

---

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

---

## 2. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

### PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

The Draft Sutter County General Plan (proposed General Plan or proposed project) focuses on how the anticipated population and employment growth projected for the County can be accommodated to support a broad continuation of the current land use pattern, while affording new opportunities for growth and change. It balances the County's vision to maintain and enhance its high quality rural lifestyle, agricultural heritage, and natural resources, with a commitment to promoting a vibrant and sustainable economy that attracts diverse jobs and services.

The proposed General Plan establishes several land use designations that include residential, commercial, retail, and industrial uses. The plan establishes land use designations to accommodate an additional 23,183 dwelling units, 25,691 jobs, 65,475 residents, and 18,665,061 square feet (2,439 acres) of commercial and industrial uses in the county by the year 2030. More detail is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description, which explains how the County developed these growth projections.

For the purposes of the environmental analysis, the boundaries of the policy area include the existing county boundaries, as shown on Figure 3-1 in Chapter 3, Project Description.

### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

#### Project Effects

As shown in Table 2-1, only one impact (Impact 6.6-1 in Section 6.6, Climate Change) was identified that required mitigation. All the other project impacts could either be reduced to less than significant through compliance with proposed General Plan policies, implementation programs, or existing laws and regulations or would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance (CEQA Guidelines, section 15382). Potential project impacts are fully analyzed in Sections 6.2 through 6.14 of this document and summarized in Table 2-1 (provided at the end of this Chapter).

However, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, some impacts could not be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The significant and unavoidable impacts that were identified for both project-level and cumulative impacts are shown below.

### **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

- 6.3-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.
- 6.3-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with other development in the region could convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.
- 6.4-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality management plan.
- 6.4-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in operational emissions that would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- 6.4-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in construction emissions that would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- 6.4-7 Cumulative growth within the SVAB, in conjunction with the proposed General Plan, would not be consistent with current growth projections and would result in inconsistencies with local air quality management plans.
- 6.4-8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with other development within the SVAB, would increase cumulative operational emissions above FRAQMD-established thresholds.
- 6.4-9 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with other construction activities in the SVAB, would increase cumulative construction-generated emissions above FRAQMD-established thresholds.
- 6.7-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.
- 6.11-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in exterior noise levels.
- 6.11-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increases to exterior noise levels associated with traffic noise, per FTA standards.
- 6.11-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in interior noise levels.

- 6.11-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in substantial vibration impacts from construction activity in the policy area.
- 6.11-7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the noise and vibration levels in the policy area, which, along with noise and vibration sources from other development in the region, could result in an increase in cumulative interior and exterior noise levels.
- 6.14-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a deterioration in LOS on roadway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions.
- 6.14-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could increase traffic volumes on Caltrans facilities that serve the unincorporated county.

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Draft EIR analyzes the following alternatives to the proposed General Plan:

**Alternative 1: No Project/2015 General Plan** – Under this alternative, development for the proposed Sutter County General Plan would not occur. Development would be guided by continued implementation of the existing 2015 General Plan.

**Alternative 2: FPARC Redesignated** - Under this alternative, development would be consistent with the proposed Sutter County 2030 General Plan with the exception of the 1,817 acres currently designed as Food Processing, Agricultural and Recreational Combining District (FPARC) near the community of Sutter. This area would be redesignated to Agricultural 80-acre minimum (AG-80).

**Alternative 3: Reduction in Industrial and Commercial Land** – This alternative would reduce the amount of land designated for Industrial and Commercial (I/C) uses as well as land designated for future Employment Corridor (EC) by 50 percent. The development assumptions for the Sutter Point Specific Plan would not change.

## POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONCERN

Responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) were received from nine public agencies and one member of the public. A copy of the NOP and responses to the NOP are included in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively, of this Draft EIR in accordance with CEQA. The NOP comments are summarized below.

- Desire to see energy conservation measures and smart growth concepts included in the General Plan;
- Concerns associated with future development within the community of Sutter;

- Vehicle and pedestrian safety for at-grade railroad crossings;
- Increased traffic volumes on state highway facilities;
- Potential loss of oak woodlands, riparian habitat, vernal pools and impacts to special-status species;
- Consistency with the Yuba/Sutter NCCP/HCP;
- Development along the boundary with Placer County and the need for agricultural or open space buffers;
- Potential traffic impacts to Placer County roadways;
- Requirements for development within the cities' SOI growth areas;
- Storm drain concerns with Gilsizer slough and Live Oak drainage facilities and potential impacts associated with the new FEMA floodplain maps;
- Water and wastewater infrastructure and connections to existing facilities.

## SUMMARY TABLE

Table 2-1 (Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures), has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 6. The summary table is arranged in four columns:

1. Environmental impacts ("Impact").
2. Level of significance prior to mitigation ("Significance").
3. Mitigation measures ("Mitigation Measure").
4. The level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures ("Residual Significance").

If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant after implementation of proposed policies in the General Plan, mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate and feasible. More than one mitigation measure may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This Draft EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including, but not necessarily limited to, proposed General Plan policies, laws, ordinances, and requirements or recommendations of the County. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area and discussed within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Section 6.1, Introduction to the Analysis.

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.2 Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>			
6.2-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could adversely affect scenic vistas.	LS	None required.	NA
6.2-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development that may create a new source of light or glare, which could cause a public hazard, annoyance, or adversely affect an existing viewshed.	LS	None required.	NA
6.2-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with future development in the surrounding region, could contribute to cumulative adverse affects to views, viewsheds, or create new sources of light or glare.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.3 Agricultural Resources</b>			
6.3-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	S	None available.	SU
6.3-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.	LS	None required.	NA
6.3-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would locate urban land uses adjacent to existing agricultural lands, which could result in land use compatibility conflicts, and potentially result in the ultimate conversion of land to nonagricultural land uses.	LS	None required.	NA
6.3-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with other development in the region could convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	S	None available.	SU

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.4 Air Quality</b>			
6.4-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality management plan.	S	None available.	SU
6.4-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in operational emissions that would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	S	None available.	SU
6.4-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in construction emissions that would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	PS	None available.	SU
6.4-4 Operation of new land uses allowed under the General Plan could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of diesel particulate matter (DPM) or other Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs).	LS	None required.	NA
6.4-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in CO concentrations that exceed state standards.	LS	None required.	NA
6.4-6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would not create objectionable odors.	NI	None required.	NA
6.4-7 Cumulative growth within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, in conjunction with the proposed General Plan, would not be consistent with current growth projections and would result in inconsistencies with local air quality management plans.	S	None available.	SU

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.4-8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with other development within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, would increase cumulative operational emissions above FRAQMD-established thresholds.	S	None available.	SU
6.4-9 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with other construction activities in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, would increase cumulative construction-generated emissions above FRAQMD-established thresholds.	S	None available.	SU
6.4-10 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with regional development, could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of DPM or other TACs.	LS	None required.	NA
6.4-11 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in conjunction with other development in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, could result in CO cumulative concentrations that exceed State standards.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.5 Biological Resources</b>			
6.5-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could adversely impact protected species.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.	LS	None required.	LS
6.5-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact



TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.5-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could interfere with migratory fish or wildlife species, established migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in adverse impacts to wetlands.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could create a potential health hazard that could pose a hazard to plant or wildlife within the policy area.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with other development within the northern Central Valley, could result in a regional loss of special-status plant or wildlife species or their habitat.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-9 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, combined with other development within the northern Central Valley, could contribute to the cumulative loss of sensitive natural communities including wetlands and riparian habitat in the region.	LS	None required.	NA
6.5-10 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with development within the northern Central Valley, could contribute to the cumulative disruption of migratory fish or wildlife species, established wildlife corridors, or use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.6 Climate Change</b>			
<p>6.6-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could generate greenhouse gases that would either directly or indirectly have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	S	<p>6.6-1 The following criteria, or equally effective measures, shall be added to the CAP as interim post 2020 reductions to account for the increased emissions due to growth between 2020 and 2030.</p> <p><b>R2-T8:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes that the Sutter Point Specific Area’s Conceptual Transit Plan is built-out.</p> <p><b>R2-E4:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes an increase in electrical energy efficiency through the strengthening of Title 24 regulations.</p> <p><b>R2-E5:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes an increase in natural gas energy efficiency through the strengthening of Title 24 regulations;R2-E3 and R2-E5: The 2030 analysis assumed that community participation in the retrofit programs would equal 30% by 2030.</p> <p><b>R2-E6 and R2-E7:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes that the commercial and industrial retrofit programs will have a minimum of 35% participation from businesses within Sutter County.</p> <p><b>R2-E9:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes that water efficiency is increased to 30%.</p> <p><b>R2-W1 and R2-W3:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes that an 80% diversion rate for non-construction generated solid waste is achieved.</p> <p><b>R2-W2:</b> The 2030 analysis assumes a 70% diversion rate for construction related solid waste is achieved.</p>	LS
<p>6.6-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan has the potential to conflict with the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions per the Sutter County Climate Action Plan and AB 32.</p>	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant      S = Significant      PS = Potentially Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable      NA = Not Applicable      NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.7 Cultural Resources</b>			
6.7-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	PS	None available.	SU
6.7-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could cause a change in the significance of an archeological resource, or disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could contribute to cumulative losses of cultural resources in Sutter County and the greater Sacramento Valley.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.8 Geology, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources</b>			
6.8-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could expose the public or structures to loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, or landslides.	LS	None required.	NA
6.8-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development that may cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LS	None required.	NA
6.8-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development located on soils that are unstable or expansive, which could potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LS	None required.	NA
6.8-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the loss of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.8-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development that may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>			
6.9-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could expose the public or the environment to potential hazards involving the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development that may emit hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in development that may be located in contaminated areas.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the policy area located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private airport/airstrip.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could interfere with the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could expose the public or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.10 Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Quality</b>			
6.10-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could increase exposure of people and/or property to risk of injury and damage from a 100-year flood.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could increase stormwater peak flow runoff rates that could exacerbate localized flooding.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the amount of developed area that could be subject to flood inundation from dam failure.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-4 Construction of new development under the proposed General Plan would generate additional sources of stormwater runoff that could contain urban contaminants that could affect receiving water quality.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-5 Operation of new developed land uses under the proposed General Plan would generate additional sources of stormwater runoff that could contain urban contaminants that could affect receiving water quality.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-6 Groundwater use to meet future potable demand in the policy area could affect groundwater levels or availability.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses, which could affect groundwater recharge potential.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.10-8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in new land uses that would use on-site wastewater disposal systems, such as septic systems, which have the potential to further degrade groundwater quality.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-9 Cumulative development within the policy area and adjoining counties would increase development in locations subject to 100-year flood hazard.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-10 Cumulative development would increase impervious surfaces that would generate additional stormwater runoff that could cause localized flooding if drainage capacity is insufficient.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-11 Cumulative development would increase the number of people and structures that could be exposed to dam failure inundation hazard.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-12 Cumulative development would increase the potential for pollutants and sediment to be carried in stormwater runoff from construction sites into waterways in the Sacramento, Feather, and Bear rivers and their tributaries, which could affect water quality.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-13 Cumulative development would increase the potential for urban pollutants to be carried in stormwater runoff into waterways in the Sacramento River watershed, which could affect water quality.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.11 Noise</b>			
6.11-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in exterior noise levels.	S	None available.	SU

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.11-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increases to exterior noise levels associated with traffic noise, per FTA standards.	S	None available.	SU
6.11-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in interior noise levels.	S	None available.	SU
6.11-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in short-term noise from construction activities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in substantial vibration impacts from construction activity in the policy area.	S	None available.	SU
6.11-6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in substantial vibration impacts at development sites close to strong operational vibration sources in the policy area.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the noise and vibration levels in the policy area, which, along with noise and vibration sources from other development in the region, could result in an increase in cumulative interior and exterior noise levels.	S	None available.	SU
<b>6.12 Public Services</b>			
6.12-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.12-2 Implementation of the General Plan could result in physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact

TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.12-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would generate additional school students.	LS	None required.	NA
6.12-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities or create a need for construction or expansion of new recreational facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.12-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the generation of solid waste beyond the capacity of existing landfills.	LS	None required.	NA
6.12-6 Buildout of the proposed General Plan, in combination with other development served by the Ostrom Road Sanitary Landfill could impact available landfill capacity.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.13 Public Utilities</b>			
6.13-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase the demand for potable water.	LS	None required.	NA
6.13-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in demand for potable water that could require the construction or expansion of water treatment facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.13-3 Full buildout of the proposed General Plan, in combination with other development within the groundwater subbasins, would result in increased demand for potable water that could require the construction or expansion of water treatment facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.13-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would generate additional wastewater that could require the expansion of existing conveyance and treatment facilities.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact



TABLE 2-1

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.13-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would generate additional wastewater that could be discharged to on-site wastewater treatment systems that, if not properly sited and designed, could conflict with Basin Plan water quality objectives, beneficial uses, or other RWQCB standards by causing or contributing to groundwater quality degradation.	LS	None required.	NA
6.13-6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could create increased demand for electrical and natural gas services.	LS	None required.	NA
6.13-7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, combined with other development within the areas serviced by PG&E could create demand for electrical or natural gas service that is substantial in relation to the existing demands.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.14 Transportation and Circulation</b>			
6.14-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a deterioration of existing LOS on roadway segments in unincorporated Sutter County.	LS	None required.	NA
6.14-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a deterioration in LOS on roadway segments located in adjacent jurisdictions.	S	None available.	SU
6.14-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could increase traffic volumes on Caltrans facilities that serve the unincorporated county.	S	None available.	SU
6.14-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could adversely affect transit facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.14-5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could adversely affect pedestrian or bicycle facilities.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

NA = Not Applicable

NI = No Impact