APPENDIX A TO CEQA GUIDELINES COMMENTS BY APACA, AEP, AND ECAT

Example Environmental Checklist for

<u>Supplemental Reviews Pursuant to</u> <u>Guidelines Sections 15162 – 15164</u> <u>(In Track Changes)</u>

1. **Project Title:** [Click and Type Project Title]

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: [Click and Type Lead Agency Name and Address]

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: [Click and Type Contact Information]

4. Project Location: [Click and Type Project Location]

5. Project Sponsor's Name and [Click and Type Project Sponsor]

Address:

6. General Plan Designation: [Click and Type General Plan Designation]

7. Zoning: [Click and Type Zoning]

8. Name of Prior CEQA Document:

89. Description of Project, including relationship to the subject of the prior CEOA document:

[Click and Type Project Description]

910. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

[Click and Type Land Uses and Setting]

1011. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

[Click and Type Other Agencies]

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

	The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" subsequent						
_	project would involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" subsequent activity"). The purpose of the following checklist is to make an initial determination of whether						
	these are new or substantially more severe impacts relative to those disclosed in the prior CEOA						
	document.), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.						
	☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agricultural and Forestry ☐ Air Quality						
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils		
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/Water Quality		
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise		
	Population/Housing		Public Services		Recreation		
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		
The the sup decinal	The subsequent activity has been evaluated pursuant to the provisions of Sections 15162—15164 of the CEQA Guidelines to determine whether a subsequent EIR or mitigated negative declaration, a supplemental EIR, or an addendum to the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration is required. The analysis compares the impacts identified in the prior document with those expected to result from the subsequent activity to determine whether the activity would result in any new or substantially more severe significant effect. No subsequent or supplemental document is necessary if the impacts of the subsequent activity do not exceed those identified in the prior document. On the basis of this initial evaluation:						
		nifica	osequent activity COULD NOTw nt effect on the environment, a prepared.				
	I find that although the proposed project could subsequent activity would have a new or substantially more severe significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent that will reduce the effect below the level of significance. A subsequent MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.						
			X subsequent activity would had ironment, and an a subsequent				

Signature	Date	
Printed Name	For	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a subsequent project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected. Those environmental effects are not necessarily limited to the items on the checklist or the effects disclosed in the prior CEQA document.

The use of this checklist is intended to be limited to subsequent activities that are essentially the same as the project analyzed in the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration. If the later activity is not part of the project analyzed in the prior EIR, the standard initial study checklist should be used.

- 1. A brief <u>An</u> explanation is required for all answers <u>except "No Impact"</u> answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to <u>projects activities</u> like the one involved (e.g., the <u>project falls outside a fault rupture zone activity is not on agricultural land</u>). A "No Impact" answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involvedfindings of the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. The subsequent activity is subject to all applicable mitigation measures. Keep in mind that the key question is not whether the subsequent project will have a significant impact on the environment, but instead whether it will have a new or substantially more severe impact in relation to the conclusions in the prior CEQA document.

- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may-would-occur-as-a result of the subsequent activity, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significanta new impact not analyzed in the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration, or an impact that is substantially more severe than disclosed in the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an subsequent EIR Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies wWhen the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced would reduce all new or substantially more severean effect impacts from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a less than significant impacts, a subsequent mitigated negative declaration is required. "Less than Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced.)
- 5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, The analysis can presume that an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier the prior EIR, negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]unless a substantial change in the project, a substantial change in its circumstances, or new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration was certified or adopted indicates that any of the conditions described in Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), (2) or (3) have occurred. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. <u>Earlier-Prior Analysis Used.</u> Identify and state where <u>earlier analyses the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration is are available for review.</u>
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects of the subsequent activity on from the above-the following checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document the prior EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards Section 15162 and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis in that prior document.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe Describe the mitigation measures that were are incorporated or refined from the earlier prior document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project. Describe any new or refined mitigation measures that are necessary to prepare a subsequent mitigated negative declaration for the subsequent activity.
- 6. The determinations must be based on substantial evidence. Lead agencies are encouraged toshould incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

I. A	Aesthetics	Potentially New Significant Impact	Less than- Substantially More Severe Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	ould the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?				
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?				

II.	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
reso age Lan pre Con asso det incl effe con and fore Ass men ado	determining whether impacts on agricultural ources are significant environmental effects, lead noises may refer to the California Agricultural and Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) pared by the California Department of asservation as an optional model to use in essing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In ermining whether impacts on forest resources, luding timberland, are significant environmental ects, lead agencies may refer to information apiled by the California Department of Forestry I Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of est land, including the Forest and Range essment Project and the Forest Legacy essment Project, and forest carbon measurement thodology provided in the Forest Protocols opted by the California Air Resources Board. und the project:				
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?				
C.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
	[Insert Discussion Here]				

[Click and type document title] 7 [Click and type date] ICF [Click and type job number]

III.	Air Quality	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
by t pol	en available, the significance criteria established che applicable air quality management or air lution control district may be relied upon to make following determinations. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
C.	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)?				
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
е.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

IV.	Biological Resources	Potentially <u>New</u> Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V.	Cultural Resources	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				
c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				

VI.	Geology and Soils	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
	3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
	4. Landslides?				
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				

VII	. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				

VII	I. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Potentially <u>New</u> Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
	uld the project:	Impact	meor poracea	Mitigation	Impact
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

IX.	Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
	uld the project:	-	•		
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
C.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?				
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?				
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?				
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

	and	typo	cliont	name1
ICIICK	anu	tvbe	ciient	name

X.	Land Use and Planning	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	ould the project:				
a.	Physically divide an established community?				
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				

		Potentially New Significant	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional	No
XI.	Mineral Resources	Impact	Incorporated	<u>Mitigation</u>	Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				

XII	. Noise	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	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?				
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
C.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

XII	I. Population and Housing	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	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)?				
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

	7. Public Services	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
VVO	uld the project:				
a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
	Fire protection?				
	Police protection?				
	Schools?				
	Parks?				
	Other public facilities?				

XV.	. Recreation	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

XVI	l. Transportation/Traffic	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				

XV	II. Utilities and Service Systems	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess- than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
Wo	uld the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
C.	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?				
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?				
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

XVI	III. Mandatory Findings of Significance	Potentially New Significant Impact	Substantially More Severe Significant ImpactLess than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact with Additional Mitigation	No Impact
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				
C.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

XIX. Earlier Analysis

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

- a. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b. **Impact adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are "potentially significant unless mitigated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05.

Reference: Section 65088.4, Government Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988), 202 Cal. App. 3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 656.