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No such plans apply to the project site.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
--	--	--	--	---

There are no known mineral resources of value on the site.

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

There are no such sites in the vicinity of the project site.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Noise generated by the project is expected to be within the standards set forth in the noise ordinance.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project is not expected to generate any groundborne noise or vibration.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
--	--	--	--	---

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The site is located within an established commercial area and the ambient noise levels from the construction of this project will be consistent with other uses that would be permitted on the site.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The site is not located in the vicinity of an airport or an airstrip.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

The proposal does not create a demand for additional housing.

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

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

No households will be displaced by the project.

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

a) Fire protection?				X
---------------------	--	--	--	---

The project will comply with the latest codes regarding fire sprinklers, fire prevention and safety. The existing Fire Department resources will be adequate to serve the project.

b) Police protection?				X
-----------------------	--	--	--	---

Existing Police Department resources will be able to adequately serve the project.

c) Schools?				X
-------------	--	--	--	---

d) Parks?				X
-----------	--	--	--	---

e) Other public facilities?				X
-----------------------------	--	--	--	---

The development of the project would have no effect upon nor result in a need for new schools, parks or other recreational facilities, maintenance of public facilities, or other governmental services over what was required by the previous use.

14. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

No existing recreational opportunities are affected by the project.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
--	--	--	--	---

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The traffic levels resulting from the project will be within the capacity of the existing streets.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Air traffic patterns will not be affected by the project.

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

The project will not increase hazards to any design features.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project will not adversely impact emergency response or access

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Parking capacity will be adequate to accommodate the proposed project..

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project will not conflict with programs supporting alternative transportation.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project not generate wastewater of a sufficient quantity or quality to exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project will not require the construction of new water or sewage treatment facilities.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The existing storm drain system will be adequate to accommodate the project.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Public water supplies are adequate for the proposed development.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The existing treatment facilities will be adequate to serve the project.

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

Existing landfill facilities will be adequate to serve the project.

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

The project will comply with all applicable statutes relating to solid waste.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The subject site does not contain the habitat of a fish or wildlife species and therefore the project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The subject site is not of prehistoric or historic importance.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
--	--	--	--	---

As documented in the findings of the previous sections, the disadvantage to both short-term and long-term environmental goals from this project are addressed by specific mitigating measures.

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

No substantial direct or indirect adverse environmental effects on human beings can be expected from this project.