

Town of Fairfax

Environmental Checklist Form

1.	Project Title: Adoption of Town Center Element of the General Plan		
2.	Lead agency name and address: Town of Fairfax Planning and Building Services 142 Bolinas Road Fairfax, CA 94930		
3.	Contact person and phone number: Ann Welsh, AICP Director of Planning and Building Services Phone: 415-458-2346		
4.	Project location: The project involves adoption of the General Plan Town Center Element which contains strategies and policies that provide specific guidance to enhance the sense of place and the quality of life in the downtown area while promoting the economic base of the Town.		
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: Town of Fairfax 142 Bolinas Road Fairfax, CA 94930		
6.	General Plan designation: The General Plan designation of the Town Center includes portions of the Central Commercial, Highway Commercial, Light Commercial, Service Commercial and Residential 1-6 areas that comprise the Town Center along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Center Boulevard, Bolinas Road, Elsie Lane and Bank Street.	7.	Zoning: The Town Center Element includes areas that are zoned Central Commercial, Highway Commercial, Light Commercial, Service Commercial and Residential 6 Districts along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Center Boulevard, Bolinas Road, Elsie Lane and Bank Street.
8.	Description of project: The Fairfax Town Council proposes to adopt a Town Center Element and incorporate it into the General Plan. The Planning Area for the Town Center Element is defined as the area that includes the commercial core of the community along with public use areas, such as the Pavilion, Town Hall, the Women's Club, Peri Park and the areas between these facilities, with Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Center Boulevard, Broadway, Bolinas Road, and Bank Street to Elsie Lane, as the main thoroughfares. The Town Center Element contains strategies and policies that provide specific guidance to enhance the sense of place and the quality of life in the downtown area while promoting the economic base of the Town.		

<p>9.</p>	<p>Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project’s surroundings: The Planning Area for the Town Center Element is defined as the area that includes the commercial core of the community along with public use areas, such as the Pavilion, Town Hall, the Women’s Club, Peri Park and the areas between these facilities, with Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Center Boulevard, Broadway, Bolinas Road, and Bank Street to Elsie Lane, as the main thoroughfares.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Ross Valley Fire District for development review Marin Municipal Water District</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages, are those that would be potentially affected by this project. The symbol “V” indicates potentially significant environmental impact, the symbol “π” indicates no potentially significant environmental impact.

V	Aesthetics	π	Agriculture Resources	π	Air Quality
π	Biological Resources	π	Cultural Resources	π	Geology /Soils
π	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	π	Hydrology / Water Quality	π	Land Use / Planning
π	Mineral Resources	V	Noise	π	Population / Housing
π	Public Services	π	Recreation	V	Transportation/Traffic
V	Utilities / Service Systems	π	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

V	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
π	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.
π	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
π	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.
π	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.

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(C)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which 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

ISSUES:

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Conflict with applicable Countywide Plan designation or zoning standards?	π	π	π	∨
b) Conflict with applicable zoning designations or zoning standards?	π	π	π	∨
c) Affect agricultural resources, operations, or contracts (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, impacts from incompatible land uses, or conflicts with Williamson Act contracts)?	π	π	π	∨
d) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	π	π	π	∨
e) Result in substantial alteration of the character or functioning of the community, or present or planned use of an area?	π	π	∨	π
f) Substantially increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, or affect existing recreational opportunities?	π	π	π	∨

Land Use Discussion:

- a) No impact. The project is consistent with Countywide plans.
- b) No impact. The Town Center Element will not conflict with the zoning ordinance.
- c) No impact. The Town Center Element policies will not result in impacts to agricultural resources, operations, or Williamson Act contracts.
- d) No impact. The Town Center Element would not result in the physical division of an established community.
- e) Less than significant impact. The Town Center Element policies could result in the alteration of the character or function of a land use pattern. If the traffic along Bolinas Road is re-routed this would result in a change to the road function and have an impact on adjacent land uses. The mitigation measures identified in the Circulation Element which include making significant improvements to Elsie Lane, should reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
- f) No impact. The Town Center Element policies will not result in the construction of new homes or structures that will increase substantially the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:				
a) Increase density in such a way that it would exceed official population projections for the planned area within which the project site is located as set forth in the Countywide Plan and/or community plan?	π	π	π	ν
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	π	π	π	ν
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	π	π	π	ν

Population and Housing Discussion:

- a) No impact. The Town Center Element policies would not result in the construction of housing or structures that would attract significant numbers of additional visitors or residents to the area.
- b) No impact. The Town Center Element policies would not necessitate the extension of major infrastructure.
- c) No impact. The Town Center Element policies would not result in the displacement of existing housing or people.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	π	π	π	ν

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	π	π	∨	π
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	π	π	∨	π
iv) Landslides?	π	π	∨	π
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	π	π	∨	π
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?	π	π	∨	π
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?	π	π	π	∨
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?	π	π	π	∨

Geology and Soils Discussion:

a-i) No impact. The Town Center Element proposals are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone¹. No active or potentially active faults are known to cross the Town Center area.

a-ii) Less than significant impact. The Town Center Element area located in the San Francisco Bay Area is one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. The closest faults to the site zoned as active (displacement within the last 11,000 years) is the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 7 miles southwest of the site. Other nearby active faults include the Hayward Fault, located approximately 12 miles to the east and the Rogers Creek Fault located approximately 14 miles to the northeast².

The Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP) was formed by the US Geological Survey to assess earthquake probabilities along active faults in the Bay Area. The WQCEP reports the probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake (major earthquake) on the Hayward-Rodgers Creek Fault System is 27 percent and on the San Andreas Fault is 21 percent between 2002 and 2031. The cumulative probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake striking the San Francisco Bay Area during the 30-year period from 2002 to 2031 is estimated at 62 percent; for a magnitude 7.0 or greater earthquake the probability is 35 percent; and for a 7.5 or greater earthquake the probability is 10 percent³.

Expected seismic shaking intensity and risk to structures within Fairfax is dependant on the distance from the causative fault and earthquake epicenter, the character of the earthquake, the underlying geologic, and soil conditions. Moderate to strong shaking within Fairfax equivalent to VI to VII on the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale is expected from a magnitude 7.1 earthquake on the Hayward-Rogers Creek Fault System. For a magnitude 7.9 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault, shaking intensity is expected to be in the strong to very strong

1 California Department of Mines and Geology (CDMG), 1997. Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California.

2 CDMG, 1994. Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas, Geologic Data Map No. 6 [Map].

3 WGCEP, 2003. USGS Open file report 03-214, *Earthquake Probabilities in the San Francisco Bay Region*.

range, MMI VII to VIII⁴. Peak ground acceleration within Fairfax is estimated to be approximately 0.52g (g is acceleration due to gravity), with a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in the next 50 years⁵.

a-iii) Less than significant impact. Liquefaction hazards may be present in loose, saturated soils, such as sands or silty sands, in which the space between individual particles is completely filled with water.

a-iv) Less than significant impact. Most of the Town Center area is already developed and additional development is not proposed by the plan.

b) Less than significant impact. Any development resulting from the policies outlined in the Town Center Element may cause erosion during the construction process however mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize these impacts. Unless properly mitigated, project construction could result in temporary impacts to soil erosion.

c) Less than significant.

d) No impact.

e) No impact. Any proposed new construction within the Town Center will not involve the construction of a septic system and/or alternative wastewater disposal system.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:				
a) Substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	π	π	V	π
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) flooding; 2) debris deposition; or 3) similar hazards?	π	π	V	π
c) Discharge of pollutants into surface or groundwaters or other alteration of surface or ground water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?)	π	π	V	π
d) Substantial change in the amount of surface water in any water body or ground water quality either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through intersection of an aquifer by cuts or	π	π	V	π

4 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2004. Online. May 2004.

Available: www.abag.ca.gov

5 CDMG, April 2003. Seismic Shaking Hazards in California. Online. May 2004.

Available: <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/pshamap/pshamain.html>

excavations?				
e) Substantial changes in the flow of surface or ground waters including, but not limited to: 1) currents; 2) rate of flow; or 3) the course or direction of water movements?	π	π	V	π
f) Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	π	π	V	π

Hydrology Discussion:

- a) Less than significant impact. The proposed Town Center Element policies would not result in substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff.
- b) Less than significant impact. A portion of the proposed Town Center area lies in the flood plain and although people and businesses living in the area are exposed to flood hazards, the proposed plan would not increase this potential hazard.
- c) Less than significant impact. The proposed Town Center Element policies in the long-term would not discharge pollutants into surface or groundwater or otherwise significantly alter surface or ground water quality.
- d) Less than significant impact. The proposed Town Center Element policies would not significantly affect surface water quantities or ground water quality.
- e) Less than significant impact. The proposed Town Center Element will not significantly deflect erosive flows downstream from the Town Center.
- f) Less than significant impact. The proposed Town Center Element would have minimal effect on public water supplies.

V. AIR QUALITY:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. AIR QUALITY—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. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	π	π	V	π
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	π	π	V	π
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the	π	π	V	π

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)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	π	π	π	ν
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	π	π	π	ν

Air Quality Discussion:

a) Less than significant impact. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (ARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. The EPA has jurisdiction under the Federal Clean Air Act to develop Federal Air Quality Standards and require individual states to prepare State Implementation Plans to attain these standards. The ARB has jurisdiction under the California Health and Safety Code and the California Clean Air Act to develop California Air Quality Standards, to require regional plans to attain these standards, and to coordinate the preparation by local air districts of plans required by both the Federal and State Clean Air Acts. The Federal and State standards were developed independently with differing purposes and methods, although both processes attempted to avoid health-related effects. In general, the California State standards are more stringent.

ARB has divided California into 15 separate air basins to better manage pollution. The Town of Fairfax is located with the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. This basin includes the Counties of Marin, Napa, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, and southern Sonoma and western Solano Counties. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for developing air quality plans and implement air quality control measures for its respective basin. In Marin County, the closest monitoring station to the project site is located in San Rafael. According to the Bay Area Air Pollution Summary for 2002⁶, this monitoring station indicates this area is in compliance with both State and Federal air quality standards throughout the year. The Town Center Element does not involve the construction of infrastructure that would result in a long-term increase in air emissions that would result in changes to regional air quality.

However, if the Town Center Element results in any increase in construction activity, project construction activities may result in short-term changes to air quality in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Temporary increases in air quality may result from earthmoving activities. Dust can be emitted by the action of equipment and vehicles and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Grading and earthmoving activities, although minimal, comprise the major source of construction dust emissions, but traffic and general disturbance of the soil also generate dust emissions. Short-term impacts would be mostly related to particulate matter emissions, but an increase in exhaust emissions produced during the transport of workers and machinery to and from the site could also occur.

- b-c) Less than Significant Impact.
- d) No impact.
- e) No impact. No permanent odors will be created.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION— Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial increase in vehicle trips or traffic congestion such that existing levels of service on affected roadways will deteriorate below acceptable County standards?	π	π	∨	π
b) Traffic hazards related to: 1) safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections); 2) barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists; or 3) incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	π	π	∨	π
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	π	∨	π	π
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	π	∨	π	π
e) Substantial impacts upon existing transportation systems, including rail, waterborne or air traffic systems?	π	π	π	∨

Transportation/Circulation Discussion:

The Town Center Element makes recommendations regarding the re-routing of traffic in the Bolinas Road area between Elsie Lane and Center Boulevard. These recommendations will be assessed under the Circulation Element and the implementation of the proposals in the Town Center Element will be subject to the recommendations that are included in the Circulation Element.

Any recommended changes to the existing traffic patterns will be designed so that they will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; will not result in inadequate parking capacity; and will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

The proposed Town Center Element is consistent with standard planning practices which advocate locating residential dwellings in close proximity to transportation corridors and public transportation facilities. The altered traffic patterns may result in increased traffic but these increases are not considered to be of such magnitude that service levels would be negatively impacted.

- a) Less than Significant Impact – The proposed changes to the traffic pattern along Bolinas Road and Elsie Lane would be implemented only if a traffic analysis indicated that there would be no deterioration in level of service and any necessary improvements to the roadway network would be made prior to changes in the traffic pattern.

- b) Less than Significant Impact – The proposed changes identified in the Town Center Element would be implemented only after detailed studies were made which address and mitigate any negative impacts on existing bicycle and pedestrian circulation and any other impacts.
- c) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Town Center Element may impact emergency access and access to other uses, however, the Town would not implement any of the proposed changes unless there were mitigation measures in place to result in no significant impact to emergency access or to nearby uses.
- d) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Town Center Element may impact parking location however re-design of parking areas would result in no appreciable net loss of parking spaces in the Town Center area.
- e) No impact. The proposed project would not affect existing transportation systems.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	π	π	v	π
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	π	π	v	π
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) Through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	π	π	v	π
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?	π	π	v	π
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	π	π	v	π
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?	π	π	v	π

Biological Resources Discussion:

The project will not conflict with the provisions of the adopted Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project also will not 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; will not 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; will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

a-f) Less than Significant Impact. Town Center Element Policy, TC 17 which promotes daylighting and creating a buffer around Fairfax Creek in the area of Sherman Avenue would have a long term positive impact on water resources and riparian habitat.

VIII. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Substantial increase in demand for existing energy sources, or conflict with adopted policies or standards for energy use?	π	π	π	∨
b) Use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	π	π	π	∨
c) Loss of significant mineral resource sites designated in the Countywide Plan from premature development or other land uses which are incompatible with mineral extraction?	π	π	π	∨

Energy and Natural Resources Discussion:

- a) No impact. The proposed project would not result in an increase in energy nor conflict with adopted policies or standards for energy use.
- b) No impact. The project would not result in the consumption of non-renewable resources.
- c) No impact. The project would have no impact on mineral resources.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND 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?	π	π	π	v
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?	π	π	π	v
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	π	π	π	v
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?	π	π	π	v
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?	π	π	π	v
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?	π	π	π	v
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	π	π	π	v
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildland are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildland?	π	π	π	v

Hazards Discussion:

- a) No impact. The proposed project does not involve the construction of a facility or structure associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- b) Less than significant with mitigation implementation. No releases of hazardous materials or substances are expected to occur during the implementation of the proposed project.
- c) No impact. The proposed project is not located within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d) No impact.
- e-f) No impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport; it is also not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) No impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response/evacuation plan.
- h) No impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the risk of wildfires in the project vicinity. The proposed project would not involve the construction of structures that would result in an increase in exposure of people and property to wildfire hazards.

X. NOISE:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial increases in existing ambient level noise levels?	π	π	π	∨
b) Exposure of people to significant noise levels, or conflicts with adopted noise policies or standards?	π	π	π	∨

Noise Discussion:

The project will not result in 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; will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Also, the project will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

- a-b) No Impact. The proposed Housing Element will not result in long-term exposure of people to significant noise levels, nor conflict with adopted noise policies or standards.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES—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?	π	π	π	ν
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?	π	π	π	ν

Mineral Resources Discussion:

a-b) No impact. The proposed project would have no effect on mineral resources.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	π	π	π	ν
Police protection?	π	π	π	ν
Schools?	π	π	π	ν
Parks?	π	π	π	ν
Other public facilities?	π	π	π	ν

Public Services Discussion:

The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities; and will not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities.

- a) No impact. The proposed project would not result in the construction of structures or facilities that would increase the need for any public services including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

VII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS— Would the project:				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	π	π	ν	π
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?	π	π	ν	π
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	π	π	ν	π
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?	π	π	ν	π
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project ' s solid waste disposal needs?	π	π	π	ν
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	π	π	π	ν

Utilities and Public Services Discussion:

The project will not substantially impact wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project will not substantially impact storm water drainage facilities. The project should 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. The project should be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; and will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In addition, the Town will require significant recycling efforts to offset major impacts in landfill disposal needs. Also, the project should not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

VIII. AESTHETICS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	π	π	π	ν
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	π	π	π	ν
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	π	π	π	ν
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	π	π	π	ν

Aesthetics Discussion:

The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	π	π	π	∨
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	π	π	π	∨
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	π	π	π	∨
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	π	π	π	∨

Cultural Resources Discussion:

a) No impact. CEQA defines a historical resource as any resource that: is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage; is associated with lives of persons important in our past; embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. The proposed project does not involve the demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources.

b) No impact. An archaeological resource implies an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it: contains information needed to answer important scientific questions; has a special particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

The Town Center Area is known to contain the site of an Indian Midden in the vicinity of the Pavillion. However, since the plan proposes no development in that area there is no impact.

c) No impact. There are no known unique geological features within the vicinity of the project area. There are no known fossil-bearing surficial sediments in the project area.

d) No impact. There are no known human remains within the vicinity of the project area.

XV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS – Would the project:				
a) Result in any physical changes which can be traced through a chain of cause and effect to social or economic impacts?	π	π	π	ν

Social and Economic Effects Discussion:

- a) No impact. The implementation of the Town Center Element is intended to have positive social and economic impacts. The positive social impacts are promotion of a pedestrian friendly environment. The positive economic impacts are to enhance the streetscape in the Town Center to support downtown businesses.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	π	π	π	ν
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)?	π	π	π	ν
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	π	π	π	ν

FINDINGS:

1. The proposed Town Center Element contains strategies and policies that provide specific guidance to enhance the sense of place and quality of life in the downtown area.
2. The Town Center Element promotes an urban design pattern for the downtown area that promotes equally pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation.
3. The potential impacts of the proposed Town Center Element have been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare. It is intended to promote the economic vitality of the community while maintaining its inherent character.
4. The Town Council has considered this Negative Declaration and finds, based on the whole record before it, that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the Negative Declaration reflects the Town's independent judgment and analysis.