



# INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

## City of Oceanside California

---

1. **PROJECT TITLE:** Nitto Denko Addition
2. **LEAD AGENCY & ADDRESS:** City of Oceanside; 300 N. Coast Highway; Oceanside, CA 92054
3. **CONTACT PERSON & PHONE:** Sam Beard, (815) 671-8019
4. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 501 Via Del Monte
5. **PROJECT SPONSOR & ADDRESS:** Nitto Denko Corporation, 501 Via Del Monte
6. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Light Industrial (LI)
7. **ZONING DESIGNATION:** Limited Industrial (IL)
8. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposed project includes the construction of a new single-story 16,125 square foot building on an existing business campus and associate site work. The proposed project will include new sitework, landscaping, structural, mechanical, plumbing and electrical work for the new proposed project only. The project is located in an existing parking lot adjacent to an existing building, currently occupied and in use by the same ownership.
9. **SURROUNDING LAND USES & PROJECT SETTING:** The City of Oceanside is in the far northwest corner of San Diego County adjacent to the cities of Carlsbad and Vista, the unincorporated communities of Bonsall and Fallbrook, and the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Marine Corps Base. The subject property is located on the south side of Highway 76 in an area that is predominantly developed with existing industrial parks and large scale production facilities.
10. **OTHER REQUIRED AGENCY APPROVALS:** N/A
11. **HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION PER PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21080.3.1? IF SO, IS THERE A PLAN FOR CONSULTATION THAT INCLUDES, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS TO TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES, PROCEDURE REGARDING CONFIDENTIALITY, ETC.?** No
12. **CONSULTATION:** Delawie
13. **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The project would not affect any environmental factors resulting in a Potentially Significant Impact or Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. A summary of the environmental factors potentially affected by this project, consisting of a Potentially Significant Impact or Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated, include:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gases     | <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                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Finding of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions  | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                            |  |  |

**DETERMINATION.** (To be completed by lead agency) Based on 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 the mitigation measures described herein have been included in this 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. 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.

---

Stefanie Cervantes, Associate Planner

#### 14. 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," as described in (5) below, 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 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 significance.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>14.1 AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building along a State-designated scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? (Public view are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicant zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?* **No Impact.** This project proposes a single-story 1-building addition to an existing industrial site. The architecture will be complimentary to the existing aesthetic of the surrounding buildings and smaller in size than the existing massing. The building also includes design elements meant to enhance the visual impact from the public ROW including an architectural design form and increased glazing at the building entry.
- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?* **No Impact.** The project is located in an existing parking lot and will increase the overall amount of landscaping design elements on the site.
- c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? (Public view are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicant zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?* **No Impact.** Refer to Responses 3.1a and 3.1b, above.
- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?* **No Impact.** The project does not include any major glare producing materials of a substantial size or orientation such that they would create any potential issue toward a public ROW or visible sight line.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.2 AGRICULTURE &amp; FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance as depicted on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the CA. Resources Agency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- 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?* **No Impact.** Designated land uses within the project area do not include agricultural uses and project implementation would not result in conversion of existing farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the project does not affect an agricultural resource area and thus does not impact designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?* **No Impact.** The proposed project is located in an area zoned for industrial uses; agricultural designations do not occur within the project area and no Williamson Act contracts apply. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in any conflicts 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))?* **No Impact.** The project is located in an industrial zone.

- d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? **No Impact.*** The project is located in an industrial zone.
- 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? **No Impact.*** As previously stated, the proposed project area is not located within an agricultural area. Thus, implementation of this project would not result in changes in the environment, which would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.3 AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determination. Would the project:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under the applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. Result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? **No Impact.*** The project site is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), which is governed by the San Diego Air Pollution Control Board (SDAPCD). A consistency determination is important in local agency project review by comparing local planning projects to the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) in several ways. It fulfills the CEQA goal of fully informing local agency decision makers of the environmental costs of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are addressed. Only new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans and significantly unique projects need to go under a consistency review due to the RAQS being based on projections from local General Plans. Therefore, projects that are consistent with the local General Plan and do not create significant air quality impacts are considered consistent with the air quality-related regional plan. Because the proposed Project is consistent with the goals of the City of Oceanside General Plan, and would not produce long-term significant quantities of criteria pollutants or violate ambient air quality standards, the proposed Project is considered to be consistent with the RAQS and a more detailed consistency analysis is not warranted.
- 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? **No Impact.***
- c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? **No Impact.*** Sensitive populations (i.e., children, senior citizens and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the general population. Land uses considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. There are no sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site. Although construction and operation of the project would increase vehicle trips on area roadways and result in associated air pollutants, these increases would not significantly contribute to pollution levels.

- d) Result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? **No Impact.** The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 Game or the USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy/ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- 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 Game or the USFWS?* **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously developed site that currently exists as a surface parking lot, therefore no impact to wildlife habitats will result from the project.
- 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 Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously developed site that currently exists as a surface parking lot, therefore no impact to wildlife habitats will result from the project.
- 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?* **No Impact.** No wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, exist or have been identified on-site or immediately adjoining the site. Thus, the project would not result in impacts to wetlands
- 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? **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously developed site that currently exists as a surface parking lot, therefore no impact to wildlife habitats will result from the project.

- e. *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy/ordinance?* **No Impact.** The project site is surrounded by developed suburban or urban land uses and ornamental vegetation. Any vegetation removed during construction will be reestablished upon completion of construction.
- 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?* **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously developed site that currently exists as a surface parking lot, therefore no impact to wildlife habitats will result from the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA?* **No Impact.** The existing project area has been completely disturbed. Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, and the policies and regulations of the City of Oceanside, the project site and surrounding area are not designated as archaeological or historically sensitive areas.

Due to the highly disturbed nature of the property, there is no potential for buried resources to be present. Therefore, no cultural resource impact will occur.

- b. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5 of CEQA?* **No Impact.** Refer to Response to a. above.
- c. *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?* **No Impact.** There are no known grave sites within the project limits. Therefore, the disturbance of human remains is not anticipated. However, in the unlikely event that human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of any human remains find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery, and shall complete the inspection within 24 of notification by the NAHC. The MLD will have the opportunity to make recommendations to the NAHC on the disposition of the remains.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.6 Energy.</b> Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during the project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a. *Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during the project construction or operation?* **No Impact.** The project proposes full energy compliance with California Title 24 regulations regarding energy consumption both during construction and upon building completion.
- b. *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?* **No Impact.** The project proposes full energy compliance with California Title 24 regulations regarding energy consumption both during construction and upon building completion. The building will also be outfitted with all infrastructure necessary to install solar panels in accordance with California Title 24 and the energy generation guidelines outlined therein.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(i.) rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (Refer to DM&G Pub. 42)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the 1994 UBC, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

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. **Less Than Significant Impact.*** The project site is located within the seismically active southern California region and would likely be subjected to ground shaking, thus exposing proposed water transmission and storage facilities to seismic hazards. No known active seismic faults traverse the City of Oceanside. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.
  - ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking? **Less Than Significant Impact.*** The project site is located within the seismically active southern California region and would likely be subjected to ground shaking, No known active seismic faults traverse the City of Oceanside and the project is designed to withstand all minimum requirements as outlined in the California Building Code. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.
  - iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? **Less Than Significant Impact.*** The project site is located in an area that is potentially affected by soil liquefaction, as outlined by the Geotechnical engineer of record on the project. The structural design for the project has accounted for and designed into the layout a foundation system that takes these potential impacts into account. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.
  - iv) *Landslides? **No Impact.*** The site is located on a flat parcel that is bordered by previously improved land.
- b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? **Less Than Significant Impact.*** Grading and trenching during the construction phase of the project would displace soils and temporarily increase the potential for soils to be subject to wind and water erosion. The contractor will be required to comply with standard engineering practices for erosion control and a qualified soils engineer will monitor soil compaction during construction.
- 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? **No Impact.*** The site is located on a flat parcel that is bordered by previously improved land.
- 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? **No Impact.*** While the geotechnical report outlines a potential liquefaction issue on the site, the structural design accounts for any potential impacts this soil condition would have. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.
- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? **No Impact.*** The proposed project does not include the implementation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.
- f) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? **No***

**Impact.** The project site is on previously improved land.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a. *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?* **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) that are less than the significance thresholds established by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and would have a less than 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?* **No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with the City's General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, nor with the Regional Mobility, Transportation, or Land Use Plans developed by the SDAPCD. In addition, the project will implement the Traffic Demand Management Plan (TDM) submitted alongside the project application, that includes a number of design features to ensure that increased traffic to the site is as minimal as possible.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.9 HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? **Less than Significant Impact.*** While the project incorporates the use of some hazardous materials, all amounts are within the required maximum amounts to stay under the threshold of a "high hazard" building classification. Therefore no significant impacts are anticipated.
- 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? **No Impact.*** The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, during the short-term period of project construction, there is the possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as spilling of hydraulic fluid or diesel fuel associated with construction equipment maintenance. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of these hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials. The contractor will be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures which would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances 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? **No Impact.*** No existing or proposed school facilities are located within a one-quarter mile radius of the project site.
- 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? **No Impact.*** According to the *Preliminary Hazardous Materials Assessment*, the proposed project site is not included on a list of sites containing hazardous materials and would not result in a significant hazard to the public or to the environment.
- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? **No Impact.*** The proposed project site is located within the Oceanside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and is located in Safety Zone 6. However, the proposed project is below the height limit as outlined in the requirements of the zone and is lower in height than the surrounding existing buildings on the project site.
- f) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? **No Impact.*** The proposed project would have no impacts on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. No revisions to adopted emergency plans would be required as a result of the proposed project.
- g) *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? **No Impact.*** The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of wildland fires because the project site does not adjoin OFD-designated wildland areas.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?* **No Impact.** The project design takes into consideration all requirements of the applicable land use plan for groundwater control and quality.
- b) *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?* **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously improved parking lot, no significant impacts are anticipated.
- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?* **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously improved parking lot, no significant impacts are anticipated.
- i. *result in substantial erosion or siltation on- of offsite;*
- 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*
- d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?* **No Impact.**
- e) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?* **No Impact.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 impact?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Physically divide an established community?* **No Impact.** The proposed project will not have an impact on the physical arrangement of an established community. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur.
- 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 impact?* **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element's designation for the project site and with the Official Zoning Map designation of the property. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.12 MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *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?* **No Impact.** The City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance would not permit any mineral extraction on or within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact.
- 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?* **No Impact.** Refer to Response 14.10a, above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.13 NOISE.</b> Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- 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? **No Impact.*** The proposed project site and location is of a size such that construction noise will be primarily contained on site. Post construction activities will not create noise levels higher than the existing activities on site, no significant impacts are anticipated.
- b) *Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? **No Impact.*** The amounts of construction and demolition required for the proposed facility is not anticipated to generate excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels. Additionally, this Project is not anticipated to include pile driving activities, therefore, ground borne vibration is not expected to occur. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, no impacts in this regard are anticipated. Also, refer to discussion 4.11a, above.
- 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? **No Impact.*** As previously stated, similar to existing buildings on site, the proposed project does not anticipate any impact due to noise from any nearby airports.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.14 POPULATION &amp; HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *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)? **No Impact.*** The proposed project will have no effect on housing or housing availability in the area.
- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.*** The proposed project will have no effect on housing or housing availability in the area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.15 PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- 1) *Fire protection? **No Impact.*** Proposed project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.
- 2) *Police protection? **No Impact.*** There are no significant impacts related to police protection or service anticipated with implementation of the proposed project.
- 3) *Schools? **No Impact.*** Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for the construction of additional school facilities. Therefore, no impacts in this regard will occur.
- 4) *Parks? **No Impact.*** Implementation of the proposed project will not affect any existing park facilities nor increase the demand for additional recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts to parks are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 5) *Other public facilities? **No Impact.*** No significant impacts to other public facilities are anticipated to occur with project implementation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.16 RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- 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?* **No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project will not generate an increase in demand on existing public or private parks or other recreational facilities that would either result in or increase physical deterioration of the facility.
- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?* **No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project does not include recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.17 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) Conflict with program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? **No Impact.** Increased traffic to the site will be the result of a minimal increase in staffing and will not create an impact to the surrounding circulation system.
- b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? **No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.15a, above.
- c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? **No Impact.** No public roadways are proposed as part of the project, therefore, no impacts regarding design features or incompatible uses would occur. The proposed project would use the same access point as the existing project.
- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?* **No Impact.** Adequate emergency access shall be provided during both short-term construction and long-term operation of the proposed project. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is 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)? **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously improved parking lot on an existing industrial development parcel.
  
- b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe)? **No Impact.** The project is located on a previously improved parking lot on an existing industrial development parcel.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded, water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructures, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded, water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? **No Impact.*** The nature and scope of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of wastewater treatment facilities.
- b) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? **No Impact.*** No new or expanded entitlements would be required with implementation of the proposed project. No impacts are anticipated.
- c) *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? **No Impact.***
- d) *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructures, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? **No Impact.*** The project proposes a minimal amount of staff increase as it relates to the overall site, no significant impacts to waste production are anticipated.
- e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? **No Impact.*** The project proposes a minimal amount of staff increase as it relates to the overall site, no significant impacts to waste production are anticipated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.20 WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, would the project:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b> Would the project:				
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 decrease 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 major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means the project's incremental effects are considerable when compared to the past, present, and future effects of other projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will have substantial adverse effects on human beings, directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

15. **PREPARATION.** The initial study for the subject project was prepared by:



Signature

Preparer's Name: Sam Beard

Agency's / Consulting Firm's Name: Delawie

19. **PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT CONCURRENCE:** Section 15070(b)(1) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines provides that Lead Agencies may issue a Mitigated Negative Declaration where *the initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but, revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur.* The property owner/applicant signifies by their signature below their concurrence with all mitigation measures contained within this environmental document. However, the applicant's concurrence with the Draft Mitigated Negative

Declaration is not intended to restrict the legal rights of the applicant to seek potential revisions to the mitigation measures during the public review process.

Oran Siddiqui

Signature

Property owner's / applicant's name: Oran Siddiqui