



**9. Project Description:**

**10. General Plan designation**

**11. Zoning designation:**

**12. Landscaping and Design:**

**13. Parking and access:**

**14. Phasing**      **Yes**      **No**

- **Phase 1**

- **Phase 2**

**15. Pedestrian Circulation and Disabled Access:**

**16. Utilities/Electrical Service**

**17. Required Approvals**

**18. Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency) Where potential impacts are anticipated to be significant, mitigation measures will be required, so that impacts may be avoided or reduced to insignificant levels.

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 IMPAT 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 ENVIROMNETAL 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 requested.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRINTED NAME

\_\_\_\_\_  
FOR

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines and used by the City of Tulare in its environmental review process. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the development's impacts and to identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

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 reference 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 and 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

List of attachments:

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

<b>AESTHETICS – Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within state scenic highway?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 Department 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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)?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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 forestland to non-forest use?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>III. AIR QUALITY –</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				

<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>V. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <b>Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. fish and Wildlife Service?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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 or US Fish and				

Wildlife Service?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wet-lands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through director removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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 know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

iv) Landslides?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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 for people residing or working in				

the project area?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
h) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land use or planned uses for which permits have been				

granted)?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on or off-site?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -</b> Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
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 lands use plan?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XII. NOISE</b> - Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

		Incorporation		
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable serve ratios, response times of other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
Fire protection?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
Police protection?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
Schools?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
Parks?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
Other public facilities?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XV. RECREATION -</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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>Analysis:</b>				
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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standard and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous				

intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
f) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste-water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects:				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
e) 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?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
f) Be serve by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				
<b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigated Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
<b>Analysis:</b>				

<p>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)?</p>				
<p><b>Analysis:</b></p>				
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>				
<p><b>Analysis:</b></p>				