

APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT CHECKLIST

1. PROJECT TITLE

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) Long-Term North Central Region Incidental Take Permit (ITP) and Master Streambed Alteration Agreement (MSAA).

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
1701 Nimbus Road
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Matthew Brown
Environmental Management
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
(559) 246-1592

4. PROJECT LOCATION

The area under consideration for the ITP and MSAA (Permit Area) consists of PG&E's current natural gas and electric facilities in CDFW's North Central Region of California, excluding San Joaquin County. The continued operation and maintenance (O&M) of specific covered activities (Covered O&M Activities) will occur in the following 15 counties or portions of the following counties as noted in parentheses: Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Lake, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento (east of Interstate (I)-5), Sierra, Sutter, Yolo (north of I-80), and Yuba.¹ The CDFW's North Central Region boundary is split with the Bay Delta Region in Sacramento and Yolo counties. The boundary follows I-5 starting at the Stanislaus County/I-5 junction to the Legal Delta boundary north of I-80. San Joaquin County also falls within CDFW's North Central Region; however, it is not included in the Permit Area as take coverage for San Joaquin County is already covered under a separate ITP. Within San Joaquin County an MSAA is already in place between the CDFW and PG&E for those jurisdictional areas where certain O&M activities may occur (Agreement No. 1600-2008-0001-0000-HQ). All Covered O&M Activities will occur within the following types of areas:

- PG&E gas and electrical transmission and distribution rights-of-way (ROWs) and lands where PG&E has other relevant land rights;
- the lands owned by PG&E in fee;
- access routes associated with PG&E's routine maintenance;
- a buffer around the ROW; and
- mitigation areas acquired to compensate for impacts resulting from the Covered O&M Activities.

¹ Only portions of the following counties are included because the Permit Area aligns with PG&E's Multiple Region O&M Habitat Conservation Plan boundary: Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado.

The Covered O&M Activities will occur within the 15-county area, totaling approximately 10,162,133 acres (7,420,043 acres of which are in natural vegetation). The Covered O&M Activities are expected to be performed throughout PG&E's ROWs and in close proximity to the ROWs over the course of the 30-year ITP terms.

5. PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
3580 East California Avenue, Building B
Fresno, CA 93725

6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

Habitat Conservation Plans/Natural Community Conservation Plans

Numerous habitat conservation plans (HCPs) and natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) have been established or are in the planning phase within the Permit Area, including the PG&E Multiple Region O&M HCP (MRHCP), Western Placer County NCCP/HCP, Proposed PG&E Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle O&M HCP (VELBHCP), Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP), Calaveras River HCP (CRHCP), South Sacramento HCP, Natomas Basin HCP/Metro Air Park HCP, Yolo HCP/NCCP, and Yuba-Sutter NCCP/HCP.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company Multiple Region O&M Habitat Conservation Plan

The MRHCP from PG&E is intended to avoid, minimize, and mitigate temporary and permanent impacts to federally threatened and endangered species resulting from PG&E's O&M and minor new construction activities in the MRHCP area (PG&E 2020). The MRHCP obtained federal take coverage for 22 species throughout the Central Coast, North Coast, and Sacramento Valley and Foothills regions, encompassing 34 counties, and provides the basis for incidental take authorization pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) for PG&E's current and future O&M activities and minor new construction in the MRHCP area. The MRHCP area overlaps with the Permit Area.

Western Placer County Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan

The Western Placer County NCCP/HCP is a component of the Placer County Conservation Program (PCCP), which was adopted in 2020 (Placer County 2020). The PCCP is a multi-component program comprised of the Western Placer County NCCP/HCP, a County Aquatic Resources Program, and an In-Lieu Fee Program to fulfill requirements for impacts to aquatic resources under the Clean Water Act Section 401/404. The Western Placer County NCCP/HCP protects 14 animal species and their habitats, fulfilling requirements of FESA and the California Natural Community and Conservation Planning Act (NCCP Act). A goal of the Western Placer County NCCP/HCP is to provide a proactive conservation strategy while streamlining the permitting process.

Pacific Gas and Electric Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan

The Proposed VELBHCP was available for public review and comment on July 9, 2024 (United States [U.S.] Fish and Wildlife Service 2024). The purpose of the VELBHCP is to enable PG&E

to continue to conduct covered activities in all or portions of 22 counties located within the Central Valley, portions of the Sierra Nevada foothills, the Sacramento and San Joaquin river basins, and some eastern portions of the Coast Ranges (Plan Area) while avoiding and minimizing impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*) and mitigating for impacts on the species and its habitat in compliance with the FESA.

Butte Regional Conservation Plan

The BRCP is anticipated to serve as an HCP pursuant to the FESA and a NCCP under the NCCP Act; it was designed to preserve and conserve the natural resources and covered species within the plan area (Butte County 2024). A goal of the BRCP is to streamline the state and federal permitting process for future projects in compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), FESA, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and National Environmental Policy Act. The final BRCP and Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report were distributed in 2019; however, the plan has not received agency approval and is not currently being implemented.

Calaveras River Habitat Conservation Plan

The CRHCP, prepared by the Stockton East Water District and finalized in 2020, aims to maintain a viable population of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and Central Valley steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*) within the CRHCP boundaries (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service [NOAA Fisheries] 2020). Portions of the CRHCP geographic scope are within the Permit Area.

South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan

The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan ensures the preservation of species, natural communities, and aquatic resources within its plan area and provides an improved environmental permitting process for covered projects that impact listed species, listed species habitats, and aquatic resources (Sacramento County 2018). A total of 28 plant and animal species is covered under this HCP, 11 of which are listed as threatened or endangered under FESA and/or CESA, including but not limited to the giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) and California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*).

Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan/Metro Air Park Habitat Conservation Plan

The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) (City of Sacramento, Sutter County, and Natomas Basin Conservancy 2003) was developed to provide and implement a multispecies conservation program for the Natomas Basin, which is located in the northern portion of Sacramento County and the southern portion of Sutter County. The Metro Air Park Habitat Conservation Plan (MAPHCP) is encompassed within the NBHCP. The MAPHCP was incorporated into the NBHCP during the 2003 NBHCP revision (Natomas Basin Conservancy 2003). The NBHCP established a multi-species conservation program to mitigate the expected loss of habitat values and incidental take of protected species that would result from urban development, operation of irrigation and drainage systems, and rice farming. The NBHCP covers 22 species, including the giant garter snake and California tiger salamander.

Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan

The Yolo HCP/NCCP (Yolo Habitat Conservancy 2018) is a countywide conservation plan to provide CESA and FESA coverage and associated mitigation for infrastructure and development activities in Yolo County. The Yolo HCP/NCCP coordinates mitigation to maximize benefits to species, as well as conserve the natural communities and agricultural land on which they depend. The plan covers 12 listed species, including the giant garter snake and California tiger salamander.

Yuba-Sutter Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan

The Yuba-Sutter NCCP/HCP (Yuba County 2011a) intends to streamline the process for administering take authorization for covered species, which would overall make management and conservation of covered species more cost and time efficient. This NCCP/HCP is currently being drafted; however, a signed planning agreement and an independent science advisors report have been finalized for reference.

7. ZONING

Table 1: Zoning Designations Crossed provides a summary of zoning designations crossed by the Permit Area. Across the 15 counties and 38 incorporated cities, the Permit Area is characterized by large expanses of agricultural land and open space, including forest land, with a limited amount of urban development. Less than half of the total miles of existing PG&E facilities in the Permit Area cross developed land, including residential, industrial, commercial, and public facilities land uses; roughly a quarter of the area crosses agricultural land; just over a quarter of the area crosses land without a zoning designation and/or roadways; and a small percentage of the area crosses open space and public land.

8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

PG&E operates a comprehensive network of gas pipelines and electric transmission and distribution facilities within CDFW's North Central Region, encompassing Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Lake, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento (east of I-5), San Joaquin, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo (north of I-80), and Yuba counties. This network was primarily established between the 1950s and 1970s, well before the establishment of the CESA and the FESA, which were enacted in 1970 and 1973, respectively, but it continues to evolve as new facilities and associated ROWs are extended, expanded, and added.

In 2020, PG&E finalized the MRHCP and obtained federal take coverage for 36 species throughout the Central Coast, North Coast, and Sacramento Valley and Foothills regions, encompassing 34 counties. This list of 36 species includes giant garter snake, California tiger salamander Central California distinct population segment (DPS), foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*) Feather River DPS, and foothill yellow-legged frog North Sierra DPS, all of which are listed as threatened under CESA. The ITP and MSAA will also cover the foothill yellow-legged frog South Sierra DPS, which is listed as endangered under the CESA.

Table 1: Zoning Designations Crossed

Zoning Designation	Approximate Length of Existing Facilities (Miles)	Approximate Percent of Total Existing Facility Length
No zoning designation	9,228	26
Agricultural	8,969	25
Suburban residential	5,591	16
Exurban residential	3,748	11
Rural residential	1,850	5
Open space and public lands	1,544	4
Urban residential	1,543	4
Industrial	638	2
Low-intensity commercial and public facilities	873	2
Planned area	849	2
High-intensity commercial	336	<1
Mixed use of residential and commercial	152	<0.5
Urban reserve	129	<0.5
Other – Not determined	69	<0.5
Water	<0.5	<0.5
Total	35,519	100

Source: California Office of Planning and Research 2024

Note: Summation of percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.

PG&E is submitting the ITP application to authorize incidental take of these three species during Covered O&M Activities in all of the counties in CDFW's North Central Region except San Joaquin County, as take coverage for San Joaquin County is already provided under a separate ITP (No. 2081-2008-001-00). Additionally, the CDFW will also collaborate with PG&E to develop the MSAA for those jurisdictional areas within CDFW's North Central Region, with the exception of San Joaquin County where an MSAA was already developed to provide coverage for certain O&M activities (Agreement No. 1600-2008-0001-0000-HQ). Acquisition and development of the ITP and MSAA are referred to as "the Project."

In addition to other relevant laws and regulations, operations and maintenance of the gas and electric system are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

Maintenance and repair of the natural gas system is required by CPUC General Order 112-F, which incorporates the U.S. Department of Transportation regulations provided by Title 49, Part 192 (Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline) of the Code of Federal Regulations. Maintenance of the electric system is required by CPUC General Order 95, which formulates requirements for overhead electric line maintenance and operation, as well as General Order 167-B, which enforces standards for the maintenance and operation of electric-generating facilities.

PG&E's natural gas system consists of a transmission system and a distribution system. The current transmission system in CDFW's North Central Region includes approximately 1,200 miles of gas transmission pipeline. Depending on the location and type of pipe, a pipe diameter can vary from 8 to 42 inches. CDFW's North Central Region current gas distribution system consists of approximately 9,300 miles of both steel and plastic lines. The ROW width for the natural gas system ranges from 5 to 150 feet.

PG&E's electrical system consists of a transmission system and a distribution system. The current electrical transmission system in CDFW's North Central Region consists of approximately 3,800 miles of transmission lines. PG&E currently operates 175 substations in the Permit Area. Power from high-voltage transmission lines is transformed to lower voltage at these substations. PG&E's current electrical distribution system provides links between most customers and the transmission system. Currently, approximately 21,200 miles of distribution lines extend through the Permit Area. Wood or steel poles support the distribution conductors. The electrical distribution ROW widths vary according to the system voltage, terrain, the number of lines per ROW and other factors.

PG&E owns less than 1 percent of gas and electric ROWs in fee title; the rest are in easements or other types of relevant land rights. Generally, PG&E reports that it has nonexclusive easements that do not allow PG&E the rights to fence the corridors. PG&E reports that it obtains exclusive easements with the right to construct fences when security fencing is required for valve lots, compressor stations, substations, and other aboveground facilities.

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING

The Permit Area is bordered to the north by agricultural land within the northern portion of the Sacramento Valley, Lassen Volcanic National Park and the surrounding wilderness areas, and Lassen National Forest; to the west by the western Mendocino National Forest, the Russian River Valley, and surrounding agricultural land; to the east by several natural and recreation areas including Plumas National Forest, Lake Tahoe, Olympic Valley, Truckee, and the

surrounding areas; and to the south by Stanislaus National Forest, Sacramento Valley agricultural land, and several parks and wildlife areas in Napa County, including the Robert Louis Stevenson State Park, the McLaughlin Reserve, the Knoxville Recreation Area, the Knoxville Wildlife Area, and the Lake Berryessa Wildlife Area. Major highways (e.g., Interstate 5, California State Route 99, Interstate 80, and Interstate 505) traverse the Permit Area. Within the Permit Area, agricultural land uses and forestry land uses have been the most common land uses throughout history, and agricultural uses continue to be the primary land use, with original settlements in the area surrounding timber operations. The land use patterns of each county within the Permit Area are summarized in Table 2: Land Use Patterns in the Permit Area. Major landowners and select land uses in the Permit Area are summarized in Table 3: Land Use Designations Crossed. The Permit Area encompasses federally owned and state-owned land. U.S. Forest Service-owned land represents approximately 27 percent of the Permit Area.

Table 2: Land Use Patterns in the Permit Area

County	Description of Land Use Patterns
Amador	Amador County includes large areas of forest land and agricultural land. A mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses are primarily found in unincorporated areas.
Butte	Land used for grazing and farming dominates Butte County, and urban uses in the foothills have grown to encompass valley areas. Commercial and office uses are concentrated near municipalities, unincorporated communities, and major transportation corridors.
Calaveras	The communities in Calaveras County were established primarily during the Gold Rush period, and these communities have remained the main centers of population and commerce. Residential subdivisions and rural residential parcels were developed in the county during more recent decades.
Colusa	Colusa County is dominated by rural and agricultural uses. The Colusa County General Plan and associated documents do not contain further information on historical county land use patterns.
El Dorado	Compact development patterns of mixed-use communities were the historical growth patterns in El Dorado County. Over time, low-density residential development throughout the foothills has created areas of dispersed residential uses in formerly rural areas.
Glenn	Agricultural land has historically been the dominant land use in Glenn County, and development continues to be centered around the agricultural economy.
Lake	Land use designations in Lake County are currently dominated by public lands, rural lands, and public facilities. The Lake County General Plan and associated documents did not contain information on historical county land use patterns.
Nevada	Nevada County is a mosaic of residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and public land uses. The City of Grass Valley, Nevada City, and the Town of Truckee have been the centers for development within the county.
Placer	Placer County is dominated by agricultural and timber production uses. The Placer County General Plan and associated documents did not contain further information on historical county land use patterns.
Plumas	Historically, towns and settlements grew around mining activities, log mills, and stage coach and railroad transportation in Plumas County, and these patterns of land use are reflected in the present day.
Sacramento	Sacramento County has received a large population influx over the past decade, leading to high levels of development. The unincorporated portions of Sacramento County are forecasted to continue to be developed with new housing units.
Sierra	Sierra County continues to be dominated by forest lands with only 0.9 percent of the county's land area used for residential, commercial, industrial, and other community uses.
Sutter	Sutter County is dominated by agricultural land uses and open spaces, with clusters of residential uses in the cities and rural communities of the county.
Yolo	Yolo County has maintained its agricultural and open space resources; over 93 percent of the county remains farmland and open space. The cities and town account for less than 6 percent of the total area of the county and house the majority of the population.

County	Description of Land Use Patterns
--------	----------------------------------

Yuba	Within Yuba County, the valley floor is the most developed and contains most of the residents and businesses. The foothills have some developed rural communities, and the mountain areas have large amounts of public land with only small, rural communities.
------	---

Sources: Amador County 2016; Butte County 2023; Calaveras County 2019; Colusa County 2012; El Dorado County 2019; Glenn County 2023; Lake County 2008; Nevada County 2014; Placer County 2013; Plumas County 2021; Sacramento County 2011; Sierra County 2012; Sutter County 2011; Yolo County 2009; Yuba County 2011b

Table 3: Land Use Designations Crossed

Landowner	Approximate Total Acres	Approximate Percentage of Permit Area	Select Land Uses	Approximate Acres
U.S. Forest Service	2,756,573	27	Plumas National Forest	776,697
			Tahoe National Forest	615,997
			Eldorado National Forest	563,178
			Mendocino National Forest	541,996
Undetermined	523,376	5	-- ¹	--
U.S. Bureau of Land Management	323,165	3	Auburn State Recreation Area (SRA)	30,413
State	129,997	1	Lake Oroville SRA	31,534
			California State Lands Commission	11,795
			Oroville Wildlife Area	11,611
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	62,888	0.6	New Melones	13,913
			East Park Reservoir	4,260
			Stony Gorge Reservoir	2,506
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	33,241	< 0.5	Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge	14,578
			Delevan National Wildlife Refuge	5,752
U.S. Air Force	26,099	< 0.5	Beale Air Force Base	25,325
			McClellan Air Force Base	3,035
			Mather Air Force Base	6,116
National Park Services	14,318	< 0.5	Lassen Volcanic National Park	14,328
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	10,262	< 0.5	Black Butte Lake	4,639
			Englebright Lake	736
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs	5,922	< 0.5	--	--
Local Government	4,785	< 0.5	Bidwell Park	3,589
			Howard Park	93
U.S. Department of Defense	3,097	< 0.5	--	--
Private	3,057	< 0.5	--	--

Landowner	Approximate Total Acres	Approximate Percentage of Permit Area	Select Land Uses	Approximate Acres
U.S. Department of Agriculture	214	< 0.5	--	--
Other Federal	20	< 0.5	--	--

Sources: California Protected Areas Database (CPAD) 2023; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) 2023

Note:

¹ -- indicates that the names and acreages of specific land uses were not publicly available.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, as indicated by the following checklist.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Aesthetics | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☒ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☒ Noise |
| ☒ Air Quality | ☐ Population and Housing |
| ☒ Biological Resources | ☐ Public Services |
| ☒ Cultural Resources | ☒ Recreation |
| ☒ Energy | ☒ Transportation |
| ☒ Geology and Soils | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☒ Utilities and Service Systems |
| ☒ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | ☒ Wildfire |
| ☒ Hydrology and Water Quality | ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| ☒ Land Use and Planning | |

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 MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Name

Signature

Agency

Date

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 projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced as discussed below).
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 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 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 significant

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			✓	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
III. Air Quality: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b) 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?			✓	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	
IV. Biological Resources: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
c) 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?		✓		
d) 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?			✓	
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?			✓	
V. Cultural Resources: Would the project:				
See a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		✓		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		✓		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		✓		
VI. Energy: Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				✓

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				✓
VII. Geology and Soils: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✓	
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 (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect 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?				✓
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✓	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				✓
IX. 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 § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or 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 public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		✓		
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			✓	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			✓	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			✓	
iii) 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; or			✓	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			✓	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			✓	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			✓	
XI. Land Use and Planning: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?				✓
XII. Mineral Resources: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a 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?				✓
XII. Noise: Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✓	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?			✓	
XIV. Population and Housing: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services: Would the project:				
a) 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:				
Fire Protection?				✓
Police Protection?				✓
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other Public Facilities?				✓
XVI. Recreation:				
a) Would the project 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) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓
XVII. Transportation: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			✓	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			✓	
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources:				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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:				
i) 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		✓		
ii) 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 § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		✓		
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems: Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✓	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?				✓
d) 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?				✓
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓
XX. Wildfire: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			✓	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as 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?			✓	
d) 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?			✓	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance:				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓	

REFERENCES

- Amador County. 2016. General Plan. Online. <https://www.amadorgov.org/home/showpublisheddocument/34501/637154583287970000>. Site visited April 2024.
- Butte County. 2007. Planning Agreement Regarding the Butte County Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan. Online. <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=26477&inline>. Site visited February 2024.
- Butte County. 2023. General Plan 2040. Online. <https://www.buttecounty.net/367/Butte-County-General-Plan-2040>. Site visited April 2024.
- Butte County. 2024. NCCP Plan Summary – Butte Regional Conservation Plan. Online <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP/Plans/Butte-County>. Site visited June 2024.
- Calaveras County. 2019. General Plan. Online. <https://planning.calaverasgov.us/General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- CAL FIRE. 2023. California Land Ownership. Online. https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/f73858e200634ca888b19ca8c78e3aed_0/explore?location=39.923255%2C-121.262012%2C10.66. Site visited May 2024.
- California Office of Planning and Research. 2024. California Statewide Zoning. Online. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/Gov-OPR::california-statewide-zoning-north/about>. Site visited April 2024.
- City of Sacramento, Sutter County, and Natomas Basin Conservancy. 2003. Final Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Online. <https://www.suttercounty.org/government/county-departments/development-services/planning-services/natomas-basin-habitat-conservation-plan#:~:text=The%20Natomas%20Basin%20Habitat%20Conservation,Sacramento%20and%20southern%20Sutter%20Counties>. Site visited February 2024.
- Colusa County. 2012. General Plan. Online. <https://www.countyofcolusa.org/137/General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- CPAD. 2023. Super Units. Online. <https://www.calands.org/cpad/>. Site visited April 2024.
- El Dorado County. 2019. General Plan. Online. <https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-and-Building/Planning-Division/Adopted-General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- Glenn County. 2023. General Plan. Online. <https://glenncounty.generalplan.org/>. Site visited April 2024.
- Lake County. 2008. General Plan. Online. <https://www.lakecountycalifornia.gov/554/Lake-County-General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.

- Natomas Basin Conservancy. 2003. Final Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Online. https://natomasbasin.org/wp-content/uploads/natomas-basin-habitat-conservation-plan/NBC150623.HCPrevisions_all1y.pdf. Site visited June 2025.
- Nevada County. 2014. General Plan, Land Use Element. Online. <https://www.nevadacountyca.gov/1065/General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- NOAA Fisheries. 2020. Calaveras River Habitat Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment. Online. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/calaveras-river-habitat-conservation-plan-and-environmental-assessment>. Site visited June 2025.
- PG&E. 2020. Pacific Gas and Electric Company Multiple Region Operations & Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan.
- Placer County. 2013. General Plan. Online. <https://www.placer.ca.gov/2977/Placer-County-General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- Placer County. 2020. Placer County Conservation Program – Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan. Online. <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/81088/Placer-County-Conservation-Program-Western-Placer-County-HCPNCCPPDF>. Site visited June 2025.
- Plumas County. 2021. 2035 General Plan. Online. <https://www.plumascounty.us/2116/Plumas-County-2035-General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- Sacramento County. 2011. General Plan. Online. <https://planning.saccounty.gov/PlansandProjectsIn-Progress/Pages/GeneralPlan.aspx>. Site visited April 2024.
- Sacramento County. 2018. South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan. Online. https://planning.saccounty.gov/PlansandProjectsIn-Progress/Documents/SSHCP/SSHCP_.pdf. Site visited June 2024.
- Sierra County. 2012. General Plan. Online. <https://www.sierracounty.ca.gov/260/General-Plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- State of California. 2017. General Plan Guidelines. Online. https://opr.ca.gov/docs/OPR_COMPLETE_7.31.17.pdf. Site visited April 2024.
- Sutter County. 2011. 2030 General Plan. Online. <https://www.suttercounty.org/government/county-departments/development-services/planning-services/general-plan>. Site visited April 2024.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2024. Habitat Conservation Plan for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Available for Public Comment. Online. <https://www.fws.gov/press-release/2024-07/habitat-conservation-plan-valley-elderberry-longhorn-beetle-available-public>. Site visited June 2025.

Yolo County. 2009. 2030 Countywide General Plan. Online. <https://www.yolocounty.org/government/general-government-departments/county-administrator/general-plan/adopted-general-plan>. Site visited April 2024.

Yolo Habitat Conservancy. 2018. Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan. Online. <https://www.yolohabitatconservancy.org/documents>. Site visited February 2024.

Yuba County. 2011a. Yuba-Sutter Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan. Online. <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP/Plans/Yuba-Sutter>. Site visited February 2024.

Yuba County. 2011b. 2030 General Plan. Online. https://www.yuba.org/departments/community_development/planning_department/general_plan.php. Site visited April 2024.