# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY January 2017

**INITIAL STUDY**

# I. BACKGROUND

PROJECT TITLE: *(Applicant name/Business name)* Application to Appropriate Water

APPLICATION: A0XXXXX

APPLICANT: *Applicant name and address*

APPLICANT’S CONTACT PERSON: *Agent name and address*

General Plan Designation:

Zoning:

## Introduction

Include applicant name, application number, and dates filed. Describe the diversion amount (acre-feet), rate (cubic feet per second), and type (direct diversion/storage), location of project (using nearby landmarks such as towns/cities), location of source (Point(s) of Diversion), purpose of use, and season of diversion (from --- to ---).

Example: On [date], [applicant name] filed an application to appropriate water by permit (A0XXXXX) with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Water Rights (Division). The Applicant is seeking the right to appropriate water from [source stream] tributary to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, thence \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, thence the Pacific Ocean in the County of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The Applicant is proposing to construct a reservoir for storage of \_\_ acre-feet (af) of water diverted from XXXX(source). The appropriated water will be used for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_. [Source Stream] is located within the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ watershed, approximately \_\_\_ miles (north, south, east, west) of [nearest town/city/landmark](reference location map if applicable).

Include detailed project description information as applicable. Information may include:

* Maximum diversion amount (af) and rate (cfs)
* Type of diversion (direct diversion/storage)
* Season of Diversion
* Location and source of Points of Diversion (PODs)
* Details of diversion such as size and type of dam or storage facility, season of diversion, means of distribution to the Place Of Use (POU)
* Purpose of Use
* Place of Use table (reference site maps)
* Additional source of project water (percolating groundwater wells, purchased water, riparian)

## Project Background

Include information regarding the history of the project such as the date of public notice, the dates and status of protests, and descriptions of protest resolutions

## Environmental Setting and Baseline

*Briefly describe habitat type(s) including sensitive habitat at the project site, elevation, climate, surrounding land use, special status species, and potential habitat for special status species. These items will be explained in detail in the biological resources section. Include a general summary of documentation from field visit(s), surveys, and reports. Identify the baseline date used for evaluation of the project. Summarize the project components included in the baseline and those which are to be evaluated.*

The following sample table may be used to summarize the information included in this section:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Existing Project Components at Baseline | CEQA Baseline Date | Project Components |
| Reservoir 1 (capacity 10 af) and existing POD 1 | July 9, 2010 | Expansion of Reservoir 1 to 40 af capacity |
| 50 acres of existing vineyard | Planting of 30 acres of proposed vineyard |

For partially existing projects, identify components of the pending application or petition that are existing. As existing features generally fall within the CEQA baseline, impacts of these features will not generally be evaluated in the CEQA document. Note that those with the potential to affect public trust resources will be addressed separately under public trust considerations.

## Regulatory Environment

If State Water Board is lead agency, include the following: “The State Water Board is the lead agency under CEQA with the primary authority for project approval. In addition, the following responsible, trustee, and federal agencies may have jurisdiction over some or all of the proposed project:”

Include a list of responsible, trustee and federal agencies with a brief explanation of the area of jurisdiction. For example:

* California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement, California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Compliance
* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Regional Water Quality Control Board – Clean Water Act section 401 Water Quality Certification
* County of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ - County Use Permit
* National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) – Consultation pursuant to Sections 7, 9, and 10 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) regarding protection of plants and wildlife that are listed as endangered or threatened
* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) – Clean Water Act section 404 Permit

The following CDFW link provides definitions of Responsible, Trustee, and Lead Agencies: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CEQA/Role>

# II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS CONSIDERED UNDER CEQA

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project. See the checklist on the following pages for more details.

All sections should include a complete explanation of reasons the environmental factor could or could not be potentially affected by the project. Where applicable, a regulatory setting should be clearly defined as it relates to the environmental factor. A “No Impact” answer must be adequately supported by referenced information sources or explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards. All answers must take account of the whole action involved including direct, indirect, and foreseeable future impacts.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 🞏 Aesthetics | 🞎 Agriculture and Forest Resources | 🞎 Air Quality |
| 🞎 Biological Resources | 🞎 Cultural Resources | 🞎 Geology and Soils |
| 🞎 Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 🞎 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 🞎 Hydrology and Water Quality |
| 🞏 Land Use and Planning | 🞎 Mineral Resources | 🞏 Noise |
| 🞏 Population and Housing | 🞎 Public Services | 🞎 Recreation |
| 🞎 Transportation/Traffic | 🞎 Tribal Cultural Resources | 🞎 Utilities and Service Systems |
| 🞏 Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |  |

### 1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of potential impacts to aesthetics such as existing distant and immediate views, views of construction vehicles, off site views of diversion structures, and continuity with surrounding land use.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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 uses? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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))? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the site designation according to the County General Plan, local policies or programs, municipal code, and/or the Williamson Act contract as well as any changes to this designation.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant)

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* Williamson Act Program - <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/>
* California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model - <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/Pages/qh_lesa.aspx>
* California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - <http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/>
  + Forest and Range Assessment Project - <http://frap.fire.ca.gov/assessment/>
  + Forest Legacy Program - <http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/resource_mgt_forestryassistance_legacy.php>
* California Air Resources Board, forest protocols - <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/forestry/forestry.htm>
* Regional Water Quality Control Board Timber Harvest Programs

### 3. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the local air basin and Air Quality Management District, emission concerns, and activities that may degrade air quality.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References

* Federal Clean Air Act National Ambient Air Quality Standards – <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants>
* California Air Resources Board State Ambient Air Quality Standards – <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/caaqs/caaqs.htm>
* URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4 model of short term construction generated emissions – <http://www.urbemis.com/>

### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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 CDFW or USFWS? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| i) Result in a substantial increase or threat from invasive, non-native plants and wildlife? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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 CDFW or USFWS? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the environmental setting, findings of the Biological Survey, and explanation of whether or not there are potential impacts to habitat types and special status plant and wildlife species, including special status fish species.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation, if applicable, such as stream setbacks, mitigation plans for onstream dams, and Clean Water Act section 401/404 mitigation.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* CDFW Survey Guidelines - <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols>
* CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (re-check database for updates since completion of biological survey and review consistency with data use guidelines) - <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB>
* CDFW Species Information - <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/genplantsanimals.html>
* CA Native Plant Society - <http://cnps.site.aplus.net/cgi-bin/inv/inventory.cgi>
* Species Designation
  + <http://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species-reports> <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/genplantsanimals.html>
* Federal Register - <http://www.fws.gov/policy/frsystem/default.cfm>
* ACOE Wetland Delineation - <http://www.usace.army.mil/Portals/2/docs/civilworks/regulatory/rw_bro.pdf>
* Significant Natural Areas - <http://gcmd.nasa.gov/KeywordSearch/Metadata.do?Portal=GCMD&KeywordPath=DataCenters%7CACADEMIC%7CUC-DAVIS%2FDES%2FICE&OrigMetadataNode=GCMD&EntryId=uc_davis_sna&MetadataView=Full&MetadataType=0&lbnode=mdlb3>
* California Cooperative Anadromous Fish and Habitat Data Program - <http://www.calfish.org>
* DFG/NMFS Draft Guidelines for Maintaining Instream Flows to Protect Fisheries Resources Downstream of Water Diversions in Mid-California Coastal Streams - <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/coastal_streams/docs/nmfs_dgs_fish_guidelines_061702.pdf>
* State Water Board Policy for Maintaining Instream Flows in Northern California Coastal Streams <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/instream_flows/>
* County website – (county ordinances)
* Local Watershed Group websites
* Regional Conservation District website

### 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the cultural resources study and any prehistoric, newly identified, or historic resources.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* California Historical Resources Information System - <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068>
* Native American Heritage Commission - <http://www.nahc.ca.gov/>
* Instructions for Recording Historical Resources - <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/manual95.pdf>
* Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format - <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf>

### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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 in 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. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iv) Landslides? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Description of the project location with respect to nearby Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, potential hazards, potential for erosion, soil types, and site topography (either in the response, in the regulatory setting or both).
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity, it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* Geologic Hazards and Regulatory Hazard Zones -<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/hazards/Pages/index.aspx>
* California Geological Survey - <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Pages/Index.aspx>
* Soil Maps - <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/surveylist/soils/survey/state/?stateId=CA>

### 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential impacts.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable,
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* California Code of Regulations section 15064.4

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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 a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any hazardous materials used during the construction and operation of the project and the related potential impacts.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that would: |  |  |  |  |
| i) result in flooding on- or off-site | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater discharge | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iii) provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iv) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Place housing or other structures which would impede or re-direct flood flows within a 100-yr. flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| f) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding: |  |  |  |  |
| i) as a result of the failure of a dam or levee? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ii) from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| g) Would the change in the water volume and/or the pattern of seasonal flows in the affected watercourse result in: |  |  |  |  |
| i) a significant cumulative reduction in the water supply downstream of the diversion? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ii) a significant reduction in water supply, either on an annual or seasonal basis, to senior water right holders downstream of the diversion? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iii) a significant reduction in the available aquatic habitat or riparian habitat for native species of plants and animals? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| iv) a significant change in seasonal water temperatures due to changes in the patterns of water flow in the stream? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the findings from the Water Availability Analysis, including a discussion of cumulative effects at each of the selected POIs and possible impacts to water quality (erosion, siltation, sources of polluted runoff). Any additional studies completed to examine the impacts should be explained and the results should be analyzed. This section should disclose any agency consultation regarding Report of Waste Discharge, NPDES Storm Water Discharge, Clean Water Act section 401 Water Quality Certification, and Clean Water Act section 404 Permits.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation such as bypass flows and passive bypass requirements if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

References:

* WAA
* Consultation with CDFW, NMFS, USFWS, County, Regional Water Quality Board
* DFG/NMFS Draft Guidelines for Maintaining Instream Flows to Protect Fisheries Resources Downstream of Water Diversions in Mid-California Coastal Streams - <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/coastal_streams/docs/nmfs_dgs_fish_guidelines_061702.pdf>
* State Water Board Policy for Maintaining Instream Flows in Northern California Coastal Streams <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/instream_flows/>
* Erosion Control Plans
* County Grading Permit
* County Ordinances
* Flood Hazard Map – <http://msc.fema.gov/portal>

### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the applicant’s compliance with land zoning designations and any related requirements such as an erosion control plan or stream setback.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-signficant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of state designated (MRZ-2) or county designated mineral resources located at the project site and any potential direct or indirect effect of the project on mineral resources.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant)

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 12. NOISE

Would the project result in:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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 in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Description of any changes in noise levels at the project site and any noise-sensitive receptors or sensitive land uses near the project site.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential direct or indirect effects of the project on population growth or housing.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above, and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Fire protection? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Police protection? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Schools? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Parks? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Other public facilities? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any public service or public facility related potential impacts.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 15. RECREATION

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential impacts on existing or proposed recreational facilities.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Result in inadequate emergency access? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| g) 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential impacts related to traffic and transportation systems during the construction period and over the long-term.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of the State Water Board’s AB 52 tribal consultation and any potential impacts.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential impacts to or changes in utilities and service systems associated with the project.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant)

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| 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) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Provide a response to each of the above questions justifying the selected level of impact. Responses may require:

1. Descriptions of any potential impacts.
2. Identification and description of specific mitigation terms, if applicable.
3. Explanation of how each term mitigates for potential impacts (i.e. how will the mitigation reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant).

For improved clarity it is highly recommended that questions be analyzed sequentially in accordance with the checklist above and that each response is labeled appropriately (i.e. a, b, c, and so forth).

### 20. EARLIER ANALYSIS

*Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15063, subd. (c)(3)(D).) In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:*

*a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses 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 that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site‑specific conditions for the project.*

# III. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. | 🞏 |
| 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 NEGATIVE MITIGATED 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. | 🞏 |
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**Authority**: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21084, 21084.1, and 21087.

**Reference**: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.1 through 21083.3, 21083.6 through 21083.9, 21084.1, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors,* 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

# IV. INFORMATION SOURCES

Include all references used in the preparation of the initial study. Each reference should include a corresponding footnote number with respect to its location in the document.

# V. LIST OF PREPARERS

# VI. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

*Do not include Public Trust Analysis, Compliance Plan, or Draft Permit as attachments.*