

## 4.15 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to briefly describe any possible significant effects that were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail. This section addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project that would not be significant. The items listed below that were found not to be significantly affected by the proposed Project are contained in the environmental checklist form included in Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Any items not addressed in this section are evaluated as required under CEQA in Section 4.0 of this SEIR.

### 4.15.1 Aesthetics

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

1. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;*
2. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;*
3. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and/or*
4. *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.*

All of the above thresholds are analyzed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*.

### 4.15.2 Agricultural Resources

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, 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;*
- 2) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;*
- 3) *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));*
- 4) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; and/or*
- 5) *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.*

Thresholds 1, 2 and 5 are discussed in Section 4.2, *Agricultural Resources*. No portion of the Project Site is under Williamson Act contracts, although the analysis does address whether nearby properties are under Williamson Act contracts and thus subject to development pressure to convert to urban uses. Further, potential zoning conflicts associated with the Project,



including Threshold 2, are discussed in Section 4.10, *Land Use*. Thresholds 3, 4, and 5 related to forest resources and timberland are discussed below.

**b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Forest Land. As no portion of the Project Site is zoned for forest land or timber land production, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, nor would it result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use since no forest land or timber land resources exist on-site. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to forest and timberland resources.

**4.15.3 Air Quality**

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;*
- 2) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;*
- 3) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);*
- 4) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and/or*
- 5) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.*

All of the above thresholds are analyzed in Section 4.3, *Air Quality*.

**4.15.4 Biological Resources**

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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;*
- 2) *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;*
- 3) *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;*



- 4) *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;*
- 5) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and/or*
- 6) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.*
- 7) *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.*

Thresholds 1 through 5 and 7 are discussed in Section 4.4, *Biological Resources* and Section 4.10, *Land use*. Threshold 6 is discussed below.

**b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Habitat Conservation Plan. The Project Site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved conservation plan. Therefore, there would be *no impact* in this regard.

#### 4.15.5 Cultural Resources

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;*
- 2) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;*
- 3) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature of paleontological or cultural value; and/or*
- 4) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*

Thresholds 2 through 4 are discussed in Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*. Threshold 1 is discussed below.

**b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Historical Resources. As described in Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*, in a previous cultural resource assessment, one historic single-family residence was identified as being located on-site, but this residence has since been demolished. No other historical resources exist on-site or in the vicinity. Consequently, the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resources, and therefore, there would be *no impact*.



#### 4.15.6 Geology and Soils

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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;*
  - ii. *Strong seismic shaking*
  - iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction,*
  - iv. *Landslides;*
- 2) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;*
- 3) *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;*
- 4) *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; and/or*
- 5) *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.*

Thresholds 1 through 4 are discussed in Section 4.6, *Geology and Soils*. Threshold 5 is discussed below.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Septic Tanks. The proposed Project would not involve installation and use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, the Project would have *no impact* from soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

#### 4.15.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; and/or*
- 2) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.*

Both of the above thresholds are analyzed in Section 4.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change*.



#### 4.15.8 Hazards/Hazardous Materials

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- 2) 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;
- 3) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile of an existing or proposed school;
- 4) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material 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;
- 5) 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;
- 6) 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;
- 7) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and/or
- 8) 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.

Thresholds 1, 2, 4, and 8 are discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. Thresholds 3, 5, 6, and 7 are discussed below.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Emissions Near Schools. The Project Site is not located within  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school to the Project Site is San Benito High School, located over two miles northeast of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile of an existing or proposed school. There would be *no impact*.

Airport or Private Airstrip. The Project Site is located more than four miles southwest of the Hollister Municipal Airport and more than seven miles southeast of the Frazier Lake Airpark. Therefore, the Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, and is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and thus it would not result in a safety hazard related to airport operations. There would be *no impact*.

Emergency Access. The proposed Project also would not interfere with any existing emergency or evacuation plan since it would include new internal roadways and a secondary emergency vehicle access route. These components would improve emergency access to the site



as well as evacuation routes from the site. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be *less than significant*.

#### 4.15.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;*
- 2) *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;*
- 3) *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;*
- 4) *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;*
- 5) *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;*
- 6) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;*
- 7) *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;*
- 8) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;*
- 9) *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; and/or*
- 10) *Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.*

Thresholds 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 are discussed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. Threshold 2 is discussed in Section 4.14, *Utilities*. Aspects of Threshold 5 are discussed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality* (Threshold 5 as it relates to additional sources of polluted runoff). Thresholds 7, 8, and 10 are further discussed below.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

**Flood Hazard Area.** The Project Site is not located within a 100-year flood zone (FEMA, July 2013), and thus it would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. For these same reasons, the Project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which could impede or redirect flows. There would be *no impact* in this regard.

**Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow.** A tsunami is a series of waves generated by an impulsive disturbance in the ocean or in a small, connected body of water. Tsunamis are produced when movement occurs on faults in the ocean floor, usually during very large earthquakes. Sudden



vertical movement of the ocean floor by fault movement displaces the overlying water column, creating a wave that travels outward from the earthquake source. An earthquake anywhere in the Pacific can cause tsunamis around the entire Pacific basin. The Project Site would not be subjected to inundation by tsunami due to the distance from the Pacific Ocean, which is approximately 16.5 miles away.

A seiche is a wave in an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir. Seiches are produced from wind activity, changes in atmospheric pressure, and earthquakes. Because seiches inherently exist in enclosed bodies of water, only land adjacent to or within the bodies of water can be impacted. The closest enclosed body of water to the Project Site is San Justo Reservoir, which is located a minimum of 2,000 feet east of any structures proposed to be developed at the site. As no proposed development would be located adjacent to or within an inland body of water, seiches are not expected to impact the project site. There would be *no impact*.

#### **4.15.10 Land Use**

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Physically divide an established community;*
- 2) *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; and/or*
- 3) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.*

Thresholds 1 and 3 are discussed below. Threshold 2 is discussed in Section 4.10, *Land Use*.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Divide an Established Community. The Project Site encompasses approximately 1,994 acres located in the central northern portion of unincorporated San Benito County. The Project Site is located approximately three miles southwest of the City of Hollister, approximately 3.5 miles southeast of the City of San Juan Bautista and 1.0 mile south of State Route (SR) 156 (see Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2). The cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista are the only two incorporated cities in San Benito County. The majority of the Project Site has been historically used for agricultural purposes and no houses are currently located on-site. A portion (approximately 262 acres) of the area currently consists of the San Juan Oaks Golf Club and related facilities, and the remaining approximately 1,731 acres are used for agricultural activities, primarily for grazing as well as some row crops. Agricultural land in the form of row crops is located directly north of the Project Site and areas of open land, some of which are used for grazing, non-irrigated pasture and dry-farming, are located to the south, east and west. Agricultural operations would continue around and within the site itself to a limited extent. The Project would not physically divide an established community. There would be *no impact* in this regard.



Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan. The Project Site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

#### 4.15.11 Mineral Resources

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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; and/or*
- 2) *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.*

Both thresholds are discussed below.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Mineral Resources. The Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resources or the availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. This is because the Project Site is not located in a mineral resource zone (MRZ) as defined by the California Department of Conservation California Geological Survey. There is no land designated for mineral resources in the Project Site. The Project Site is not located on, adjacent to, or near known mineral resources or recovery sites. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to mineral resources.

#### 4.15.12 Noise

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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;*
- 2) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels;*
- 3) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;*
- 4) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;*
- 5) *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; and/or*
- 6) *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.*





Thresholds 1 through 4 are discussed in Section 4.11, *Noise*. Thresholds 5 and 6 are discussed below.

**b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Airport or Private Airstrip. The nearest public airport to the Project Site is the Hollister Municipal Airport, located at 90 Airport Drive in Hollister, approximately four miles northeast of the Project Site. The nearest private airstrip to the Project Site is Christenson Ranch Airport, located in Hollister, approximately seven miles northeast of the Project Site. The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, there would be *no impact* in this regard.

**4.15.13 Population and Housing**

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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);*
- 2) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and/or*
- 3) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

Threshold 1 is discussed in Section 5.0, *Other CEQA Discussions*. The remaining thresholds are discussed below.

**b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Displacement. The Project Site is currently used for agriculture and as a golf course and has no on-site residences. As such, the proposed Project would not displace any houses or people or require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there would be *no impact* in this regard.

**4.15.14 Public Services**

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities;*



Thresholds 1 is discussed in Section 4.12, *Public Services*.

#### 4.15.15 Recreation

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *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; and/or*
- 2) *Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.*

Both thresholds are discussed in Section 4.12, *Public Services*.

#### 4.15.16 Transportation and Circulation

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit;*
- 2) *Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;*
- 3) *Result in a change in traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks;*
- 4) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment);*
- 5) *Result in inadequate emergency access; and/or*
- 6) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

Thresholds 1 and 2 are discussed in Section 4.12, *Transportation and Circulation*. The remaining checklist items (3 through 6) are discussed below.

#### **b. Assessment of Impacts.**

Air Traffic Patterns. The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private air strips. The Project Site is located more than four miles southwest of the Hollister Municipal Airport and more than seven miles southeast of the Frazier Lake Airport. Additionally, the proposed Project would not require any additional air traffic to service the



Project Site. The Project would not result in any changes in air traffic patterns. There would be *no impact* in this regard.

Hazards and Emergency Access. The main access point to the Project Site is at the intersection of Union Road and San Juan Oaks Road. All Project traffic is assumed to use this entrance/exit to access the Project Site. The Project would include the construction of a new emergency vehicle access road (EVA) from the Project Site to SR 156 between Bixby Road and Flint Road. All roadways (including new internal roadways) would be designed to meet the standards of the County of San Benito, as set forth in Title 23 (Subdivision Ordinance), Chapters 23.25 (Design Requirements), 23.27 (Fire Design Standards), 23.29 (Road Standards), and 23.31 (Improvement Designs), Article II (Roadway Design Standards), standards focusing on the safe and standardized design of streets in subdivisions, design standards for bike lanes and separated bike paths, defensible space in the event of fires, accessible roadways for fire service providers, and water systems for fire protections. Emergency vehicles would also have access to the Project Site via any of the proposed access points and the roadways would meet the minimum standards required by the City of Hollister Fire Department. Therefore, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

The vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site would not cause any conflicts with the properties to the north, south, east, and west of the Project Site as the proposed Project does not involve any new agricultural uses that would involve farm equipment. Therefore, the proposed Project would not increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections).

The Project would not introduce incompatible uses (e.g., new on-site farm equipment) that would increase hazards. Adjacent agricultural uses may result in slow farm vehicles and equipment traveling on area roadways. However, farm vehicles would not utilize internal roadways associated with the Project. In addition, farm vehicles related to agricultural uses north of the Project Site may travel north, south, or eastward to other agricultural uses, but would not often travel southward past the Project Site along Union Road. The proposed Project would add vehicles traveling on SR 156 past agricultural uses. However, the added passenger traffic would not change substantially compared to existing conditions as passenger vehicles currently utilize these roadways to travel east and west. Therefore, the Project would not increase hazards due to incompatible uses.

Based on the above, the proposed Project would not result in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Alternative Transportation Plans. Implementation of the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or decrease the performance or safety of such facilities as the Project Site is not located within an area with these existing facilities. Furthermore, the Project proposes establishing pedestrian and bicycle-oriented circulation within the Project Site. There would be *no impact*.



#### 4.15.17 Utilities and Service Systems

**a. Thresholds of Significance.** Pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G checklist, potentially significant impacts would occur if the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- 1) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;*
- 2) *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;*
- 3) *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;*
- 4) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed;*
- 5) *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;*
- 6) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; and/or*
- 7) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.*

Thresholds 2 and 3 are analyzed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. All of the remaining thresholds above are analyzed in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*.

