



PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 886-3000/FAX (530) 886-3080

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study.

I. BACKGROUND

TITLE OF PROJECT: **Atwood 80 (EIAQ-3804)**

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.
- B. "Less than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as 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 IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).
- D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- E. All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA, Section 15063 (a) (1)].
- F. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.
- G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans/community plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

1. LAND USE PLANNING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with general plan/community plan/specific plan designation(s) or zoning, or policies contained within such plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by responsible agencies with jurisdiction over the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Planning Department

The project site is bordered by single-family residential uses on the north, east and the west. The project also proposes to grade approximately 15% of their site. The A/BCP has a land use goal that “encourages all building sites be developed in a manner minimizing disturbance to natural terrain and vegetation and maximizing the preservation of natural beauty and open space.” Additional environmental information needs to be provided in the EIR to fully evaluate consistency with environmental plans or policies. See the biological section for additional discussion.

The project design is attempting to preserve the stream corridor. Additional adjustments may be required to ensure that the stream and riparian zone are protected. In the past, the property has been used for pasture. Project is located in a transition zone in which the lots to the west have a minimum parcel size of 4.6 acres. Some of the lots along the west property line (i.e. 9-15) may need to be enlarged to ensure compatibility with the adjacent properties.

The EIR shall evaluate appropriate mitigation measure to address land use compatibility issues with the adjoining residential uses. Appropriate mitigation measures would include, but not be limited to: adequate land use buffers, lot size compatibility, and lighting.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Planning Department

The proposed project is consistent with the zoning designation of a 40,000 sq ft min lot size requirement. The site is vacant and will not displace existing residences. The existing sewer is proposed to be extended ¼ mile that could result in inducing growth.

3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Department of Public Works

The proposed project will have probable environmental impacts that are considered to be potentially significant due to the proposed grading and alteration of the existing ground surface required for the proposed roadway improvements and future home site construction. Appropriate mitigations, as determined by an appropriate geotechnical investigation (a portion of which has been submitted), should be proposed that will adequately reduce the impacts as a result of these improvements. A specific description of the proposed BMP's both during and after construction of the project's components should be made to determine if proper mitigation for erosion will be incorporated into the project's design.

Planning Department

The project proposes to disturb approximately 15% of the site. The EIR should evaluate whether any of the lots exceed a

Environmental Issues*(See attachments for information sources)*

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

slope of 20% and proposed mitigation measures to minimize disturbance to the existing terrain.

4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Discharge into surface waters or other alterations of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions of withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Impacts to groundwater quality? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Impacts to the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to, Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Department of Public Works

The probable environmental impacts to the surface water quality issues are considered to be potentially significant. The current proposal has the potential to increase the amount of stormwater runoff from pre-development levels and cause downstream drainage impacts if not properly mitigated. The increase in impervious surface has the potential to degrade water quality by introducing oils, greases, and sediments into the stormwater runoff. Additional discussion in the environmental document is required to demonstrate that specific types of BMP's will provide appropriate mitigation for the project's impacts to water quality both during and after construction.

5. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have the potential to increase localized carbon monoxide levels at nearby intersections in exceedance of adopted standards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create objectionable odors? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

This project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is non-attainment for both the state and federal ozone standards and is non-attainment for the state particulate matter standards. The project will result in significant short-term construction impacts and contribute to long-term cumulative air quality impacts.

The short-term construction emissions will result primarily from diesel-powered construction equipment, trucks hauling building supplies and construction employee vehicle trips. Based on the proposed project, daily construction emissions will be above the District’s significance thresholds unless the mitigation measures below are implemented. In addition, the project site is also in an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). The applicant will be required to comply with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, And Surface Mining Operations. An implementation plan to comply with this air toxic control measure should be developed and approved during the environmental review process.

The long-term emissions related to the project would result primarily from vehicle exhaust, fireplaces, landscape maintenance equipment and heating and air conditioning emissions. The proposed project’s long-term operational emissions would be below the District’s significant thresholds. However, the project will contribute to significant cumulative impacts occurring within Placer County.

The District has identified mitigation measures that should be implemented by the project to ensure the project’s short-term construction and long-term operational impacts and contribution to cumulative air quality impacts will remain below the significant level. The applicant can propose other measures that achieve the same emission reductions.

Mitigations:

Construction

1. The applicant shall submit to the District and receive approval of a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking.
2. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations.
3. The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.
4. An enforcement plan shall be established to weekly evaluate project-related on-and-off- road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. An Environmental Coordinator, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
5. The project shall provide a plan for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 30 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.

6. No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements. Vegetative material should be chipped or delivered to waste to energy facilities.
7. Clean earth moving construction equipment with water once per day.
8. Spread soil binders on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas.
9. Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers specifications, to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours).
10. Employ construction activity management techniques, such as: extending the construction period outside the ozone season of May through October; reducing the number of pieces used simultaneously; increasing the distance between emission sources; reducing or changing the hours of construction; and scheduling activity during off-peak hours.
11. Wet broom or wash streets daily if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares.
12. Traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall not exceed 15 miles per hour.
13. Install wheel washers or wash all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
14. Suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties.
15. Use low sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment
16. An operational water truck shall be onsite at all times. Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts offsite.
17. Minimize idling time to 5 minutes.
18. Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
19. Use low emission on-site stationary equipment.
20. Develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities. The plan may include advance public notice of routing, use of public transportation, and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service.
21. Develop trip reduction plan to achieve 1.5 AVR for construction employees.

Operational

22. Use of low VOC coatings per District Rule 218 Architectural Coatings.
23. Open burning shall be prohibited through CC&Rs on all lots.
24. Install low nitrogen oxide (NOx) hot water heaters.
25. Install a natural gas outlet in the rear of each residence.
26. Only U.S. EPA Phase II certified wood-burning devices shall be allowed to install in single-family residences. Masonry fireplaces must have installed UL listed natural gas fire boxes or meet EPA Phase II emission standards. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed 7.5 grams per hour.
27. The project shall implement an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the District, to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. In lieu of each individual project implementing the own offsite mitigation program, the applicant can choose to pay an equivalent amount of money into the District's Air Quality Mitigation Fund. The District provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the projects general vicinities that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The offsite mitigation program has been implemented by a number of projects in Placer County and is considered a feasible mitigation measure for this project to implement. Based on the current project as proposed, the applicant would have to contribute \$21068 into District's Offsite Mitigation Program.

6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. | Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Department of Public Works

The probable environmental impacts are considered to be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated because of the increase in vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian traffic created by the proposed project. Appropriate mitigations should be based on a traffic analysis that evaluates all potential project related traffic impacts to existing traffic near the project as well as any special needs created by the project that may impact off-site County, other municipality or State public roads. Adequacy of the proposed secondary access road should also be evaluated.

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but no limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Locally occurring natural communities (e.g., oak woodlands, mixed conifer, annual grasslands, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Significant ecological resources including: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 1) Wetland areas including vernal pools; | | | | |
| | 2) Stream environment zones; | | | | |
| | 3) Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer), migratory routes and fawning habitat; | | | | |
| | 4) Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including but not limited to Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat; | | | | |
| | 5) Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway; | | | | |
| | 6) Important spawning areas for anadromous fish? | | | | |

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Planning Department

The A/BCP requires that new construction shall be located within 50' from the centerline of an intermittent stream from the edge of riparian areas. The project proposes to incorporate a portion of this stream environment zone.

The EIR needs to access the number of trees that will have any disturbance within the dripline as well as removed to determine the number of trees that will actually be impacted by the project. The potential impacts need to be evaluated and mitigation measures prepared.

The EIR shall determine where there are any endangered, threatened or rare species, or if their habitat exists on-site. A study needs to be prepared which evaluates significant ecological resources as defined in the Placer County General Plan.

The EIR needs to evaluate the potential impacts of encroaching into the 50 setback of the intermittent stream and propose mitigations measures to reduce these impacts. The impacts to the biological section are considered to be potentially significant until additional information is provided.

Open Space lot C may need to be enlarged to ensure that the 50' setback from the edge of riparian vegetation is located within this lot.

8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and state residents? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Planning Department

The project will utilize non-renewable resources and will be constructed to the standards established in the California Uniform Building Code.

9. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

trees?

Environmental Health

The project site needs to be reviewed for geological or physical hazards from past land use activities such as mining.

Planning Department

The project is located near large residential lots containing flammable brush, grass, or trees. Two roads will provide access to the property. A will serve letter shall be required form the Consolidated Fire District.

10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Increases in existing noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people to noise levels in excess of County standards? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Health

Construction noise from this project could increase ambient noise levels.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in need for new or altered government services, in any of the following areas:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fire Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Sheriff Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other governmental services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Department of Public Works

The probable environmental impacts are considered to be potentially significant with the introduction of new structures, occupants and vehicles as a result of the proposed project.

Planning Department

The project will result in the construction of 61 residential lots and will impact the public service providers of the area. However, the impacts to sheriff and fire protection, public facilities, and other governmental services are considered to be less than significant.

The developer shall pay school impact fees as provided for in state law (California Code 65995) to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Communication systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sewer, septic systems, or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Department of Public Works

The probable environmental impacts are considered to be potentially significant with the introduction of new structures, paved surfaces, occupants and vehicles as a result of the proposed project.

Planning Department

The project will impact local facilities and service systems by adding 61 residential lots to the area. The impacts to power/natural gas, communication systems, and solid waste materials recovery/disposal would be less than significant.

The impacts to the local water treatment or distribution facilities, sewer, wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, storm water drainage, and water supplies may be potentially significant. The EIR will need to evaluate these potential impacts and evaluate whether mitigation measures can reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

13. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Create adverse light or glare effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Planning Department

The project could create potentially significant light (glare) impacts. The EIR should evaluate potential mitigation measures to reduce grading impacts associated with home construction.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a. Disturb paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Affect historical resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Planning Department

A records search and cultural Resource study should be prepared for the EIR to fully evaluate the potential impacts

If construction activities uncover artifacts, bone or exotic rock, then a qualified archeologist should be contacted to examine the deposit and determine its nature and significance. State law requires that if bone is discovered which might be human the County Coroner must be contacted. If the coroner determines that the bone is Native American in origin, he will contact the Native American Heritage in Sacramento to identify most likely descendants.

15. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Planning Department

The project will create 61 residential lots and this will impact existing parks and will increase the demand for recreational facilities. The EIR should discuss any recreational impacts resulting from the project.

The developer will be required to pay the County's park dedication fee on a per unit basis.

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

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, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Department of Public Works

The increased grading, erosion, impervious surface, traffic and impact on public services has the potential of creating long-term, cumulative and substantial environmental impacts without mitigation.

Planning Department

The project has the potential to significantly impact the environment. Additional information is needed in the areas of land use, biological resources, schools, utilities, and aesthetics to determine if sufficient mitigation measure are proposed to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines 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. **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- C. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are checked as "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," 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 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans) | <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board | <input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers | <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service | |

VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

- A. I find that the proposed project is categorically exempt (Class ____) from the provisions of CEQA.
- B. I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- C. I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- D. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in an previously adopted Negative Declaration, and that only minor technical changes and/or additions are necessary to ensure its adequacy for the project. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- E. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required (i.e. Project, Program, or Master EIR).
- F. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and at least one effect has not been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets (see Section IV above). An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared to address those effect(s) that remain outstanding (i.e. focused, subsequent, or supplemental EIR).
- G. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously certified EIR, and that some changes and/or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions requiring a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR exist. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-CERTIFIED EIR** will be prepared.
- H. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously-certified Program EIR, and that no new effects will occur nor new mitigation measures are required. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets, including applicable mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project (see Section IV above). **NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT** will be prepared [see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(c)(2)], 15180, 15181, 15182, 15183.
- I. Other

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments Consulted):

Charlene Daniels, Planning Department
Robert Vrooman, Department of Public Works
Roger Davies, Environmental Health Services
David Vintze, Air Pollution Control District

Signature: _____
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

_____ Date

T:\CMD\CMDP\LORI\EIAQ\3804