

Table ES-3. Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation and Significant and Unavoidable Impacts on Resources Analyzed

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans would result in the conversion of substantial acres of important farmland to nonagricultural land.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plans could reduce impacts on important farmland in some of the jurisdictions, but not to less-than-significant levels.
AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans of the County and City of Gridley would result in the conversion of existing Williamson Act land to nonagricultural uses.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plans could reduce impacts on Williamson Act lands in some jurisdictions, but not to less-than-significant levels.
AG-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans of the County and the City of Gridley would result in conversion of substantial acres of farmland to nonagricultural uses.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plans could reduce impacts on some agricultural lands in some jurisdictions, but not to less-than-significant levels.
Air Quality and Climate Change			
AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would generate emissions levels in conflict with the NSVPA Plan.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, standard construction mitigation measures from BCAQMD's CEQA guidelines, BCAQMD's fugitive PM10 mitigation measures, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would violate air quality standards or contribute to an existing air quality violation.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, BCAQMD's fugitive PM10 mitigation measures, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Chico, Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would generate emissions that violate air quality standards.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of construction-related activities under the City of Oroville’s general plan would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Oroville and Gridley would expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-6: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies’ general plans and emissions associated with transportation facilities, recurring maintenance, and water and irrigation district activities would generate significant levels of greenhouse gases.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-7: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies’ general plans and emissions associated with transportation facilities, recurring maintenance, and water and irrigation district activities would generate significant levels of greenhouse gases.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, and Caltrans BMPs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
Biological Resources			
BIO-1: Effects on tricolored blackbird	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 12,617 acres (5%) of modeled tricolored blackbird habitat and one colony; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-2: Effects on yellow-breasted chat	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of over 980 acres (14%) of modeled yellow-breasted chat nesting and foraging habitat and 48 acres (16%) of known use area; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-3: Effects on bank swallow	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would have permanent and direct effects on 9 linear miles (5%) of modeled bank swallow habitat and significantly but indirectly effect 500 feet of bank swallow habitat.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-4: Effects on western burrowing owl	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 14,496 acres (9%) of modeled western burrowing owl habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-5: Effects on western yellow-billed cuckoo	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 50 acres (1%) of modeled western-yellow billed cuckoo habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-6: Effects on greater sandhill crane	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the loss of 1,764 acres (1%) of modeled greater sandhill crane habitat and result in an indirect increased risk of powerline collisions.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-7: Effects on California black rail	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area could affect occurrences of black rail; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-8: Effects on American peregrine falcon	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the loss of 9 acres (14%) of modeled nesting habitat, 3,759 acres (2%) of modeled foraging habitat, and one known nest location.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-9: Effects on Swainson's hawk	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 11,710 acres (8%) of modeled Swainson's hawk habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-10: Effects on white-tailed kite	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 16,664 acres (5%) of modeled white-tailed kite habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-11: Effects on bald eagle	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 2,784 acres (12%) of nesting habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-12: Effects on giant garter snake	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of up to 18 miles (4%) of movement habitat and 3,196 acres (2%) of other modeled giant garter snake habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-13: Effects on Blainville's horned lizard	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in a considerable loss of suitable habitat for Blainville's horned lizard; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-14: Effects on western pond turtle	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 24 (12%) potential breeding ponds, 5 linear miles (5%) of stream habitat, and 4,652 acres (5%) of modeled western pond turtle habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-15: Effects on foothill yellow-legged frog	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 107 miles of streams (10%) and 1,189 acres (11%) of associated upland habitat suitable for foothill yellow-legged frog; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-16: Effects on western spadefoot	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 22 (11%) potential breeding ponds and 10,142 (9%) acres of modeled western spadefoot habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-21: Effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 3,360 acres (8%) of modeled valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant direct and indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-22: Effects on vernal pool crustaceans	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 1,963 acres (6%) of modeled habitat for vernal pool crustaceans, loss of several known occurrences of four species of vernal pool crustaceans, and adverse indirect effects affecting water quality and hydrology; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-23: Effects on Red Bluff dwarf rush	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 1,313 acres of modeled habitat as well as at least one occurrence of Red Bluff dwarf rush.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-24: Effects on Butte County meadowfoam	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 345 acres of modeled primary habitat and 1,165 acres of modeled secondary habitat, as well as multiple occurrences of Butte County meadowfoam. Additionally, 477.6 acres of critical habitat designated for Butte County meadowfoam would be removed.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-25: Effects on Butte County checkerbloom	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 2,638 acres of modeled habitat, as well as multiple eight occurrences of Butte County checkerbloom.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-26: Effects on other special-status plants	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of modeled habit and temporary loss of habitat functions for eight covered plant species and five non-covered special-status plant species: 1,313 acres and 18 acres, respectively (Hoover's spurge, Ahart's dwarf rush, hairy Orcutt grass, slender Orcutt grass, Ahart's paronychia, and Greene's tuctoria); 176 acres and 18 acres (Ferris' milkvetch); and 236 acres and 184 acres (Butte County golden clover).	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-29: Effects on noncovered special-status birds and migratory birds	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of natural communities that provide habitat for non-covered special-status birds and migratory birds: 11,324 acres (12%) of oak woodland and savanna, 1,529 acres (6%) of riparian, and 93 acres (0.2%) of wetland natural communities; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-30: Effects on bats	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of up to 12,737 acres (11%) of potential bat roosting habitat; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-32: Effects on migratory deer	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the loss of critical winter habitat for the Bucks Mountain deer herd and the lower elevation winter habitat for the East Tehama and Mooretown deer herds.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-33: Effects on wildlife migration corridors	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would cause disruption of wildlife movement within two Essential Connectivity Areas (ECAs).	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-34: Effects on wetlands and waters of the United States	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in direct impacts to 1,911 acres (3%) of potentially jurisdictional wetlands, 136 acres (0.2%) of other waters, and 141 linear miles (6%) of other waters; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-37: Effects on oak woodland and savanna natural communities	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the decline of 11,324 acres (12%) of oak woodland; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-38: Effects on grassland natural communities	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the decline of 9,715 acres (10%) of grassland natural communities; 7,776 acres (13%) of grasslands and 1,939 acres (6%) of grassland with vernal swale complex; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-39: Effects on riparian natural communities	significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 1,413 acres (6%) of riparian natural communities; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
BIO-40: Effects on wetland natural communities	significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 93 acres (0.2%) of wetland natural communities; recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
BIO-41: Effects on aquatic natural communities	significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and permanent development projects in the Plan Area would result in the direct loss of 140 acres (1%) of aquatic natural communities and 52 ponds (11%); recurring maintenance activities would also result in significant indirect impacts.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
Hydrology and Water Quality			
WQ-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans would expose people and structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of levee or dam failure in the Plan Area.	Goals and actions of the general plans could reduce the risk associated with levee failure, but would not eliminate risks to people and property and would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
Noise			
NOI-3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and transportation projects would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with traffic, and implementation of the City of Chico's general plan would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with stationary sources.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plans, in addition to Caltrans BMPs, could reduce impacts associated with the permanent increase in ambient noise levels, but not to less-than-significant levels.
NOI-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Biggs' general plan would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels associated with construction.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plan could reduce impacts associated with the temporary increase in ambient noise levels, but not to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
Public Services and Public Utilities			
PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios for the City of Gridley due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would exceed wastewater treatment requirements due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels,
PS-3: Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities due to the projected land use development.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the need for additional solid waste disposal services due to the projected population increase.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
Recreation, Open Space, and Visual Resources			
REC-1: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in a substantial increase in the use of existing recreational facilities because of the projected population growth.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in project population growth, thereby requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels.
REC-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas as a result of blocking views of the Sutter Buttes.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels.
REC-5: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Gridley and Chico would result in the conversion of agricultural land and open space to urban lands, substantially degrading the existing visual character or quality within their jurisdictions.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
REC-6: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of City of Gridley general plan would increase urban land uses, resulting in a new source of substantial light or glare.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)			
Population and Housing, Socioeconomics, and Environmental Justice			
SOC-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plan for the Cities of Gridley, Oroville, and Biggs would induce substantial population growth.	General plans policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
SOC-6: Substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans, transportation facilities, and water and irrigation district activities would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services and public utilities, recreation and visual resources, and transportation. These impacts would occur in locations of the Plan Area with meaningfully larger populations of minority and low-income persons, and therefore substantially disproportionately affect low-income populations.	General plans policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
Transportation			
TRA-1: A substantial increase in traffic compared to existing traffic volumes and the capacity of the roadway system	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and transportation facilities would result in substantial increases in traffic as a result of construction and operation.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
TRA-2: Safety hazards due to design features, incompatible uses (e.g., hazards to vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle transit), or inadequate emergency access	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Biggs' general plan would result in significant impacts related to traffic safety hazards or inadequate emergency access.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, as well as Caltrans BMPs, would reduce impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies' general plans and implementation of the conservation strategy would result in the conversion of substantial acres of important farmland to nonagricultural uses.	The agricultural protection target of Alternative 2 would preserve more than 30% of agricultural communities—most of which would likely be important farmland—however, this would not offset impacts associated with conversion of farmland. General plan goals, policies, and actions could reduce impacts on important farmland in some of the jurisdictions, but not to less-than-significant levels.
AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the County's and the City of Gridley's general plans would result in the conversion of existing Williamson Act land to nonagricultural uses; implementation of the conservation strategy would not conflict with Williamson Act contracts or agricultural use zoning.	General plan goals, policies, and actions or mitigation measures would not reduce impacts on Williamson Act lands to less-than-significant levels.
AG-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the County's and the City of Gridley's general plans would involve other changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses; implementation of the conservation strategy would not involve other changes that would convert farmland.	The agricultural protection target in Alternative 2 would protect important farmlands from conversion to nonagricultural uses—however, this would not offset impacts associated with conversion of farmland. General plan goals, policies, and actions would not reduce impacts on some of the agricultural lands to a less-than-significant level.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
Air Quality and Climate Change			
AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would conflict with the NSVPA Plan. In addition, implementing the conservation strategy could result in a conflict with the NSVPA Plan.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for construction equipment, and Mitigation Measure AQ-1b: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for fugitive dust, AMM14 and AMM26, Caltrans BMPs, BCAQMD’s CEQA guidelines, and BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures; however, the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce the conflict with the NSVPA Plan associated with implementation of the general plans to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Chico, Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would violate air quality standards. In addition, implementation of the conservation strategy could result violate air quality standards.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy and construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for construction equipment, and Mitigation Measure AQ-1b: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for fugitive dust, AMM14 and AMM26, Caltrans BMPs, BCAQMD’s CEQA guidelines, and BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures; however, the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce emissions associated with implementation of the general plans to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the Cities of Chico, Oroville, Gridley, and Biggs; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. In addition, implementing the conservation strategy could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for construction equipment, and Mitigation Measure AQ-1b: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for fugitive dust, AMM14 and AMM26, Caltrans BMPs, BCAQMD’s CEQA guidelines, and BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures; however, general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce the net increase of criteria pollutants associated with implementation of the general plans to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans for the City of Gridley would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants. Implementation of the conservation strategy; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would have a low potential for exposing sensitive receptors, and this would be further reduced with implementation of a mitigation measure.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for construction equipment. General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Gridley and Oroville’s general plans would create objectionable odors. Implementation of the conservation strategy; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would not likely affect substantial numbers of people with objectionable odors, and this impact would be further reduced with implementation of a mitigation measure.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy; construction activities related to transportation facilities; and water and irrigation district activities would be further reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Implement BCAQMD mitigation measures for construction equipment, as well as BCAQMD’s CEQA guidelines, and BCAQMD’s fugitive PM10 mitigation measures. General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce effects associated implementation of the general plans to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-6: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the general plans, transportation facilities, recurring maintenance facilities, and water and irrigation district activities and implementation of the conservation strategy would generate significant levels of greenhouse gases.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, Caltrans BMPs, and Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Implement best construction practices for minimizing GHGs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
AQ-7: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of all the general plans, transportation facilities, recurring maintenance facilities, water and irrigation district activities, and implementation of the conservation strategy would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs, Caltrans BMPs, and Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Implement best construction practices for minimizing GHGs, would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
Hydrology and Water Quality			
WQ-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Local Agencies’ general plans would expose people and structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of levee or dam failure in the Plan Area. Implementation of the conservation strategy and other covered activities would not expose people or structures to a significant risk associated with flooding or the failure of a dam or levee.	Goals and actions of the general plans could reduce the risk associated with levee failure, but it would not eliminate risks to people and property associated with implementation of the general plans and would not reduce the risk to a less-than-significant level.
Noise			
NOI-1: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies	Less than significant with mitigation	Implementation of Local Agencies’ general plan policies, Caltrans’ BMPs, or AMM27 would restrict noise-generating activities associated with general plan implementation and other covered activities (e.g., transportation facilities). However, construction activities associated with the conservation strategy could result in short-term exceedances in local noise standards.	Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement measures to reduce noise during construction and address noise complaints, would reduce impacts associated with implementing the conservation strategy to less-than-significant levels.
NOI-3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Local Agencies’ general plans and transportation facilities would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels as a result of transportation noise and stationary sources (in the case of the City of Chico). Implementation of the conservation strategy, water and irrigation district activities, and recurring maintenance would not result in a substantial permanent increase in noise because there would be very few noise-generating activities that occur within the Plan Area on a permanent basis.	Goals, policies, and actions of the general plans, in addition to Caltrans BMPs, could reduce impacts associated with the permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with implementation of general plans and transportation facilities, but not to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
NOI-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Local Agencies’ general plan policies, Caltrans’ BMPs or AMM27 would restrict temporary noise-generating activities associated with general plan implementation and other covered activities (e.g., transportation facilities). However, implementation of the City of Biggs’ general plan would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels associated with construction. In addition, construction activities associated with implementing the conservation strategy could result in short-term exceedances in local noise standards.	Impacts associated with the conservation strategy would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement measures to reduce noise during construction and address noise complaints, and AMM27; however, the general plan policies or mitigation measures would not reduce the temporary increase in ambient noise levels associated with general plan implementation to a less-than significant level.
Public Services and Public Utilities			
PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in a substantial decrease in service ratios for the City of Gridley due to the projected population increase. Implementation of the conservation strategy and other covered activities would not result in a population increase and would not affect service ratios.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would exceed wastewater treatment requirements due to the projected population increase. Implementation of the conservation strategy and other covered activities would not result in a population increase in the Plan Area and consequently would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
PS-3: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in a population increase which would likely require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Implementation of the conservation strategy and other covered activities would not need water or wastewater services.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the construction of stormwater facilities. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not result in significant environmental effects as a result of construction of stormwater drainage facilities not already disclosed within this EIS/EIR.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in insufficient water supplies or require new or expanded entitlements. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not need new water entitlements.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
PS-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the need for additional wastewater treatment services. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not need new wastewater services.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in an increase in solid waste disposal needs. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not generate solid waste and would not need solid waste disposal services.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
Recreation, Open Space, and Visual Resources			
REC-1: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in unavoidable impacts on parks or other recreational facilities as a result of the anticipated population increase. Implementation of the conservation strategy is anticipated to increase the recreational opportunities for the public in the Plan Area.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would require the construction of recreational facilities that would adversely affect the environment. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not construct specific recreational facilities and would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
REC-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Gridley’s general plan would result in the conversion of agricultural land to urban uses and reduce the visibility of the Sutter Buttes, thereby substantially affecting scenic vistas or views. The conservation strategy would not affect scenic vistas and views and in some cases may enhance existing views.	Implementation of the general plan policies the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
REC-5: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Chico’s and City of Gridley’s general plans would result in substantial degradation of the existing visual character and quality of the areas within their local jurisdictions primarily due to more urban land uses. Implementation of the conservation strategy would benefit the existing visual character of the Plan Area and not substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of agricultural lands and natural lands.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
REC-6: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Gridley’s general plan would result in a substantial increase of light and glare as a result of the increase in urban land uses. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not result in a substantial increase of light and glare because permanent activities under the conservation strategy are not expected to use substantial light.	Implementation of the general plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce these effects associated with general plan implementation to less-than-significant levels.
Population and Housing, Socioeconomics, and Environmental Justice			
SOC-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Gridley, Biggs, and Oroville general plans would result in substantial increases in population growth. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not result in substantial population growth.	Implementation of the general plans or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with implementation of the general plans to less-than-significant levels.
SOC-6: Substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the Local Agencies’ general plans, transportation projects, and water and irrigation district activities, as well as the conservation strategy, would result in significant impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services and public utilities, recreation and visual resources, and transportation. These impacts would occur in locations of the Plan Area with meaningfully larger populations of minority and low-income persons and, therefore, substantially disproportionately affect low-income populations.	Implementation of the general plans or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. The mitigation measures incorporated for the effects associated with implementation of the conservation strategy for air quality, noise, and transportation would reduce effects to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 2—Proposed Action			
Transportation			
TRA-1: A substantial increase in traffic compared to existing traffic volumes and the capacity of the roadway system	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of Local Agencies’ general plans and transportation facilities would result in substantial increases in traffic as a result of construction and operation. Implementation of the conservation strategy or other covered activities (e.g., water and irrigation district activities) would not generate substantial volumes of short-term and long-term traffic.	General plan policies or the adoption of identified mitigation measures in general plan EIRs would not reduce impacts associated with general plan implementation or transportation facilities to less-than-significant levels.
TRA-2: Safety hazards due to design features, incompatible uses (e.g., hazards to vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle transit), or inadequate emergency access	Significant and unavoidable	Implementation of the City of Biggs’ general plan would result in significant impacts related to traffic safety hazards or inadequate emergency access. Implementation of the conservation strategy and other covered activities would not result in traffic hazards because conservation activities would generally be small, of limited duration, and located in areas with little traffic.	General plan policies would reduce the impacts associated with implementation of the general plan, but not to less-than-significant levels.
TRA-3: Potential conflicts with transportation plans, programs, and planned projects	Less than significant with mitigation	Implementation of the Local Agencies’ general plans would not conflict with transportation plans, programs, and planned projects because it would incorporate the infrastructure and transportation projects adopted in the local general plans and transportation plans. Implementation of the conservation strategy would establish of conservation areas in areas where land may be required for transportation project rights-of-way and this could impair construction of these transportation projects; similarly, the construction of transportation projects in such areas could limit their suitability as resource preserves.	Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Avoid acquisition of conservation lands that are within or adjacent to proposed alignments of programmed or planned transportation projects, would reduce impacts associated with the conservation strategy to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill			
Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AG-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Air Quality and Climate Change			
AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill			
AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-6: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-7: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less ground disturbance and development are expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Hydrology, Water Resources, and Water Quality			
WQ-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Noise			
NOI-1: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies	Less than significant with mitigation	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement measures to reduce noise during construction and address noise complaints, would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.
NOI-3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
NOI-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill			
Public Services and Public Utilities			
PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-3: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill			
Recreation, Open Space, and Visual Resources			
REC-1: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-5: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-6: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Population and Housing, Socioeconomics, and Environmental Justice			
SOC-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
SOC-6: Substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill			
Transportation			
TRA-1: A substantial increase in traffic compared to existing traffic volumes and the capacity of the roadway system	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because of the reduction in overall development.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
TRA-2: Safety hazards due to design features, incompatible uses (e.g., hazards to vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle transit), or inadequate emergency access	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
TRA-3: Potential conflicts with transportation plans, programs, and planned projects	Less than significant with mitigation	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly less because less development is expected to occur.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Avoid lands that are within or adjacent to proposed alignments of programmed or planned transportation projects, would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
Agricultural and Forestry Resources			
AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not convert important farmland beyond the conversions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act contracts beyond the conflicts already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AG-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not involve other changes that would convert important farmland beyond the changes already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Air Quality and Climate Change			
AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-6: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
AQ-7: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in additional air quality emissions beyond the emissions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
Hydrology, Water Resources, and Water Quality			
WQ-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not generate risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Noise			
NOI-1: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies	Less than significant with mitigation	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not generate noise levels in excess of established standards beyond those excesses already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement measures to reduce noise during construction and address noise complaints, would reduce impacts to less than significant.
NOI-3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in the permanent increase in ambient noise levels beyond those increases already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
NOI-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels beyond those increases already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
Public Services and Public Utilities			
PS-1: Environmental impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not reduce service ratios beyond those reductions already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-2: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements beyond those exceedances already identified under Alternative 2	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-3: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not require the construction of new water or wastewater facilities beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-4: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not require the construction of stormwater drainage facilities beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-5: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not require water supplies beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
PS-6: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not require the construction of new water or wastewater facilities beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
PS-7: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not require additional solid waste disposal services beyond the uses already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Recreation, Open Space, and Visual Resources			
REC-1: 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	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not increase the use of recreational facilities beyond the increases already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not include recreational facilities beyond those already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2 but fewer, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not substantially adversely affect a scenic vista beyond the adverse effects already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
REC-5: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not substantially degrade the visual characters beyond the visual degradation already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
REC-6: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not create a new source of substantial light or glare beyond those new sources already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
Population and Housing, Socioeconomics, and Environmental Justice			
SOC-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not induce substantial population growth beyond the growth already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
SOC-6: Substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts associated with implementation of the general plans would be the same as under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not substantially disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations beyond the impacts already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.

Impact	NEPA/CEQA Significance	Summary of Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures or Residual Impacts
Alternative 4—Greater Conservation			
Transportation			
TRA-1: A substantial increase in traffic compared to existing traffic volumes and the capacity of the roadway system	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in a substantial increase in traffic beyond the increase already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
TRA-2: Safety hazards due to design features, incompatible uses (e.g., hazards to vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle transit), or inadequate emergency access	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be the same as those described under Alternative 2, as the increased conservation of additional grasslands and ricelands would not result in safety hazards beyond the hazards already identified under Alternative 2.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2.
TRA-3: Potential conflicts with transportation plans, programs, and planned projects	Less than significant with mitigation	Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, although slightly greater as the greater area of conserved grasslands and ricelands increases the potential for conflicts to arise.	Mitigation measures or residual impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative 2. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Avoid acquisition of conservation lands that are within or adjacent to proposed alignments of programmed or planned transportation projects, would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.