

**Lemoore Planning Commission
Staff Report**

E.I.A No. 2005-07 / TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO.2005-03
APPLICATION BY CRAIG PEDERSEN

A. General Information:

1. Planning Commission Review: January 9, 2006
2. Applicant: Craig Pedersen
16382 Houston Avenue
Hanford, CA. 93230
3. Owners: Semas Farms LLC
15434 Houston Avenue
Lemoore, Ca 93245
(559) 582-7347

Mardell B. Pedersen
25478 Houston Avenue
Lemoore, Ca 93245
(559) 584-7784
4. Engineer/Surveyor: Provost & Pritchard
John Dutton
3500 W. Orchard Court
Visalia, Ca 93277
(559) 636-1166, (559) 636-1177 fax
5. Location: Westside of Highway 41
6. Property Description: Assessor Parcel Nos:
023-510-007, 011,012, 014,015, 031, & 032
023-480-006, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016,017,
019, 020, 021, & 022
023-470-009 & 010
023-520-005 & 006
7. Site Area: Approximately 956 acres, with 23 existing parcels

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--|
| 10. | General Plan Designations: | Low Density, Low-Medium Density, and Medium Density and High Density Residential designations, Central Commercial Professional Office Open Space |
| 11. | Zone Districts: | RA-20, R-1-7, RM 3, RM-2 Central Commercial, Professional Office, Open Space, RSC |
| 12. | Existing Use | Vacant land, ag land, and wetlands |

B. Project Location & Description:

The project location is on the west side of Highway 41, north and south of the railroad tracks and surrounds the West Hills College site. The applicant proposes to create 15 parcels containing approximately 956 acres, consisting of 23 parcels. The the subject site is vacant land, ag land and some wetlands. The entire site is designated for residential, commercial, and industrial development as well as some open space. These parcels are being created to seperate the property into saleable pieces which generally align with general plan identified arterial and collector streets as well as align with some general plan and zoning designations. A portion of Semas Avenue is proposed to be abandoned and a new right-of-way given to better align with future development north of Bush.

C. Project Review:

The Tentative Parcel Map application is reviewed to determine its compliance with the State Map Act, Lemoore Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances, as well as City Policies and Standards. Comments received from the Southern California Gas Company, P.G & E, Quad-Knopf as well as from City staff during the preliminary site plan review process and taken into consideration in making the following findings:

1. Subdivision Map Act

Section 66426 of the Subdivision Map Act does not require the filing of a Subdivision Map for this project, even though more than four parcels are involved because of the following exceptions listed under items a-d below. Technically, the developers could have been required the submittal of two or three parcels maps to satisfy this section, however, staff determined in working with the City Attorney that a composite single parcel map would be acceptable.

Haven Drive)

- (d) Each parcel created by the division has a gross area of not less than 40 acres or is not less than a quarter of a quarter section (which is the case for the remaining parcels).

Based on exceptions (a) through (d) above, the submitted map meets the requirements to file a parcel map instead of a subdivision map.

In regards to the design layout of the parcels, parcel 7 is proposed with a long finger adjacent to the railroad west of parcels 5 and 6 which is not a logical configuration. Therefore, the finger portions of parcel 7 needs to become part of parcels 5 and 6 where it is narrowly pinned between the railroad and the parcels on the proposed map.

2. Williamson Act:

Some of the parcels involved in the parcel map are not currently under Williamson Act contracts, some have filed notices of non-renewals filed and will expire in less than three years, a few have more than three years to expiration, and one parcel is still under the full Williamson Act contract as summarized below:

Assessors Parcel Number

023-480-011	This property is not under contract
023-480-012	This property is not under contract
023-480-015	This property is not under contract
023-480-017	This property is not under contract
023-480-019	This property is not under contract
023-480-020	This property is not under contract
023-480-021	This property is not under contract
023-480-022	This property is not under contract
023-480-013	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, as shown on assessors computer and recorders office documents
023-480-014	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, "
023-480-016	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, "
023-510-007	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, "
023-510-014	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, "
023-510-010	Contract will expire on 1/1/08, "

023-510- Notice of Non-Renewal has not been filed yet
031

If all the active Williamson Act contracts applicable to these properties have less than three (3) years remaining in their term, there would be no need to deny or condition the recording of the Parcel Map pursuant to Section 66474.4(e)(2) of the Subdivision Map Act. However, because this is not the case, the Subdivision Map Act Section 66474.4 requires that the recording of the Parcel Map cannot occur until the Williamson Act contracts affecting the property have either expired or been granted tentative cancellation under California government code section 51282 which requires the payment of applicable early cancellation penalties.

3. Zoning:

The subject property contains property zoned commercial, industrial, mixed residential and open space. No zone changes are proposed with this application and no buildings are located on site that would require setback issues to be reviewed.

4. Access:

The subject parcels are located west of State Highway 41 adjacent to existing maintained City streets (such as Bush Street and College Avenue) or dedications are being provided to give access to all parcels with the exception of the remainder parcel which abutts the railroad right-of-way.

Caltrans' comment letter believed that the "project could generate a significant amount of vehicle trips during AM and PM peak travel times and would have a major adverse impact to State facilities". However, a parcel map does not give any approvals for specific development of property and therefore in and of themselves can not generate any impact on State facilities. However, when specific subdivision maps, site plan reviews, or planned unit developments come forward, then staff can analyze the impacts based on the proposed development. If those projects show impacts to the State facilities they will be addressed at the time they are approved and any associated impact fees will be imposed. The City has already started its impact fee study which will review alternatives at the highway and on City streets, their costs, and a timeline for improvements.

5. Rights-of-Way / Irrevocable Offers of Dedications / Easements / Abandonement:

The map includes some new dedications of right-of-ways (ROW) and irrevocable offers of dedications which include the following:

- ? Bush Street so that 104' of ROW shall exist (versus the existing 94') between Highway 41 to College Avenue and 89' ROW shall be dedicated west of the college. The portion closest to the highway is not clearly delineated as to the existing ROW and the additional ROW being given and needs to be clearly on the Final Map.
- ? Pedersen Street between Semas Avenue alignment and the existing Belle Haven Drive so that 84' shall be given.
- ? Semas Avenue between Bush Street and Pedersen Street alignments shall dedicate 84' of new ROW. Additionally the Semas Avenue alignment north of Bush Street proposes an 84' dedication through an irrevocable offer to dedicate.
- ? College Avenue alignment north of Bush Street shall give an irrevocable offer to dedicate 84' of ROW.
- ? A street north of Bush Street designated as an arterial street, in alignment with Production Place (located north of the railroad tracks within the industrial park), shall provide an irrevocable offer to dedicate 84' of ROW.
- ? Marsh Drive alignment south of the Pedersen Street Alignment will give an irrevocable offer to dedicate 84' of ROW between parcels 7 & 8

Several easements exist within the project area and may or may not be listed in the map but will need to be reflected in the Final Parcel Map as follows:

Street may be necessary.



Curb radii on all arterial and collector streets intersections requires a 30' curb-radius at 90 degree intersections. A few intersections have obtuse angles, therefore the City Engineer will have to provide radii to obtain the same results as the City standard. These are not delineated on the map and will need to be part of the dedications and shown on a separate map page due to the scale of the map.

The Tentative Parcel Map shows the vacating of a portion of Semas Avenue as its current alignment does not work for development projects which are moving forward and a new alignment has been proposed by staff to meet future traffic signal conditions. Under the California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8300 and following, the City Council must initiate vacating proceedings via resolution then a public hearing must be conducted prior to a final resolution being adopted to fully accept the vacating shown on the parcel map. Therefore, the Planning Commission should recommend that the City Council begin vacating process to eliminate this portion of public right-of-way prior to a Final Parcel Map being recorded.

Other easements are identified in the Preliminary Title Report and need to be shown and reference on the Final Parcel Map including easements to County of Tulare, Lemoore Canal and Irrigation Company, Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, Southern California Gas Company, Cal-King Livestock & Feeding Co, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, City of Lemoore, County of Kings, Kings County Land and Cattle Company, Inc., Land Conservation Contract, etc. as shown in the attached Exhibit A.

6. Public Infrastructure:

City water currently exists in Bush Street from the eastside of town to West Hills College, within College Avenue between Bush and Pedersen Streets, within Belle Haven Drive north of Bush Street to Industry Way, and under the freeway to serve the existing Cimarron Park residential housing tract. Fire hydrants are in adjacent to College Avenue and North Belle Haven Drive. Sewer lines currently exists in Belle Haven Drive south of Bush Street, within Pedersen Street between Belle Haven and College Avenue, and within College Avenue north of Pedersen to the partially constructed City ponding basin. Storm water pipes only exist in a portion of Belle Haven Drive north of Bush Street.

In order to maintain the integrity of the Southern California Gas Company's high-pressure pipeline and to preserve the free and complete exercise of their easement rights, they provided a list of 17 requirements and recommendations (as shown in the attached letter, Exhibit B) that will need to become one of the conditions of approval. All of their requirements and recommendations relate to construction activities and permanent access to specific areas which will be more pertinent when subdivision maps or site plans are brought forward.

The City Engineer recommends that the Parcel Map depict any designated flood plain on the Parcel Map, therefore need to be added to the Map.

D. Environmental Assessment:

Most Parcel Maps are categorically exempt from California Environmental Quality Act as per Section 15315 of the State Guidelines, but only if it involves four or fewer parcels. Because the proposed Tentative Parcel Map involves 14 parcels and a remainder an environmental determination has to be made. A preliminary environmental impact assessment of the project was conducted by the staff in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act. It was determined that the project could not have any significant adverse impacts on the environment. The Commission should adopt a Negative Declaration for the project pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act.

H. Recommendation:

- ? The Planning Commission should adopt a Negative Declaration for the project pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act.
- ? The Planning Commission should approve Craig Pedersen's Tentative Parcel Map No. 2005-03 to create/merge 23 parcels into 14 parcels and one unsurveyed remainder with the following conditions and such approval shall be valid for two (2) years and will expire on January 9, 2008 so long as the City Council processes and approves the vacating of a portion of Semas Avenue pursuant to the California Streets and Highways Code Section 8300 et al before the Parcel Map is recorded. Should the abandonment of the existing alignment be denied, the Final Parcel Map shall reflect the current alignment of the southerly half of Semas south of Bush Street.
 1. Parcels 5, 6, and 7 shall be altered to remove the finger area between the railroad and the parcels so that the finger no longer exists and is part of parcels 5 and 6.
 2. The recording of the Parcel Map cannot occur until the Williamson Act contracts affecting the property have either expired or been granted tentative cancellation under California government code section 51282 which requires the payment of applicable early cancellation penalties.
 3. The Parcel Map shall dedicate additional ROW sufficient to create a 104' wide right of way strip and shown on the map along Bush Street between Highway 41 and College Avenue. The developer is advised that additional ROW may be required along Bush Street with the submittal of future Subdivision Maps as determined by a traffic analysis.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

FOR THE CITY OF LEMOORE

1. Project Title: Tentative Parcel Map No. 2005-03
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lemoore, 210 Fox Street, Lemoore California 93245
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Holly Smyth (559) 924-6740
4. Project Location: Westside of State Highway 41 north and south of the railroad and surrounding West Hills College
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Craig Pedersen 16382 Houston Avenue, Hanford, CA. 93230
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density, Low-Medium Density, and Medium Density and High Density Residential designations, Central Commercial, Professional Office, Open Space
7. Zone District: RA-20, R-1-7, RM 3, RM-2, Central Commercial, Professional Office, Open Space, RSC
8. Description of Project: To create 14 parcels and a remainder from approximately 956 acres of land from 23 parcels
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Vacant land, ag land and wetlands
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: _____

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

- 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

- 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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

			XX
			XX

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

(Note: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	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 on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to *Division of Mines & 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 soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX
			XX

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 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 one-quarter 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 Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

wildlands area adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				XX
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.)?				XX
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				XX
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				XX
e) 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?				XX
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				XX
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				XX
h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				XX
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				XX
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				XX

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?				XX
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				XX

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?

			XX
--	--	--	----

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in: (cont.)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generations of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				XX
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				XX
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				XX
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				XX
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				XX

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by processing new homes and Businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?				XX
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				XX
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				XX

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical Impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?				XX
ii) Police protection?				XX
iii) Schools?				XX

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			XX

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections.)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

- 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 which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to the 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

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?
- 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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			XX

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----