

## PURPOSE

The City of Milpitas (City), as Lead Agency, determined that the 2040 Milpitas General Plan project (2040 General Plan, General Plan, or Project) is a "project" within the definition of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and, therefore, requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This Draft EIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Project. This EIR is designed to fully inform decision-makers in the City, other responsible and trustee agencies, and the general public of the potential environmental consequences of approval and implementation of the General Plan. A detailed description of the proposed Project, including the components and characteristics of the Project, project objectives, and how the EIR will be used, is provided in Chapter 2.0 (Project Description).

## AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the project that are known to the City, either raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR addresses the potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gas emissions and energy, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use planning and population/housing, mineral resources, noise, public services and recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, wildfire, and cumulative impacts.

During the NOP process, six comment letters were received from interested agencies and organizations. The comments are summarized in Chapter 1.0 (Introduction), and are also provided in Appendix A.

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.** Under Alternative 1, the City would not adopt the General Plan Update. The existing Milpitas General Plan would continue to be implemented and no changes to the General Plan, including the Land Use Map, Circulation Diagram, goals, policies, or actions would occur. Subsequent projects, such as amending the Municipal Code (including the zoning map) and the City's Design Guidelines, would not occur. The Existing General Plan Land Use Map is shown on Figure 5.0-1.
- **Alternative 2: Modified Project Alternative.** Under Alternative 2, the City would adopt the updated General Plan policy document, but would retain the existing Land Use Map. This alternative would result in the same growth as the existing General Plan and Alternative 1,

but would implement the updated goals, policies, and actions found in the General Plan Update. This Alternative would result in less residential and non-residential growth than the proposed project or Alternative 3. This alternative was developed to potentially reduce the severity of significant impacts associated with noise, as well as the potential further reduction in less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, air quality, public services, and utilities.

- Alternative 3: Increased Residential Density Alternative.** Alternative 3 would adopt the General Plan Update, including the proposed General Plan Land Use Map and updated goals, policies, and actions. However, Alternative 3 would place more emphasis on residential development, increasing the allowed densities for the residential land uses. This Alternative would result in a 15 percent increase in the number of new residential dwelling units when compared to the proposed project, resulting in more dwelling units than the other Alternatives. This Alternative would also result in more non-residential growth than Alternatives 1 and 2, but the same non-residential growth as the proposed Project. This alternative was developed to potentially reduce the severity impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and transportation, as most new development would be within close proximity to transit and in urban build up areas, or part of a mixed use area which would help to reduce per capita VMT. Figure 2.0-3 of Chapter 2 (Project Description) shows the proposed General Plan Land Use Map.

A comparative analysis of the proposed project and each of the project alternatives is provided in Table ES-1 below. The table includes a numerical scoring system, which assigns a score of 1 to 5 to each of the alternatives with respect to how each alternative compares to the proposed project in terms of the severity of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. A score of “3” indicates that the alternative would have the same level of impact when compared to the proposed project. A score of “1” indicates that the alternative would have a better (or reduced) impact when compared to the proposed project. A Score of “2” indicates that the alternative would have a slightly better (or slightly reduced) impact when compared to the proposed project. A score of “4” indicates that the alternative would have a slightly worse (or slightly increased) impact when compared to the proposed project. A score of “5” indicates that the alternative would have a worse (or increased) impact when compared to the proposed project. The project alternative with the lowest total score is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

**TABLE ES-1: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE</i>	<i>PROPOSED PROJECT</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO PROJECT)</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 2 (MODIFIED)</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 3 (INCREASED DENSITY)</i>
Aesthetics	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	4 – Slightly Worse
Agricultural Resources	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Air Quality	3 – Same	5 – Worse	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – same
Biological Resources	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same	3 – Same
Cultural Resources	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same	3 – Same
Geology and Soils	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same	3 – Same
Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy	3 – Same	5 – Worse	4 – Slightly Worse	2 – Slightly Better
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	4 – Slightly Worse

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE</i>	<i>PROPOSED PROJECT</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO PROJECT)</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 2 (MODIFIED)</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE 3 (INCREASED DENSITY)</i>
Hydrology and Water Quality	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same	3 – Same
Land Use and Population	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same
Noise	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	4 – Slightly Worse
Public Services and Recreation	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	3 – Same
Transportation and Circulation	3 – Same	4 – Slightly Worse	4 – Slightly Worse	3 – Same
Utilities	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	3 – Same
Wildfire	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Irreversible Effects	3 – Same	2 – Slightly Better	2 – Slightly Better	3 – Same
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>50</b>

As shown in Table ES-1, Alternative 2 (Reduced Mixed Growth Alternative) is the environmentally superior alternative when looked at in terms of all potential environmental impacts. While Alternative 3 has the same score as the Proposed General Plan, Alternative 3 fails to reduce the severity of any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project and scores lower compared to Alternative 2. All of the alternatives fail to reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts to a less than significant level. Throughout the preparation of the General Plan Update, the City Council, Planning Commission, and GPAC all expressed a desire and commitment to ensuring that the General Plan not only reflects the community’s values and priorities, but also serves as a self-mitigating document and avoid significant environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible. To that end, the proposed General Plan includes the fully range of feasible mitigation available to reduce potential impacts to the greatest extent possible.

Overall, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative as it is the most effective in terms of overall reductions of impacts compared to the proposed General Plan and all other alternatives. As such, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative for the purposes of this EIR analysis. Additionally, similar to the Proposed General Plan, Alternative 2 meets most project objectives. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2 reflects the current goals and vision expressed by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders; addresses issues and concerns identified by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders; protects Milpitas’s family-oriented environment, character, and sense of community; continues to maintain the road network and improve multimodal transportation opportunities; maintains strong fiscal sustainability; continues to provide efficient and adequate public services; and addresses new requirements of State law. However, without the updated Land Use Map Alternative 2 provides less high-quality housing options; and doesn’t not meet the General Plan’s Objectives to attract and retain businesses and industries that provide high-quality and high-paying jobs when compared to the proposed Projects Innovation Area, and Business Park Research and Development land uses to address emerging employment needs and trends. Additionally an objective of the General Plan is to expand and improve neighborhood serving shopping areas to provide better local services near neighborhoods. The proposed Project does this through newly established commercial and mixed use areas included within the Neighborhood Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial Mixed-Use land use designations that Alternative 2 would not implement. Thus Alternative 2 fails to meet

all project objectives as it retains of the existing land use map and designations that are central to the proposed Project's objectives.

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR focuses on the Project's significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines defines a significant effect as a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions which exist in the area affected by the proposed Project. A less than significant effect is one in which there is no long- short-term significant adverse change in environmental conditions. Some impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures and/or compliance with regulations. "Beneficial" effect is not defined in the CEQA Guidelines, but for purposes of this EIR a "beneficial" effect is one in which an environmental condition is enhanced or improved. CEQA defines Cumulatively Considerable to mean incremental effects of an individual project that are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and future projects. Significant and Unavoidable describes significant impacts for which mitigation to reduce the significant impact to a less-than-significant level is not available or feasible. A potentially significant impact is identified where a Project may cause a substantial adverse change in the environment. A project impact is considered potentially significant if the Project is anticipated to exceed identified standards of significance thereby result in a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. In instances where potentially significant impacts are identified, the EIR must consider whether mitigation measures or alternatives to the Project that would reduce those impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed Project, the impact level of significance are summarized in Table ES-2.

**TABLE ES-2: PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
<b>AESTHETICS</b>			
Impact 3.1-1: General Plan implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.1-2: General Plan implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.1-3: General Plan implementation would not, in a non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, or in an urbanized area, conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.1-4: General Plan implementation could result in the creation of new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
<b>AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.2-1: General Plan implementation would result in the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, to non-agricultural use	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable**PS – potentially significant**LCC – less than cumulatively considerable**SU – significant and unavoidable**LS – less than significant*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.2-2: General Plan implementation would not result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.2-3: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.2-4: General Plan implementation would not 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	LS	None Required	LS
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
Impact 3.3-1: General Plan implementation would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.3-2: General Plan implementation would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.3-3: General Plan implementation would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)	LS	None Required	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.4-1: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.4-2: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.4-3: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.4-4: General Plan implementation would not 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	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.4-5: The General Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.4-6: General Plan implementation would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan	LS	None Required	LS
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.5-1: General Plan implementation could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.5-2: Implementation of the General Plan could lead to the disturbance of any human remains	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.5-3: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, and that is: 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 a resource determined by the lead agency	LS	None Required	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

SU – significant and unavoidable



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>GEOLOGY</b>			
Impact 3.6-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.6-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.6-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in development 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	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.6-4: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in development on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.6-5: General Plan implementation does not have the potential to have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water			
Impact 3.6-6: General Plan implementation has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature	LS	None Required	LS
<b>GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND ENERGY</b>			
Impact 3.7-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to generate GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.7-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to conflict with adopted plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.7-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in a significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency	LS	None Required	LS
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
Impact 3.8-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to create a significant hazard to the	LS	None Required	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment			
Impact 3.8-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.8-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to have projects located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.8-4: General Plan implementation is not located within an airport land use plan, two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.8-5: General Plan implementation has the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.8-6: General Plan implementation has the potential to expose people or structures to a	LS	None Required	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

SU – significant and unavoidable

LS – less than significant

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires			
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>			
Impact 3.9-1: General Plan implementation could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.9-2: General Plan implementation could result in the depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge or conflict with a groundwater management plan	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.9-3: General Plan implementation could alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, impeded flows, or polluted runoff	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.9-4: General Plan implementation would not release pollutants due to project inundation by flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
<b>LAND USE PLANNING AND POPULATION/HOUSING</b>			

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.10-1: General Plan implementation would not physically divide an established community	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.10-2: General Plan implementation would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.10-3: General Plan implementation would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.10-4: General Plan implementation would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere	LS	None Required	LS
<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.11-1: General Plan implementation would not 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	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.11-2: General Plan implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	LS	None Required	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

*LS – less than significant*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan			
<b>NOISE</b>			
Impact 3.12-1: General Plan implementation may result in exposure to significant traffic noise sources	PS	<i>Mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No additional feasible mitigation is available.</i>	SU
Impact 3.12-2: General Plan implementation may result in exposure to excessive railroad noise sources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.12-3: Implementation of the General Plan could result in the generation of excessive stationary noise sources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.12-4: General Plan implementation may result in an increase in construction noise sources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.12-5: General Plan implementation may result in construction vibration	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.12-6: General Plan implementation may result in exposure to groundborne vibration	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION</b>			
Impact 3.13-1: General Plan implementation could result in adverse physical impacts on the environment associated with the need for new governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts and the provision of public services	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.13-2: General Plan implementation may result in adverse physical impacts associated with the deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities or the construction of new parks and recreation facilities	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>			
Impact 3.14-1: General Plan implementation would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS
Impact 3.14-2: General Plan implementation would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (a)	PS	<i>Mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No additional feasible mitigation is available.</i>	SU

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.14-3: General Plan implementation would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.14-4: General Plan implementation would not result in inadequate emergency access	LS	None Required	LS
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>			
Impact 3.15-1: General Plan implementation would result in sufficient water supplies available to serve the City and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.15-2: General Plan implementation may require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.15-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to 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	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.15-4: General Plan implementation may require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities, the	LS	None Required	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

SU – significant and unavoidable



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects			
Impact 3.15-5: General Plan implementation may require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.15-6: General Plan implementation would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals	LS	None Required	LS
<b>WILDFIRES</b>			
Impact 3.16-1: General Plan implementation could substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.16-2: General Plan implementation would not exacerbate wildfire risks, or thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 3.16-3: Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as	LS	None Required	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

*LS – less than significant*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment			
Impact 3.16-4: Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LS

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS</b>			
Impact 4.1: Cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.2: Cumulative impact to agricultural lands and resources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.3: Cumulative impact on the region's air quality	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.4: Cumulative loss of biological resources, including habitats and special status species	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.5: Cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.6: Cumulative impacts related to geology and soils	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.7: Cumulative impacts related to greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.8: Cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and human health risks	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.9: Cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.10: Cumulative impacts related to local land use, population, and housing	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 4.11: Cumulative impacts related to mineral resources	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.12: Cumulative impacts related to noise	PS	<i>Mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No additional feasible mitigation is available.</i>	CC/SU
Impact 4.13: Cumulative impacts to public services and recreation	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.14: Cumulative impacts on the transportation network	PS	<i>Mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No additional feasible mitigation is available.</i>	CC/SU
Impact 4.15: Cumulative impacts related to utilities	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.16: Cumulative impact related to wildfire	LS	<i>None Required</i>	LCC
Impact 4.17: Irreversible Effects	PS	<i>Mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No additional feasible mitigation is available.</i>	SU

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

*LS – less than significant*