

Attachment B. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Aesthetics		
<p>Impact 1-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Aesthetics</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 1-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 1-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to aesthetics. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized general practices routinely required to avoid and/or minimize impacts to aesthetic resources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant scenic or aesthetic impacts of the project. • The project proponent would color and finish the surfaces of all project structures and buildings visible to the public to: (1) minimize visual intrusion and contrast by blending with the landscape; (2) minimize glare; and (3) comply with local design policies and ordinances. The project proponent would submit a surface treatment plan to the lead agency for review and approval. • To the extent feasible, the sites selected for use as construction staging and laydown areas would be areas that are already disturbed and/or are in locations of low visual sensitivity. Where feasible, construction staging and laydown areas for equipment, personal vehicles, and material storage would be sited to take advantage of natural screening opportunities provided by existing structures, topography, and/or vegetation. Temporary visual screens would be used where helpful, if existing landscape features did not screen views of the areas. • All construction, operation, and maintenance areas would be kept clean and tidy, including the re-vegetation of disturbed soil and storage of construction materials and equipment would be screened from view and/or are generally not visible to the public, where feasible. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting projects and their associated elements next to important scenic landscape features or in a setting for observation from State scenic highways, national historic sites, national trails, and cultural resources would be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. • The project proponent would contact the lead agency to discuss the documentation required in a lighting mitigation plan, submit to the lead agency a plan describing the measures that demonstrate compliance with lighting requirements, and notify the lead agency that the lighting has been completed and is ready for inspection. 	
Agriculture and Forestry Resources		
<p>Impact 2-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Agriculture and Forestry Resources</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft <u>Final</u> Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 2-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 2-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to agriculture and forestry. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a "project" under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize agriculture and</p>	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>forestry resource impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with local or State land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of the project. Because CARB has no land use authority, mitigation is not within its purview to reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. Any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency and future environmental documents by local and State lead agencies should include analysis of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoidance of lands designated as Important Farmlands (State defined Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland) as defined by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. ▪ Analysis of the feasibility of using farmland that is not designated as Important Farmland prior to deciding on the conversion of Important Farmland. ▪ The feasibility, proximity, and value of the proposed project sites should be balanced before a decision is made to locate a facility on land designated as 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>Important Farmland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any action resulting in the conversion of Important Farmlands should consider mitigation for the loss of such farmland. Any such mitigation should be completed prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit by providing the permitting agency with written evidence of completion of the mitigation. Mitigation may include but is not limited to: ▪ Permanent preservation of off-site Important Farmland (State defined Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland) of equal or better agricultural quality, at a ratio of at least 1:1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preservation may include the purchase of agricultural conservation easement(s); purchase of credits from an established agricultural farmland mitigation bank; contribution of agricultural land or equivalent funding to an organization that provides for the preservation of farmland towards the ultimate purchase of an agricultural conservation easement. ○ Participation in any agricultural land mitigation program, including local government maintained, that provides equal or more effective mitigation than the measures listed. 	
Air Quality		
Impact 3-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects to	TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 3-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 3-1 The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and	Potentially significant and

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Air Quality Potentially significant</p>	<p>regulations that relate to air quality. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a "project" under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize air quality impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant scenic or aesthetic impacts of the project. • Project proponents would apply for, secure, and comply with all appropriate air quality permits for project construction from the local agencies with air quality jurisdiction and from other applicable agencies, if appropriate, prior to construction mobilization. 	<p>unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project proponents would comply with the federal Clean Air Act (The Act) and the California Clean Air Act (e.g., New Source Review and Best Available Control Technology criteria, if applicable). • Project proponents would comply with local plans, policies, ordinances, rules, and regulations regarding air quality-related emissions and associated exposure (e.g., construction-related fugitive PM dust regulations, indirect source review, and payment into offsite mitigation funds). • For projects located in PM nonattainment areas, prepare and comply with a dust abatement plan that addresses emissions of fugitive dust during construction and operation of the project. 	
<p>Impact 3-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Air Quality Beneficial</p>	N/A	N/A
Biological Resources		
<p>Impact 4-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects to Biological Resources Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 4-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 4-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to biological resources. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary</p>	Potentially significant and unavoidable

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize biological resource impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant biological resources impacts of the project. • Actions required to mitigate potentially significant biological impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retain a qualified biologist to prepare a biological inventory of site resources prior to ground disturbance or construction. If protected species or their habitats are present, comply with applicable federal and State endangered species acts and regulations. Construction and operational planning will require that important fish or wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites are not 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>impeded by project activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retain a qualified biologist to prepare a wetland survey of onsite resources. This survey shall be used to establish setbacks and prohibit disturbance of riparian habitats, streams, intermittent and ephemeral drainages, and other wetlands. Wetland delineation is required by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. ▪ Prohibit construction activities during the rainy season with requirements for seasonal weatherization and implementation of erosion prevention practices. ▪ Prohibit construction activities in the vicinity of raptor nests during nesting season or establish protective buffers and provide monitoring, as needed, to address project activities that could cause an active nest to fail. ▪ Prepare site design and development plans that avoid or minimize disturbance of habitat and wildlife resources, and prevent stormwater discharge that could contribute to sedimentation and degradation of local waterways. Depending on disturbance size and location, a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit may be required from the California State Water Resources Control Board. ▪ Prepare spill prevention and emergency response plans, and hazardous waste disposal plans as appropriate to protect against the inadvertent release of potentially toxic materials. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plant replacement trees and establish permanent protection suitable habitat at ratios considered acceptable to comply with “no net loss” requirements. ▪ Contractor will keep the site and materials organized and store them in a way to prevent attracting wildlife by not creating places for wildlife to hide or nest (e.g., capping pipes, covering trashcans and emptying trash receptacles consistently and promptly when full). 	
<p>Impact 4-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Biological Resources Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 4-2 The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to biological resources. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize biological resource impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant biological resources impacts of the project. • Prohibit vegetation management activities in the vicinity of raptor nests during nesting season or establish protective buffers and provide monitoring as needed to ensure that project activity does not cause an active nest to fail. • Maintain site design and development plan features that avoid or minimize disturbance of habitat and wildlife resources, and prevents stormwater discharge that could contribute to sedimentation and degradation of local waterways during project operation. • Maintain and replace, as needed replacement trees and permanently protected suitable habitat identified during the construction phase of the project. 	
Cultural Resources		
<p>Impact 5-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Cultural Resources</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 5-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 5-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to cultural resources. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority.</p>	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a "project" under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize cultural resource impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant cultural resources impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate potentially significant cultural impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retain the services of cultural resources specialists with training and background that conforms to the U.S. Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, as published in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, part 61. ▪ Seek guidance from the State and federal lead 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>agencies, as appropriate, for coordination of Nation-to-Nation consultations with the Native American Tribes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide notice to Native American Tribes of project details to identify potential Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs). In the case that a TCR is identified, prepare mitigation measures that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Avoid and preserve the resources in place, ○ Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, ○ Employ permanent conservation easements, and ○ Protect the resource. ▪ Consult with lead agencies early in the planning process to identify the potential presence of cultural properties. The agencies will provide the project developers with specific instruction on policies for compliance with the various laws and regulations governing cultural resources management, including coordination with regulatory agencies and Native American Tribes. ▪ Define the area of potential effect (APE) for each project, which is the area within which project construction and operation may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties. The APE should include a reasonable construction buffer zone and laydown areas, access roads, and borrow areas, as well as a reasonable assessment of areas subject to effects from visual, 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>auditory, or atmospheric impacts, or impacts from increased access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retain the services of a paleontological resources specialist with training and background that conforms with the minimum qualifications for a vertebrate paleontologist as described in Measures for Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Non-Renewable Paleontological Resources: Standard Procedures (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010). ▪ Conduct initial scoping assessments to determine whether proposed construction activities would disturb formations that may contain important paleontological resources. Whenever possible potential impacts to paleontological resources should be avoided by moving the site of construction or removing or reducing the need for surface disturbance. The scoping assessment should be conducted by the qualified paleontological resources specialist in accordance with applicable agency requirements. ▪ The project proponent’s qualified paleontological resources specialist would determine whether paleontological resources would likely be disturbed in a project area on the basis of the sedimentary context of the area and a records search for past paleontological finds in the area. The assessment may suggest areas of high known potential for containing resources. If the assessment is inconclusive a surface survey is recommended to determine the fossiliferous potential and extent of the pertinent sedimentary units 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>within the project site. If the site contains areas of high potential for significant paleontological resources and avoidance is not possible, prepare a paleontological resources management and mitigation plan that addresses the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a preliminary survey (if not conducted earlier) and surface salvage prior to construction; ▪ physical and administrative protective measures and protocols such as halting work, to be implemented in the event of fossil discoveries; ▪ monitoring and salvage during excavation; ▪ specimen preparation; ▪ identification, cataloging, curation and storage; and ▪ a final report of the findings and their significance. 	
Energy Demand		
<p>Impact 6-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects on Energy Demand Less than significant</p>	N/A	N/A
<p>Impact 6-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects on Energy Demand Beneficial</p>	N/A	N/A

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Geology and Soils		
<p>Impact 7-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Geology, Seismicity, and Soils</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 7-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 7-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to geology and soils. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize impacts to geology, seismicity, and soils include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant geology and soils impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate potentially 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>significant geology and soil impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the issuance of any development permits, proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure would prepare a geotechnical investigation/study, which would include an evaluation of the depth to the water table, liquefaction potential, physical properties of subsurface soils including shrink-swell potential (expansion), soil resistivity, slope stability, mineral resources, and the presence of hazardous materials. ▪ Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure would provide a complete site grading plan, and drainage, erosion, and sediment control plan with applications to applicable lead agencies. Proponents would avoid locating facilities on steep slopes, in alluvial fans and other areas prone to landslides or flash floods, or with gullies or washes, as much as possible. ▪ Disturbed areas outside of the permanent construction footprint would be stabilized or restored using techniques such as soil loosening, topsoil replacement, revegetation, and surface protection (i.e., mulching). 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change		
<p>Impact 8-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</p> <p>Beneficial</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
<p>Impact 9-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft <u>Final</u> Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 9-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 9-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to hazards and hazardous materials. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize impacts to hazards and hazardous materials include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the project. • Actions required to mitigate potentially significant upset and accident-related hazard impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. • Handling of potentially hazardous materials/wastes should be performed under the direction of a licensed professional with the necessary experience and knowledge to oversee the proper identification, characterization, handling and disposal or recycling of the materials generated as a result of the project. As wastes are generated, they would be placed, at the direction of the licensed professional, in designated areas that offer secure, secondary containment and/or protection from stormwater runoff. Other forms of containment may include placing waste on plastic sheeting (and/or covering with same) or in steel bins or other suitable containers pending profiling and disposal or recycling. • The temporary storage and handling of potentially hazardous materials/wastes should be in areas away from sensitive receptors such as schools or residential areas. These areas should be secured with chain-link fencing or similar barrier 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	with controlled access to restrict casual contact from non-project personnel. All project personnel that may come into contact with potentially hazardous materials/wastes will have the appropriate health and safety training commensurate with the anticipated level of exposure.	
<p>Impact 9-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p> <p>Less than significant</p>	N/A	N/A
Hydrology and Water Quality		
<p>Impact 10-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 10-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 10-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations regarding hydrology and water quality. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or mitigate hydrology and water quality-related impacts include the following:</p>	Potentially significant and unavoidable

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. • Under the oversight of the lead agency, prior to issuance of any construction permits, the proponents for the proposed renewable energy project would prepare a stormwater drainage and flood control analysis and management plan. The plans would be prepared by a qualified professional and would summarize existing conditions and the effects of project improvements, and would include all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, changes in downstream flows and flood elevations, proposed on- and off-site improvements, features to protect downstream uses, and property and drainage easements to accommodate downstream flows from the site. Project drainage features would be designed to protect existing downstream flow conditions that would result in new or increased severity of offsite flooding. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish drainage performance criteria for off-site drainage, in consultation with county engineering staff, such that project-related drainage is consistent with applicable facility designs, discharge rates, erosion protection, and routing to drainage channels, which could be accomplished by, but is not limited to: (a) minimizing directly connected impervious areas; (b) maximizing permeability of the site; and, (c) stormwater quality controls such as infiltration, detention/retention, and/or biofilters; and basins, swales, and pipes in the system design. • The project proponent would design and construct new facilities to provide appropriate flood protection such that operations are not adversely affected by flooding and inundation. These designs would be approved by the local or State land use agency. The project proponent would also consult with the appropriate flood control authority on the design of offsite stream crossings such that the minimum elevations are above the predicted surface-water elevation at the agency’s designated design peak flows. Drainage and flood prevention features shall be inspected and maintained on a routine schedule specified in the facility plans, and as specified by the county authority. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, the project proponent shall coordinate with the local groundwater management authority and prepare a detailed hydrogeological analysis of the potential project-related effects on groundwater resources prior to issuance of any permits. The proponent shall mitigate for identified adverse changes to groundwater by incorporating technically achievable and feasible modifications into the project to avoid offsite groundwater level reductions, use alternative technologies or changes to water supply operations, or otherwise compensate or offset the groundwater reductions. 	
<p>Impact 10-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 10-2a: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 10-1</p> <p>Full text of measure previously provided.</p> <p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 10-2b: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 10-2</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that provide protection of hydrology and water quality. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a "project" under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid</p>	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>and/or minimize impacts to hydrology and water quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and avoid areas with unstable slopes and local factors that can cause slope instability (groundwater conditions, precipitation, seismic activity, slope angles, and geologic structure). • Identify soil properties, engineering constraints, and facility design criteria. • Develop a site grading and management plan to identify areas of disturbance, areas of cut and fill, slope during and after grading, existing vegetation, and measures to protect slope, drainages, and existing vegetation in the project area. • Develop an erosion control plan to delineate measures to minimize soil loss and reduce sedimentation to protect water quality. • Design runoff control features to minimize soil erosion. • Construct drainage ditches only where necessary. • Use appropriate structures at culvert outlets to prevent erosion. 	
Land Use Planning		
<p><i>Impact 11-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Impacts on Land Use and Planning</i></p> <p>Less than significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Mineral Resources		
<p>Impact 12-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects to Mineral Resources</p> <p>Less than significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Impact 12-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Mineral Resources</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 12-2</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that provide protection of mineral resources. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified infrastructure that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified infrastructure in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation measures may be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize impacts to mineral resources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of construction activities implemented because of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses associated with the Proposed Amendments would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents will implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts on mineral resources associated with the project. • Actions required to mitigate potentially significant mineral resource impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the issuance of any development permits, proponents of new or modified infrastructure will prepare an investigation/study, which will include an evaluation of the development’s impact on the availability of mineral resources valuable to the region and residents of the State or delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. ▪ Proponents of new or modified infrastructure will provide a complete site plan showing any overlapping areas between the proposed plan and locally important mineral resources delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Proponents will avoid locating infrastructure that would result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources, as much as possible. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Noise		
<p>Impact 13-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Effects</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 13-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes, but is not limited to, applicable laws and regulations that pertain to noise. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that could be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize noise include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant noise and vibration impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate potentially significant noise impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure noise-generating construction activities (including truck deliveries, pile driving, and blasting) are limited to the least noise-sensitive times of day (e.g., weekdays during the daytime hours) for projects near sensitive receptors. ▪ Consider use of noise barriers, such as berms, to limit ambient noise at property lines, especially where sensitive receptors may be present. ▪ Ensure all project equipment has sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. ▪ All construction equipment used would be adequately muffled and maintained. ▪ Consider use of battery-powered forklifts and other facility vehicles. ▪ Ensure all stationary construction equipment (i.e., compressors, generators) is located as far as practicable from nearby sensitive receptors or shielded. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Properly maintain mufflers, brakes and all loose items on construction and operation related vehicles to minimize noise and address operational safety issues. Keep truck operations to the quietest operating speeds. Advise about downshifting and vehicle operations in sensitive communities to keep truck noise to a minimum. ▪ Use noise controls on standard construction equipment; shield impact tools. ▪ Consider use of flashing lights instead of audible back-up alarms on mobile equipment. ▪ Install mufflers on air coolers and exhaust stacks of all diesel and gas-driven engines. ▪ Equip all emergency pressure relief valves and steam blow-down lines with silencers to limit noise levels. ▪ Contain facilities within buildings or other types of effective noise enclosures. ▪ Employ engineering controls, including sound-insulated equipment and control rooms, to reduce the average noise level in normal work areas. 	
<p>Impact 13-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Noise Effects</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 13-2: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 13-1</p> <p>Full text of measure previously provided.</p>	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Population and Housing		
Impact 14-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Population and Housing Less than significant	N/A	N/A
Public Services		
Impact 15-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Public Services Less than significant	N/A	N/A
Recreation		
Impact 16-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Recreation Less than significant	N/A	N/A
Transportation		
Impact 17-1: Short-Term Construction-Related Effects to Transportation Potentially significant	TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 17-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 17-1 The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations regarding transportation. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The	Potentially significant and unavoidable

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize construction traffic impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant transportation impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate potentially significant traffic impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimize the number and length of access, internal, service, and maintenance roads and use existing roads when feasible. 	

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide for safe ingress and egress to/from the proposed project site. Identify road design requirements for any proposed roads, and related road improvements. ▪ If new roads are necessary, prepare a road siting plan and consult standards contained in federal, State, or local requirements. The plans should include design and construction protocols to meet the appropriate roadway standards and be no larger than necessary to accommodate their intended functions (e.g., traffic volume and weight of vehicles). Access roads should be located to avoid or minimize impacts to washes and stream crossings, follow natural contours and minimize side-hill cuts. Roads internal to a project site should be designed to minimize ground disturbance. Excessive grades on roads, road embankments, ditches, and drainages should be avoided, especially in areas with erodible soils. ▪ Prepare a Construction Traffic Control Plan and a Traffic Management Plan. 	
<p>Impact 17-2: Long-Term Operation-Related Effects to Transportation Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 17-2: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 17-1 Full text of measure previously provided.</p>	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems		
<p>Impact 18-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operational Impacts on Utilities and Service Systems</p> <p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>TRU Draft-Final Supplemental EA Mitigation Measure 18-1: Implement State SIP Strategy EA Mitigation Measure 18-1</p> <p>The Regulatory Setting in Attachment A includes applicable laws and regulations that relate to utilities and service systems. CARB does not have the authority to require implementation of mitigation related to new or modified facilities that would be approved by local jurisdictions. The ability to require such measures is under the purview of jurisdictions with local or State land use approval and/or permitting authority. New or modified facilities in California would most likely qualify as a “project” under CEQA. The jurisdiction with primary approval authority over a proposed action is the Lead Agency, which is required to review the proposed action for compliance with CEQA statutes. Project-specific impacts and mitigation would be identified during the environmental review by agencies with project-approval authority. Recognized practices that are routinely required to avoid and/or minimize utility and service-related impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponents of new or modified facilities or infrastructure constructed as a result of reasonably foreseeable compliance responses would coordinate with State or local land use agencies to seek entitlements for development including the completion of all necessary environmental review requirements (e.g., CEQA). The local or State land use agency or governing body must follow all applicable environmental regulations as part of approval of a project for development. • Based on the results of the environmental review, proponents would implement all feasible mitigation to reduce or substantially lessen the potentially significant scenic or aesthetic impacts of the project. Actions required to mitigate 	<p>Potentially significant and unavoidable</p>

Resource Area Impact Significance before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
	<p>potentially significant utility or service-related impacts may include the following; however, any mitigation specifically required for a new or modified facility would be determined by the lead agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comply with local plans and policies regarding the provision of water supply, wastewater treatment, and storm water drainage utilities, and solid waste services. ▪ Where an on-site wastewater system is proposed, submit a permit application to the appropriate local jurisdiction. ▪ Where appropriate, prepare a Water Supply Assessment consistent with the requirements of Section 21151.9 of the PRC/ Section 10910 et seq. of the Water Code. The water supply assessment would be approved by the local water agency/purveyor prior to construction of the project. ▪ Comply with local plans and policies regarding the provision of wastewater treatment services. 	
Wildfire		
<p><i>Impact 19-1: Short-Term Construction-Related and Long-Term Operation-Related Effects on Wildfire</i></p> <p>Less than significant</p>		