

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

FOR ADDENDUM TO THE CITY OF LIVE OAK GENERAL PLAN EIR

Prepared in conjunction with the SB 5 General Plan Amendment

The City of Live Oak is amending its 2030 General Plan to comply with the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill 5, 2007), which requires cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to incorporate Urban Level of Flood Protection (ULOP) requirements in their general plans. The ULOP is defined as the “level of protection that is necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year using criteria consistent with, or developed by, the Department of Water Resources.”

The Live Oak 2030 General Plan adopted in 2010 preceded the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 5 and related flood protection bills. The SB 5 General Plan Amendment (GPA) incorporates additional flood protection and management information and 200-year flood protection goals, policies, and implementation programs in Live Oak’s 2030 General Plan. This addendum provides an environmental analysis of the SB 5 GPA to the 2030 General Plan project compared to the adopted 2030 General Plan EIR (SCH# 2008092050). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164 allows an addendum to a previously certified or adopted environmental document to be prepared when only minor technical changes or changes that would not result in new significant impacts are proposed in a project. The changes to the 2030 General Plan include the addition of specific information, goals, policies, and programs that reflect current statewide flood protection strategies.

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the environmental impact categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the 2030 General Plan EIR. This document cites the 2030 General Plan EIR and reference documents used in preparation of the 2030 General Plan EIR. The environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the SB 5 GPA does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the General Plan EIR. Based on the analysis, the SB 5 GPA to the 2030 General Plan does not involve any new impacts or substantially increase impacts compared to that analyzed as a part of the adopted 2030 General Plan EIR.

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

WHERE WAS IMPACT ANALYZED?

This column provides a cross-reference to the section or sections of the prior environmental documents where information and analysis may be found that relate to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

DO PROPOSED CHANGES INVOLVE NEW SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS?

In accordance with Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project would result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact. A “yes” response would require that additional environmental analysis (a supplemental or subsequent EIR) be prepared.

ANY NEW CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVING NEW IMPACTS?

In accordance with Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether changes to the project site or the vicinity (i.e., the circumstances under which the project is undertaken) have occurred, subsequent to the prior environmental documents, that would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact. A “yes” response would require that additional environmental analysis (a supplemental or subsequent EIR) be prepared.

ANY NEW INFORMATION REQUIRING NEW ANALYSIS OR VERIFICATION?

In accordance with Section 15162(a)(3)(A–D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance (i.e., that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete) is available that requires an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid.

If the new information shows that (A) the project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; or (B) significant effects previously examined would be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or (C) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, then the question would be answered “Yes,” requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this environmental review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified environmental impacts are not found to be more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary, then the question would be answered “No” and no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required. New studies completed as part of this environmental review are attached to this addendum or are on file with the City of Live Oak Planning Department at 9955 Live Oak Boulevard, Live Oak, CA 95953.

MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED OR ADDRESS IMPACTS?

In accordance with Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the prior environmental documents provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures may have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in either instance. If “NA” is indicated, this environmental review concludes that the impact does not occur with this project and therefore no mitigations are needed. A “no” response indicates that revised mitigation would be required to address the identified impact.

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

DISCUSSION

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category to explain the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Applicable mitigation measures from the prior environmental review that apply to the project are listed under each environmental category. If revised mitigation is required to address an identified impact, that mitigation is described here.

CONCLUSIONS

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the analysis is contained in each section. A conclusion that the changes to the project involve no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts is required to support the use of an addendum as the appropriate level of environmental analysis.

I. VISUAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was the Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Project Changes Lead to New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Do Changed Circumstances Lead to New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?	Does Any New Information Require New Analysis or Verification in an EIR?	Do Prior Mitigation Measures or Acceptable Revised Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Page 4.12-2	No	No	No	Yes
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Page 4.12-2	No	No	No	Yes
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Page 4.12-4	No	No	No	Yes
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Page 4.12-5	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a & b) The 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan would result in urban development that would permanently alter and block some views of the Sutter Buttes, as well as view of agricultural lands. Although the 2030 General Plan includes policies and programs to provide adequate buffer space between development and agricultural lands to maintain those views, encourage future urban development to take advantage of view of the Sutter Buttes and agricultural lands from being blocked by development, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects to scenic resources.

c) The 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan would result in urban development that would substantially alter the current visual character within and surrounding the City of Live Oak. Although 2030 General Plan policies requiring buffering of agricultural lands and enforcement of right-to-farm policies would limit the size of the agricultural area affected by the urban development envisioned under the General Plan, impacts to the community's visual character are significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects to visual character.

d) The 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan would result in the development of new urban uses, which would create substantial new sources of light and glare in areas currently used for agriculture. Although the 2030 General Plan includes policies to reduce spillover light and encourage use of low-reflectance surfaces, these measures would not reduce adverse effects to below the level of significance. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects of lighting and glare.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the

environment, it would not result in effects on scenic resources and visual character, or create new sources of light and glare that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to visual resources. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in effects to visual resources that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Page 4.8-6	No	No	No	Yes
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
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))?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
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?	Page 4.8-11	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would result in the conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses. The 2030 General Plan includes policies and programs that are intended to conserve agricultural land and reduce conflicts between agricultural operation and adjacent uses. However, the 2030 General Plan identifies urban land uses for all areas of the City’s Planning Area, including areas of high-quality agricultural land and areas currently zoned for agriculture use. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects to Important Farmland.

b) Currently, there are no properties in the Planning Area protected under the Williamson Act contract.

c & d) Currently, there is no forestland (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)) in the Planning Area.

e) The Planning Area includes a large amount of agricultural land with non-agricultural land use designations. The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that future development within this area could result in the conversion of adjacent farmland. The 2030 General Plan includes policies and programs that are intended to reduce conflicts between agricultural operations and adjacent uses, including policies requiring buffering of agricultural uses and enforcing right-to-farm policies. However, the General Plan would allow development of land that is currently in agricultural use, and that would be adjacent to ongoing agricultural operations, potentially resulting in conflicts with these ongoing agricultural uses. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects to farmland.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on agricultural and forest land conversion; conflicts with Williamson Act contracts; adjacent agricultural land uses; and, existing zoning for forestland, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production, that are more severe than those described under the original General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to agricultural resources. No further mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on agricultural resources that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Page 4.13-19	No	No	No	Yes
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Pages 4.3-16, 4.3-22, and 4.3-23	No	No	No	Yes
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)?	Pages 4.3-16, 4.3-22, and 4.3-23	No	No	No	Yes
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Page 4.3-24	No	No	No	Yes
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Page 4.3-27	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce air pollutant emissions that affect both Live Oak and the region; however, development allowed under the General Plan would still result in operation emissions in excess of significance thresholds used by the Feather Region Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) for relevant clean air plans. This impact is significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to conflicts with current air quality planning efforts.

b, c, & d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce criteria air pollutants and precursors from short-term construction related emissions and long-term operational emissions from activities associated with development under the General Plan, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions. Long-term, operational, local mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) would not be expected to substantially contribute to emissions concentration that would exceed air quality standards. Proposed sensitive land uses and toxic air contaminant (TAC) sources would be adequately sited under the 2030 General Plan policies and programs to minimize exposure to substantial concentration of TACs to less than significant.

e) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in the exposures of sensitive receptors to emissions of objectionable odors. Minor sources of odors (e.g., construction equipment, State Route 99, Union Pacific Railroad line) would result in exposure of sensitive

receptors (on- or off-site) to excessive project-generated odor sources. Proposed on-site receptors could also be exposed to excessive odors from existing land uses (e.g., food processing facilities waste water treatment plant expansion, and agricultural land uses) on a regular basis. However, the 2030 General Plan includes policies and programs to reduce these impacts to less than significant.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on relevant clean air policies, or effects related to exposure to criteria air pollutants and precursors, local mobile-source emissions of CO, TACs, or objectionable odors that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to air quality. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on air quality that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Page 4.6-23	No	No	No	Yes
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Page 4.6-26	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Page 4.6-26	No	NO	No	Yes
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Page 4.6-25	No	No	No	Yes
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in loss or degradation of existing populations or of suitable habitat for special-status plants, wildlife, and fish. However, General Plan policies and programs would avoid, minimize, and/or compensate for these potential adverse effects. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information,

goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on special-status plants and wildlife, and areas that would be considered suitable habitat for these species, that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b & c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that construction of infrastructure, roadways, or developments resulting from implementation of the General Plan could result in adverse effects on federally and state protected wetlands and/or riparian vegetation. However, 2030 General Plan policies and programs are designed to avoid adverse effects to the riparian and wetland habitat occurring in the Planning Area and would ensure unavoidable indirect effects would be mitigated. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan is unlikely to result in substantially adverse effects to federally and state protected wetlands and/or state protected riparian vegetation. These impacts are less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on federally and state protected wetlands and/or state protected riparian vegetation that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d & f) The Feather River is designated critical habitat for spring-run Chinook Salmon and steelhead, and the riparian corridor along the river provides an important migratory wildlife corridor. However, the Planning Area does not include the Feather River's riparian corridor, does not designate land use change along the river, and there are no adopted conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved state, regional or local habitat conservation plan in the vicinity of the Planning Area. Thus, implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, or conflict with any local, regional or state conservation plan. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on fish and wildlife movement, native wildlife nursery sites, or conflict with any local, regional or state conservation plan.

e) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in adverse effects on native trees and/or large heritage trees; however, General Plan policies and programs would avoid, minimize, and/or compensate for potential adverse effects to trees. This impact is considered less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on native trees and/or large heritage trees that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to biological resources. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on biological resources that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Page 4.11-13	No	No	No	Yes
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Pages 4.11-14 and 4.11-17	No	No	No	Yes
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Page 4.7-6	No	No	No	Yes
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Page 4.11-18	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in changes that could affect historic structures, historic districts, or the historic character of Live Oak, but that 2030 General Plan policies and programs would ensure that the context of historic features is considered in future development. This impact is considered less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects to existing historic structures, districts, or the historic character of Live Oak that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis identified 16 significant or potentially significant cultural resources (e.g. historic district, cemetery, railroad tracks) and concluded the General Plan goals and policies would ensure that potential historic features were assessed for their significance. Impacts to these resources, which could affect their potential historic significance, could then be mitigated, reducing the impacts to less than significant. Construction activities under the General Plan would involve grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities, which could disturb or damage as-yet-undiscovered archaeological resources or human remains. However, 2030 General Plan policies and programs combined with existing regulations would reduce these impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects to known and as-yet-unknown cultural resources that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that construction associated with implementation of the General Plan could disturb previously unknown paleontological resources during earthmoving activities. Although the City is unaware of any significant paleontological resources in the Planning Area, it recognizes that

resources could be uncovered during 2030 General Plan buildout; therefore, implementation of a General Plan program will minimize potential adverse impacts on unique, scientifically important paleontological resources. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects on paleontological resources that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that while some burial ground locations are known, ground-disturbing activities associated with development in the Planning Area could uncover prehistoric or historic human remains. The 2030 General Plan goals, policies and programs would reduce impacts by requiring adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 7052, and California Public Resources Code Section 5097, which outline procedures for the treatment of human remains. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects to human remains that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to cultural resources. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on cultural resources that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
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 California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	Page 4.7-17	No	No	No	Yes
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Page 4.7-17	No	No	No	Yes
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Page 4.7-18	No	No	No	Yes
iv) Landslides?	Page 4.7-18	No	No	No	Yes
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Page 4.7-19	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Page 4.7-20	No	No	No	Yes
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Page 4.7-21	No	No	No	Yes
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan would not result in development in areas prone to strong seismic ground shaking; however, it would result in development in areas with moderate potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and associated lateral spreading, landslides, and collapse resulting from loss of strength during earthquake shaking. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs and existing California Building Code (CBC) regulations that reduce the potential for

substantial adverse effects due to the exposure to seismic ground shaking or ground failure. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to seismic ground shaking and ground failure that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; however, implementation of policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan and existing regulations would result in use of best practices to prevent soil erosion and topsoil loss. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that buildout of the General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable. Unstable soils include soils subject to landsliding, lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse caused by earthquake shaking, seasonal saturation of soils and rock materials, or grading and construction activities. Implementation of existing regulations, as well as the 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce the impacts of unstable soils associated with General Plan buildout through application of best management practices and engineering controls. The impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and implementation programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to unstable soils that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d) The 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that buildout of the General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas with expansive soils; however, implementation of existing regulations and 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce the impacts of expansive soils through application of best management practices and engineering controls. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to expansive soils that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

e) The 2030 General Plan would not include construction of new buildings or land uses that would rely on septic systems for disposal of sewage. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to septic systems.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to geology and soils. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on geology and soils that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Page 4.14-18	No	No	No	Yes
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Page 4.14-18	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a & b) The original 2030 General Plan analysis concluded that General Plan development-generated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would not be anticipated to conflict with AB 32 (i.e., an agency-adopted regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions). The 2030 General Plan policies and programs were designed to reduce GHG emissions and accommodate for growth in a more GHG-efficient manner than the 1994 General Plan. Implementation of these policies and programs, as well as mitigation measures, would ensure consistency with the mandates of AB 32. However, buildout of the 2030 General Plan would still result in substantially higher GHG emissions compared to existing levels because of the large amount of development and potential for simultaneous construction of multiple sites; taken together with 2030-modeled emissions, implementation of the 2030 General Plan could represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of climate change. The impact is significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to greenhouse gas emissions.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to GHG emissions, or applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs, as well as mitigation measure 4.14-1, as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to GHGs. No additional mitigation measures are required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on GHGs that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Page 4.15-11	No	No	No	Yes
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Page 4.15-11	No	No	No	Yes
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Page 4.15-14	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Page 4.15-13	No	No	No	Yes
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Page 4.15-12	No	No	No	Yes
h) Expose people or structures to a 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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a & b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded the future population growth during buildout of the General Plan would result in an increase in the routine transport, use and/or disposal of hazardous materials, which could result in exposure of such materials to the public through either routine use or accidental release. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies, in combination with existing regulations, would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to routine transportation, use, or accidental release of hazardous materials that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in development of uses that would emit or handle hazardous material or waste within one-quarter mile of new or existing schools. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies would prevent future conflicts between hazardous materials handling and emissions, and schools. This impact is therefore, less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to emissions or handling of hazardous materials or waste within proximity of schools that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in environmental or public exposure to hazardous materials from development on known hazardous materials sites (Cortese-listed sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5) within the Planning Area. However, while 2030 General Plan policies and current regulations would not absolutely prevent exposure to hazardous materials on these sites, they would reduce potential impacts related to development on these sites to a less-than-significant level. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to exposure to hazardous materials from development on Cortese-listed sites that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

e & f) The Planning Area is not subject to any Airport Land Use plans, and there are no private airstrips in the Planning Area. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to conflicts with public airport plans or private airstrips.

g) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would create additional traffic and residences that requiring evacuation in case of emergency. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies would ensure conformance with countywide emergency response programs and continued cooperation with emergency-response service providers. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to interference with an adopted emergency-response plan that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

h) The Planning Area does not include any areas of moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity zones. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to high, or very high fire hazard severity zones.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on hazards or hazardous materials that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Pages 4.5-29 and 4.5-36	No	No	No	Yes
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Page 4.5-38	No	No	No	Yes
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 on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	Page 4.5-33	No	No	No	Yes
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 on- or off-site flooding?	Page 4.5-33	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Pages 4.5-29, 4.5-33, and 4.10-16	No	No	No	Yes
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Page 4.5-36	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Page 4.5-40	No	No	No	Yes
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	Pages 4.5-13 and 4.5-5	No	No	No	Yes

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
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?	Pages 4.5-42 and 4.5-43	No	No	No	Yes
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a & f) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would result in additional discharges of pollutants to receiving water bodies from nonpoint sources (e.g., increased surface water runoff from impervious sources such as rooftops and sidewalks) and construction and grading activities. Such pollutants would result in adverse changes to the water quality of local water bodies. Additionally, many construction-related wastes have the potential to degrade existing water quality. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations, including permitting requirements, would reduce these impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to water quality or waste discharge that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development and land use changes consistent with General Plan would result in additional impervious surfaces and the diversion of groundwater to surface water. Resulting reductions in groundwater recharge in the groundwater basins underlying the Planning Area could affect groundwater levels and the yield of hydrologically connected wells. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce the potential for impacts on groundwater to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to groundwater recharge or supplies that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c & d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development and land use changes consistent with the General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the total volume and peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff. This could alter local drainage patterns, increasing watershed flow rates above the natural background level (i.e., peak flow rates). Increased peak flow rates may exceed drainage system capacities, exacerbate erosion in overland flow and drainage swales and creeks, and result in downstream sedimentation. General Plan policies would reduce downstream flooding and erosion through federal and regional regulations and City performance standards for development design that controls surface runoff discharge, reducing potential impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that

contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to stormwater drainage patterns that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

e) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in increased runoff that could exceed capacity of existing stormwater drainage system and that the City would need to provide new and expanded stormwater drainage facilities in order to accommodate growth anticipated under the General Plan. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs would require that the City prepare and maintain a drainage master plan and include performance standards such that new development would be designed to control surface runoff discharges. The 2030 General Plan policies and programs also call for LID standards to reduce stormwater runoff levels, improve infiltration to replenish groundwater sources, and reduce pollutants close to their source. These policies and programs along with existing City and County grading, erosion, and flood control regulations would reduce the impact to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to flooding that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

g & h) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan could result in the development of residential or commercial structures in floodplains, thereby exposing people and structures to flood hazards. However, implementation of General Plan policies and programs combined with enforcement of existing flood control regulations would reduce this impact to less than significant

The proposed SB 5 GPA includes information about a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to the City of Live Oak from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) received in January 2014, which included an annotated FIRM panel map. The LOMR and annotated FIRM panel map revised a small area in the City's Planning Area that is susceptible to localized flooding from Zone A to "Contained" (in storm drain), and indicates incorporation of the modification. Zone A is defined as an area of 100-year flood; base flood elevation and flood hazard factors not determined. Incorporation of the LOMR eliminates FEMA designated 100-year floodplains in the General Planning Area.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map or placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. The proposed GPA flood protection and management goals, policies, and programs provide additional benefit in flood protection and management than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

h) Section 4.5 of the original 2030 General Plan EIR, "Hydrology and Water Resources," includes information about surface water and groundwater regulations in the General Planning Area. Federal, State, and local regulations provide a framework for addressing all aspects of hydrology and water quality resulting from General Plan implementation, including development of structures in 100-year flood hazard zones that would impede or redirect flood flows. As described in Section 4.5.1, "Regulatory Setting," of the EIR, drainage design criteria in the City of Live Oak Public Works Improvements Standards provides that:

- Placement of any fills across an existing drainage course shall incorporate a means by which excess flows not handled by the drainage system can flow overland via essentially the same course as prior to placing the fill across the drainage course, without inundating or damaging any structure.

The City received a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in January 2014, which includes an annotated FIRM panel map. The LOMR and annotated FIRM panel map revised a small area in the City’s Planning Area that is susceptible to localized flooding from Zone A to “Contained” (in storm drain), and indicates incorporation of the modification. Zone A is defined as an area of 100-year flood; base flood elevation and flood hazard factors not determined. Incorporation of the LOMR eliminates the prior FEMA designated 100-year floodplain in the General Planning Area. The SB 5 GPA incorporates this information into the EIR. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. The proposed GPA flood protection and management goals, policies, and programs provide additional benefit in flood protection and management than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

i) The Feather River Levee system protects the Sutter Basin, including the 2030 General Planning Area. Levees can fail because of earthquake-induced slumping, landslides, liquefaction, overtopping, and high volume flows. The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs, combined with relevant state and local regulations, would reduce the potential for effects on the Planning Area from levee failure. The proposed GPA will also indirectly lead to improved flood protection and emergency preparedness for the residents of Live Oak. The Sutter County Emergency Operations Plan identified two dams, Oroville and Thermalito Afterbay, which would affect the Planning Area in the unlikely event of dam failure. However, implementation of policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan would minimize the potential for effects from dam failure. Potential impacts from levee or dam failure are less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to flooding from levee or dam failure that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

j) The Planning Area is located in an area not subject to seiche or tsunami, and the area topography is relatively level and not subject to mudflow. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts to hydrology and water quality. No additional mitigations is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on hydrology or water quality that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	Page 4.1-7	No	No	No	Yes
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Page 4.1-8	No	No	No	Yes
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Page 4.1-8	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in changes to existing land uses and extend development and associated infrastructure into areas that are currently undeveloped. Although the division of any existing community is unlikely, the 2030 General Plan goals and policies would prevent division of communities in the future. Overall, policy and land use diagram changes in the 2030 General Plan promotes connectivity throughout the City, including promoting infill development of underutilized land that may currently create divisions in neighborhoods, as well as promoting efficient circulation patterns. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects to existing developed portions of the community that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan’s goals, policies, and programs would not conflict with other applicable land use plans, policies, or agency regulation with jurisdiction over the Planning Area, including the 2008 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), Sutter County General Plan, Sutter Local Agency Formation Commission, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint, that would result in physical effects under CEQA. The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the environmental impact categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. The EIR demonstrates consistency between Live Oak 2030 General Plan policies and the 2008 MTP plan for transportation, land use, and air quality on a regional level. In 2016, SACOG approved an updated MTP, having conferred with jurisdictions within its six-county region to parallel transportation and land use planning efforts, maintaining consistency between the MTP and local general plan policies. The regional plan update included inputs from Live

Oak's 2030 General Plan. Updates to the MTP do not present a significant change in the regulatory setting that would result in a new environmental impact compared to that analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to conflicts with other applicable land use plans, policies, or agency regulations that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis did not include analysis of potential conflicts with conservation plans as there were no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, which covered the Planning Area; the Yuba-Sutter Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (referred to as the Yuba-Sutter Regional Conservation Plan) is still under development. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to conflicts with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts related to land use and planning. No other mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on land use and planning that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a & b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that no known mineral resources of value to the region and residents of the state have been identified in the Planning Area, and no locally important mineral resources are identified in local land use plans. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to mineral resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on mineral resources that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XII. NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the project:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	Page 4.4-17, 4.4-25, 4.4-27, and 4.4-30	No	No	No	Yes
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Page 4.4-31	No	No	No	Yes
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Page 4.4-17, 4.4-25, and 4.4-27	No	No	No	Yes
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Page 4.4-25	No	No	No	Yes
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
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?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a & c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that traffic generated by land uses accommodated under the General Plan would increase noise levels along transportation routes. However, 2030 General Plan policies and programs for new development to include site planning techniques and/or feasible mitigation to reduce noise associated with vehicular transportation routes, as well as agricultural activities and buildout of stationary and area sources (e.g., mechanical equipment, schools, landscape and building maintenance activities) will reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Railroad operations within the City consist of freight and Amtrak passenger service on the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) mainline track. The City has included all feasible noise mitigation as policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan, including cooperation with UPRR to reduce or eliminate the use of horns in noise sensitive areas of the community. Although the City has included 2030 General Plan policies and programs to ensure that its citizens are protected from excessive noise levels from train pass-bys, given the proximity of existing and proposed sensitive land uses to the railroad line, it cannot be

guaranteed that the City's objectives can be achieved in every case. The impact of railroad noise in excess of local standards is considered significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to railroad noise. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to vehicular, stationary and area-source, and railroad noise that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that short-term construction source vibration levels and vibration from train pass-bys could exceed Caltrans' recommended standard of 0.2 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) with respect to the prevention of structural damage for normal buildings, and the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard for 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e. annoyance) at vibration-sensitive land uses. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to short-term groundborne vibration levels that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that short-term construction noise levels associated with development under the General Plan could exceed the applicable City standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and if occurring during more-sensitive hours could result in annoyance and/or sleep disruption. However, the application of policies in the 2030 General Plan and compliance with the City's Municipal Code that would restrict construction activities to less sensitive daytime hours would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to short-term construction noise that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

e & f) There are no airports in the immediate vicinity of the City of Live Oak, and there are no private airstrips in the Planning Area, although occasional commercial, military, and general aviation aircraft overflights occur at higher altitudes. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to noise associated with public airports or private airstrips.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts related to noise. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on noise that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) Induce substantial 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)?	Page 4.1-13	No	No	No	Yes
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would accommodate population growth in the City and its Planning Area. However, Live Oak has accommodated a balance of residential, commercial, employment, civic, recreational, and open space uses to avoid growth inducement in other areas. The City’s 2030 General Plan land use policies would reduce the potential to induce growth not accounted for in the General Plan. The impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to inducement of population growth that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b & c) The 2030 General Plan does not require land use change and does not include any infrastructure planning elements that would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Although some changes, such as allowing mixed uses in the downtown area, would result in changes to land uses in the area, the General Plan does not propose any changes that would require the removal or displacement of existing housing. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to displacement of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address potential impacts related to population and housing. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on population and housing that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or 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?	Page 4.9-8	No	No	No	Yes
Police protection?	Page 4.9-9	No	No	No	Yes
Schools?	Page 4.9-11	No	No	No	Yes
Parks?	Page 4.9-12	No	No	No	Yes
Other public facilities?	Page 4.9-15	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) Fire and Police Protection: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would increase the population in the City of Live Oak, increasing demand for fire and police protection services, which would result in the need for additional and/or expanded fire and police protection facilities and services. The 2030 General Plan policies would ensure that new fire and police facilities and services are funded and constructed to serve new development. Future facilities construction plans would be subject to project-level CEQA analysis and mitigation. The 2030 General Plan includes policies, programs, and the EIR includes mitigation measures, where necessary, that would reduce or avoid impacts. There is no additional significant impact related to construction of these facilities beyond that which is comprehensively analyzed throughout the EIR. The impact is less than significant.

School Facilities and Parks: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in an increase in population in the City of Live Oak, including the number of school-aged children, which would result in an increase in demand for school services and expanded school facilities, as well as parks. Buildout of the General Plan would increase people and demand for new and existing parks, and enrollment within the Live Oak Unified School District would increase over existing capacity at some of its schools. However, policies in the 2030 General Plan address or avoid these potential impacts, including policies to match future parkland with future population growth. Additionally, the payment of school impact fees is designed to offset the cost of new school facility construction. The 2030 General Plan includes policies, programs, and the EIR includes mitigation measures, where necessary, that would reduce or avoid impacts. There is no additional significant impact related to construction of these facilities beyond that which is comprehensively analyzed throughout the EIR. The impact is less than significant.

Libraries: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would generate new population in Live Oak, which would create an increase in demand for library services and potentially the need for new or expanded library facilities. The City has no regulatory control over library facilities and services because Sutter County owns and operates the library; thus, the City cannot guarantee that any deficiencies in library facilities and services would be rectified. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies are intended to offset the need for additional library services through innovative solutions that would be triggered by new growth in the City. There is no significant impact related to construction of these facilities beyond that which is comprehensively analyzed throughout the EIR. The impact is less than significant.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to fire and police protection and services, schools, parks, and libraries that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies, programs, and mitigation measures as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address potential impacts related to fire and police protection and services, schools, parks, and libraries. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on fire and police protection services, schools, parks, and libraries that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XV. RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) 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?	Page 4.9-12; 4.9-14	No	No	No	Yes
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Page 4.9-12	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a & b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in an increase in population in the City of Live Oak, which would result in an increased demand on existing City park and recreation facilities and the need for additional and/or expanded parks and recreation facilities. Demand on existing City park facilities would lead to accelerated deterioration of these facilities if not properly maintained. The goals and policies of the 2030 General Plan, along with the requirement for new development to provide parkland or in-lieu fees, would aid in providing an increased amount of parkland such that the likelihood of overuse by new residents and accelerated physical deterioration of existing facilities would be reduced to less than significant.

The specific environmental impacts of constructing a new individual park or recreation facility cannot be determined at the programmatic level of analysis. Development and operation of park facilities may result in potentially significant impacts (such as damage to habitat and noise) that are addressed through policies, programs, and mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Various park and recreational expansion or improvement projects have been identified in certain areas of the City, which would be subject to specific environmental analysis and mitigation, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA. There is no additional significant impact related to construction of these facilities beyond that which is comprehensively analyzed throughout the EIR. The impact is less than significant.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to recreation facilities that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies, programs, and mitigation measures as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address potential impacts related to recreation. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on recreation that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XVI. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
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?	Pages 4.2-21, 4.2-25, 4.2-28, and 4.2-30	No	No	No	Yes
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Pages 4.2-21, 4.2-25, 4.2-28, and 4.4-30	No	No	No	Yes
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Page 4.2-33	No	No	No	Yes
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Page 4.2-33	No	No	No	Yes
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	N/A	No	No	No	N/A

DISCUSSION

a & b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would degrade City roadways operating at level of service (LOS) D or better to LOS E or LOS F levels. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs related to circulation improvement strategies would generally provide acceptable LOS for City roadway segments. UPRR crossings fall under the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and would require input from the railroad and, due to proximity of the state highway, Caltrans. It should be noted that because railroad crossing are under the jurisdiction of the PUC, the City cannot

guarantee that the actions taken by the City with regard to railroad crossings can be implemented and will require investigation of design options. The impact is less than significant.

The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would contribute traffic to intersections that would operate in excess of acceptable LOS. With implementation of measures for Planning Area intersections involving only City streets (and not State Route 99), traffic conditions could be maintained at the minimum level established by the 2030 General Plan. The impact to City street intersections is less than significant. Improvements to intersections with State Route (SR) 99 require coordination with other agencies (Caltrans and PUC). Although the City identified all potential feasible mitigation, the City cannot guarantee implementation of required improvements while meeting other agency requirements to achieve acceptable LOS at identified intersections with SR 99. The impact is considered significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to degradation of LOS at intersections with SR 99.

The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under of the General Plan would contribute traffic to regional roadways (i.e., located outside the City of Live Oak sphere of influence) currently operating at LOS C or better. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs related to a regional approach to planning and funding improvements of County roads would reduce these impacts, particularly LOS E conditions, which exceeds Sutter County's minimum LOS D standard, on Larkin Road north of Riviera Road. However, because the exact nature of the improvements were not knowable at the time, there is no guarantee that LOS on Larkin Road will not exceed LOS D and without improvements would be LOS F. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to degradation of regional/County roadway LOS.

The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that buildout of the General Plan would result in four State Route (SR) 99 segments operating at LOS F; although, implementation of policies and programs provides that the City collaborate with Caltrans in the development of an Access Management Plan that identifies acceptable improvements for improved operations. However, there is no guarantee that a high enough level of access control on SR 99 will be implemented under the Access Management Plan that achieves peak period congestion that satisfies City LOS standards. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to degradation of highway LOS.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to local and regional roadway, intersection, and highway LOS that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) Because the closest airport to the 2030 General Planning Area, Sutter County Airport, is located 10 miles southwest of Live Oak, implementation of the General Plan would 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. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to air traffic patterns.

d & e) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would add multi-modal trips to the existing and planned transportation network. If not properly designed, certain aspects of the 2030 General Plan could introduce traffic hazards. However, policies and programs in the 2030 General

Plan and the City's standards would ensure adequate emergency access and avoid introducing substantial traffic hazards. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to traffic hazards or emergency access that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

f) The 2030 General Plan identifies an extensive range of policies and programs designed to ensure the safety and convenience of pedestrian and bicycle travel, which was not substantively addressed in the 1994 General Plan. Therefore, conflicts with policies intended to promote alternatives to vehicular travel were not analyzed in the original 2030 General Plan EIR. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts related traffic and transportation. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on traffic and transportation that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XVII. PUBLIC UTILITIES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Page 4.10-14	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Pages 4.10-11 and 4.10-15	No	No	No	Yes
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?	Page 4.10-16	No	No	No	Yes
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Page 4.10-12	No	No	No	Yes
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	Page 4.10-15	No	No	No	Yes
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Page 4.10-18	No	No	No	Yes
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Page 4.10-18	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would require upgrades to wastewater treatment infrastructure. However, the upgrades would not exceed any wastewater

treatment requirements of either the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) or the State. A 2030 General Plan policy requires master planning for wastewater treatment capacity and phased expansion of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) to serve new growth anticipated under the General Plan, and implementation of improvements to achieve compliance with wastewater treatment standards. There is no land uses in the General Plan that would be expected to generate wastewater of such poor quality and concentration or in such amounts that future treatment systems would not be able to adequately treat according to applicable water quality standards. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the CVRWQCB or the State that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b & e) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would accommodate land use change and result in population growth that increase demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities and require construction of new water supply and distribution facilities. It is anticipated that land use change under the General Plan would generate wastewater demand in excess of the capacity of the City's existing wastewater treatment plant, necessitating the expansion of existing or construction of new wastewater facilities. Construction of wastewater and water facilities could have adverse effects on the physical environment. Technical sections in the original 2030 General Plan EIR evaluated the direct effects of construction and operation of these facilities relative to specific environmental issue areas (e.g., noise, air quality). General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the original EIR, where necessary, would reduce or avoid impacts as noted throughout the EIR. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to new water and wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the City would need to provide new and expanded stormwater drainage facilities in order to accommodate growth anticipated under the General Plan. Technical sections of the original 2030 General Plan EIR evaluated the direct effects of construction and operation of these facilities relative to specific environmental issue areas (e.g., air quality, noise). Construction of such facilities could result in significant adverse environmental effects; however, 2030 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the original EIR, where necessary, will minimize the impacts. There are no additional significant impacts beyond those considered comprehensively throughout the original EIR. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to stormwater drainage facilities that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

d) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the City would need to provide additional water supplies to meet the demand that would be created by buildout of the 2030 General Plan. However, by adhering to the General Plan policies, the City of Live Oak would reduce its overall water demand using conservation measures. Although water demand would increase substantially over current levels, the City's total water demand in 2030 would be roughly 0.4 percent of the East Butte Subbasin's total storage capacity. There has not been substantial decrease in groundwater levels that would suggest long-term water supply will be a substantial issue in the region. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not

authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to water supplies that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

f & g) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the General Plan would allow for the development of new homes and businesses within Live Oak, which would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste sent to landfills. The majority of solid waste generated within the City of Live Oak is transported to and disposed of at the Ostrom Road Landfill. The combination of 2030 General Plan policies and existing regulations related to the disposal and reduction of solid waste reduces the amount of solid waste generated locally and sent to the Ostrom Road Landfill. Additionally, though the City does not manage the Ostrom Road Landfill, its portion of waste stream to the landfill is less than 4 percent of the total municipal waste the landfill receives on an annual basis. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to solid waste disposal that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs, and mitigation measures as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts related to public utilities. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on public utilities that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XVIII. ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
Would the Project:					
a) Increase the demand for consumption of energy?	Page 4.13-9	No	No	No	Yes

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the General Plan would allow for a large amount of urban development, which would increase the demand and consumption of energy. However, the 2030 General Plan includes policies and programs intended to establish efficient land use patterns and efficient use of energy in areas of land use change. This impact is less than significant. The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects related to energy consumption that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address impacts related to the consumption of energy. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on energy consumption that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Where Was Impact Analyzed in Prior Environmental Document?	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Mitigation Measures Address Impacts?
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Sections 4.6 and 4.11	No	No	No	Yes
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.)	Chapter 6	No	No	No	Yes
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, and 4.15	No	No	No	Yes
<p>Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21083.5. Reference: Government Code Sections 65088.4. Public Resources Code Sections 21080, 21083.5, 21095; <i>Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka</i> (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; <i>Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency</i> (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; <i>San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.</p>					

DISCUSSION

a) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would result in the use of both renewable and nonrenewable natural resources (e.g., fossil fuels, lumber and other forest products, water) for construction and future operation. Land uses and development would also result in changes to traffic and circulation and therefore would increase emissions of air pollutants, GHG emissions, and noise, and any conversion of agricultural lands would be a significant and irreversible environmental change. Biological resource impacts resulting from implementation of the 2030 General Plan, including loss of special-status species plans, loss of special-status wildlife and fish species, loss of native and heritage trees, and loss and degradation of sensitive natural communities or federally protected wetlands, would all be reduced to less than significant levels following mitigation. Policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan are designed to avoid or reduce biological impacts to less-than-significant levels with a range of conservation, restoration, and preservation strategies. Impacts on cultural resources, including examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, can be reduced to less-than-significant level by applying goals, policies, and programs in the 2030 General Plan.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in effects to the environment, including biological resources and cultural resources, that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

b) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that development under the General Plan would result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to air quality, noise, transportation and circulation, agricultural resources, and visual resources:

Air Quality: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that air quality in the region does not meet State of California standards. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would cause significant short- and long-term criteria pollutant emissions. The cumulative effects from short- and long-term criteria pollutants generated from development under the 2030 General Plan, combined with related projects, are cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.

Noise: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of the 2030 General Plan, along with regional growth and traffic conditions, would cause changes in traffic noise levels over existing traffic noise levels. The 2030 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant impact.

Transportation and Circulation: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that regional population and employment growth is anticipated to result in traffic volumes along regional roadways, such as SR 99, that exceed acceptable levels of service. This represents a significant cumulative impact. While the General Plan includes various policies to reduce traffic demand and mitigation for roadway segments and intersections, traffic is anticipated to exceed level of service standards at certain roadway segments and intersections. The 2030 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

Agricultural Resources: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that combined with past, present, and future development within Sutter, Butte, and Yuba County farming areas, implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in direct conversion of agricultural land that would contribute to an incremental decline in Important Farmland to the region. The loss of Important Farmland is a cumulatively considerable impact when considered in connection with the significant cumulative losses that would occur through implementation of the 2030 General Plan, past farmland conversions, and planned future development.

Visual Resources: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that despite a range of policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan that would reduce or avoid adverse visual impacts throughout the Planning Area, urban development of agricultural lands and open space would occur. Growth and development in Sutter County, Butte County, and Yuba County would involve similar conversion of former agricultural lands, open space, and elements of the rural landscape. Cumulative visual impacts are considered cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance beyond that contemplated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Because the proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, it would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts that are more severe than described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

c) The original 2030 General Plan EIR analyzed potential effects that would cause indirect or direct adverse effects on human beings, such as effects related to air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and water quality:

Air Quality: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce criteria air pollutants and precursors from short-term construction-related emissions and long-term operation emissions from development under the General Plan, though they would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Consideration was approved for adverse effects related to short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions. Long-term, operational, local mobile-source emission of CO would not be expected to substantially contribute to emissions concentration that would exceed air quality standards. Proposed sensitive land uses and TAC sources would be adequately sited under the 2030 General Plan to minimize exposure to substantial concentration of TACs to less than significant. Sensitive receptors could be exposed to excessive odors from existing land uses (e.g., food processing facilities, wastewater treatment plant expansion, agricultural land uses); however, the 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

Geology and Soils: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of existing regulations and 2030 General Plan policies and programs, would reduce impacts, including substantial risks to life related to unstable and expansive soils associated with General Plan buildout through application of best management practices and engineering controls to less than significant. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs and existing California Building Code (CBC) regulations reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to seismic ground shaking or ground failure.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that in combination with existing regulations, 2030 General Plan policies would reduce public exposure to increased routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials and potential impacts from development on Cortese-listed sites. The 2030 General Plan policies would prevent future conflicts between hazardous materials handling and emissions and schools and ensure conformance with countywide emergency response programs and continued cooperation with emergency-response service providers resulting in impacts to adopted emergency and evacuation plans that are less than significant. The Planning Area does not include any areas of moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity zones, is not subject to any Airport Land Use plans, and there are no private airstrips in the Planning Area that would result in these potential safety hazards for people residing or working in the area.

Noise: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that the 2030 General Plan policies and programs include all feasible noise mitigation that reduces noise related to railway operations. However, given the proximity of existing and proposed sensitive land uses to the UPRR mainline track, it cannot be guaranteed that the City's noise standards can be achieved with every train pass-by; therefore, impacts related to railroad noise that could expose persons to noise in excess of local standards is considered significant and unavoidable. The 2030 General Plan policies and programs would reduce noise associated with vehicular transportation routes, agricultural activities, and stationary and area sources to less than significant. Exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and short-term construction noise from development under the General Plan would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The original 2030 General Plan EIR analysis concluded that implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and programs, along with existing regulations, would reduce discharges of pollutants to receiving water bodies and downstream flooding and erosion from increased stormwater runoff to less than significant. Although implementation of the 2030 General Plan policies and programs, combined with relevant state and local regulations, would reduce potential effects related to levee or dam failure to less than significant,

the proposed SB 5 GPA will lead to improved flood protection and emergency preparedness for Live Oak residents.

The SB 5 GPA flood management and protection information, goals, policies, and programs do not authorize any additional development or disturbance. The proposed GPA does not propose any physical action that could result in a direct or indirect effect on the environment, including air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and water quality, that would result in effects to human beings that are more severe than those described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Live Oak will implement 2030 General Plan policies and programs as identified in the original 2030 General Plan EIR, as applicable, to address potential impacts to the environment and human beings, and those impacts that are cumulatively considerable in the context of past, current, and future projects. No additional mitigation is required.

CONCLUSION

The SB 5 GPA would not result in direct or indirect effects on the environment or human beings, or result in cumulatively considerable impacts that are more severe than those effects described in the original 2030 General Plan EIR.