



## 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:** Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant

EIAQ #3750

**Environmental Setting:** Project site was previously used as a fruit tree orchard and is still densely populated with fruit trees. There are also pine, locust and several varieties of oak trees, as well as coyote bush and other dense shrubs and grasses. The parcel slopes upward between Ophir Road and Interstate 80.

**Project Description:** The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a concrete batch plant on an approximately five-acre parcel. The project would include a 1,200 square-foot office building, a 2,400 square-foot shop building, a batch plant, and parking and wash areas for the concrete trucks.

#### **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

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

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.

**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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by responsible agencies with jurisdiction over the project?                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity?   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Planning Department**

**Item 1a - Discussion:** The project is in direct conflict with policy 1.E.1.of the Placer County General Plan, which states that Industrial projects shall not be approved without adequate infrastructure. This project proposes to utilize an onsite well and septic system, which is not considered "adequate infrastructure" for a commercial project by the Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services.

Applicant shall obtain approval for an on-site septic system from the Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services.

**Item 1c - Discussion:** While the subject parcel is zoned for commercial and industrial uses, there are residential uses in the surrounding area that may be affected by traffic, noise, and aesthetic impacts, as well as impacts to groundwater quantity and water quality, as a result of the construction and operation of the project. The project requires numerous concrete truck trips per day, and the operation of the batch plant would very likely result in noise from machinery grinding rocks, conveyer belts and concrete trucks on high idle. Additionally, the project proposes to use an on-site well in it's concrete processing operation, which could have a potentially significant impact upon the quantity of groundwater in the area, which, if the water table were significantly lowered, could have a significant impact on wells in the area that serve existing residences. Finally, the project proposes to use potentially hazardous materials in its operations which, if not treated properly, could create a significant impact to the water quality of the surrounding residential land uses.

**Environmental Issues***(See attachments for information sources)*

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

The focused EIR should address noise, traffic, aesthetic, and groundwater quantity/water quality impacts to surrounding land uses that may result from the construction and operation of this project.

**Environmental Health**

**Item 1a - Discussion:** The County General Plan (Industrial Land Use, Goal 1.E, Policy 1.E1.) requires “adequate infrastructure” for industrial development. This project area lacks public water and sewer services. The EIR should discuss the following:

When will public sewer and water utilities be available?

Have there been any efforts to solicit a joint effort with other adjacent and proposed uses?

If this project is approved on individual systems is there a commitment on the part of the applicant to join in any future efforts to bring sewer to the area and would they in fact connect if an opportunity presents itself?

It is our understanding that treated water may be available as early as 2006. Will the applicant commit to connecting when available?

**2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:**

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

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?                             | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and   | <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
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

**Department of Public Works**

**Items 3b & 3c – Discussion:** The proposed project will disturb approximately 4.9 acres (2.5 acres for batch plant and shop/offices) and result in significant increases in the amount of impervious surface present on the site. To construct the improvements proposed, significant disruption of soils will occur, including grading, compaction for parking/circulation areas and construction of a large retaining wall. A significant amount of cut material has been identified on the preliminary grading plan. These impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the following mitigation measures.

**Items 3b & 3c - Mitigations:**

**MM 3.1 -** The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the DPW for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the DPW prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

**MM 3.2 - Staging Areas:** Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

**MM 3.3** All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and DPW concurs with said recommendation.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the DPW.

Submit to the DPW a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/DPW for a determination

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

of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/DPW to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

MM 3.4 - Storm drainage from on-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and routed through specially designed catchbasins, vaults, filters, or other approved system(s) for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases as approved by DPW. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catchbasin cleaning program shall be provided to DPW upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for Conditional Use Permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.  
**(CR/MM) (DPW)**

Item 3e – Discussion: The proposed project could potentially disturb 4.9 acres and result in significant increases in the amount of impervious surface present on the site. To construct the improvements proposed, significant disruption of the soils on-site will occur, creating a potential for contamination of storm runoff with disturbed sediment or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. This disturbance will likewise create increased risk of erosion on-site during construction. Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could also contribute to these impacts in the long-term. Discharge from the site enters a nearby tributary to Auburn Ravine. These impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the following mitigation measures.

Item 3e - Mitigation: MM 3.1, MM 3.2, MM 3.3, MM 3.4, MM 3.5 -Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the DPW for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall address storm drainage during construction and thereafter and shall propose "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, etc. Said BMP measures for this project shall include: Minimizing drainage concentration from impervious surfaces, construction management techniques, erosion protection at culvert outfall locations and sand/oil separators (or other suitable proprietary treatment units, as approved by the DPW).

MM 3.6 - All on-site parking and circulation areas shall be improved with a minimum asphaltic concrete or portland cement concrete capable of supporting anticipated vehicle loadings.

<b>4. WATER.</b> Would the proposal result in:	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water	<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
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

movements?

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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**

Items 4a, b, c & d – Discussion: This project will disturb approximately 4.9 acres of undeveloped, but previously disturbed property in the Newcastle area. This project will create impervious surfaces including parking and circulation areas as well as the concrete batch plant with associated offices. The applicant has proposed the use of various treatment techniques to mitigate impacts to water quality and has demonstrated that water quantity increases can be mitigated by standard design methods. Based on these proposals, the impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level by the implementation of the following mitigation measures.

Items 4a, b, c, d - Mitigation: MM 3.1, MM 3.3, MM 3.4, MM 3.5, MM 4.1 - Drainage facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of DPW. These facilities shall be constructed with project improvements and easements provided as required by DPW. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the property owner(s).

**Environmental Health**

Item 4.c - Discussion: Concrete process water, wastewater, truck wash water handling and the use of hazardous materials onsite pose threats to surface water quality.

Item 4.f - Discussion: The project proposes to utilize an on-site well for domestic, irrigation, and process water. The proposed use of an on-site well could have an adverse impact on the available quantity of groundwater. How will the project address the potential for over-drafting groundwater in the area? Adjacent commercial and residential properties rely on groundwater as their only source of water. Scope of work for the EIR should address means for quantifying groundwater impacts on adjacent properties and developing strategies for mitigating for the potential loss of water to these properties.

Item 4.h - Discussion: The potential to degrade groundwater quality could be high. Soils testing by this office on various portions of the property have identified that seasonal ground water levels can be as shallow as 11” to 30” (October 20, 1999). Seepage and spring activity have been observed. Communication should be submitted from the Regional Water Quality Control Board about what type of waste discharge requirements will be required. This is especially important due to the fact that the Board has identified problems with Hexavalent Chromium, a metal of concern, from the recycle ponds

<b>Environmental Issues</b> (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

of similar concrete plants. All of the potential for the degradation of groundwater and mitigations should be discussed in the scope of work for the EIR.

**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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Air Pollution Control District**

**Items 5a-d - Discussion:** This project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standard and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. The project will result in short-term construction related air quality impacts from diesel powered construction equipment, trucks hauling building supplies and construction worker vehicle trips. Long term emissions will result in both stationary and sources. Stationary source emissions will be controlled by conditions applied to the project through District permitting requirements. Long-term emissions from the project would result primarily from employee vehicle exhaust, landscape maintenance equipment and heating and air conditioning emissions. The project’s daily short and long-term air pollutant emissions are expected to be below the District’s significance thresholds and therefore the project alone will not result in significant air quality impacts. The project will however, contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts within Placer County. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, or others proposed by the applicant that achieve the same emission reductions, will ensure that this project’s contribution to short term and cumulative air quality impacts remain below the significant level. These mitigation measures have been implemented by other projects throughout Placer County.

**Items 5a - Mitigation:**

1. The applicant shall submit to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (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. 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 20% Nox reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent California ARB fleet average at the time of construction; and the project representative shall submit a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horse power, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be

**Environmental Issues**

*(See attachments for information sources)*

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

required for any 30-day period in which no construction operations occur. 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 day, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, particulate matter traps, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as become available.

5. The project owner(s) shall include language in construction contracts that require the equipment operators to shut down heavy duty diesel equipment on declared Spare The Air days. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District shall receive copies of construction contracts prior to issuance of building permits.
6. The applicant has agreed to perform grading work outside the ozone seasons of May through October, as possible. 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.
7. Diesel equipment idling time shall not exceed 10 minutes.
8. Use low sulfur California diesel fuel for stationary construction equipment.
9. Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than diesel power generators.
10. Use electric or low emission natural gas on-site stationary equipment.
11. No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements. Vegetative material should be chipped or delivered to waste to energy facilities.
12. The applicant shall implement sufficient dust control measures so as not to violate California Health and Safety Code section 41700 emission limits, and visible emission standards of 20% opacity.
13. All diesel fuel used in the on and off-road construction equipment shall at a minimum use California diesel fuel. The applicant will use a lower sulfur diesel fuel if economically available.
14. The applicant will use “alternative diesel fuels”, such as PuriNOx fuel developed by The Lubrizol Corporation, if found to be economically and readily available.
15. The applicant will consider installing “particulate traps” on all off road diesel equipment is found to be economically and readily available.
16. The applicant shall obtain an Authority to Construct / Permit to Operate from the District for all stationary source equipment, including the concrete operation and the use of any engines and/or generators.

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

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Items 6a – Discussion:** The proposed project will create additional vehicle trips that will increase traffic volumes both

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

locally and regionally thus creating an impact as a result of the cumulative effect of this project and others both existing and proposed. This cumulative impact will require that the project mitigate for these impacts.

EIR required to provide discussion on the projects impacts to the transportation system and to propose mitigations to reduce these impacts.

Items 6b & 6e - Discussion: The project proposes to gain access to Ophir Road, a county maintained highway, creating an impact resulting in additional hazards to safety for other vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians. The following mitigation measures will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Items 6b & 6e - Mitigations:

MM 6.1 - Submit, for review and approval, a striping and signing plan with the project Improvement Plans. The plan shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices and shall be reviewed by the County Traffic Engineer. A construction signing plan shall also be provided with the Improvement Plans for review and approval by the County Traffic Engineer.

MM 6.2 - Construct one-half of a 40' road section where the project fronts Ophir Road, as measured from the existing centerline thereof or as directed by DPW. Additional widening and/or reconstruction may be required to improve existing structural deficiencies, accommodate auxiliary lanes, intersection geometrics, signalization, bikelanes, or for conformance to existing improvements. The roadway structural section shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 8.0, but said section shall not be less than 3" AC/8" Class 2 AB unless otherwise approved by DPW.

MM 6.3 - Construct a public road entrance onto Ophir Road to a Plate 27, LDM standard. The design speed of the roadway shall be 55 mph, unless an alternate design speed is approved by the DPW. The improvements shall begin at the outside edge of any future lane(s) as directed by the DPW. An Encroachment Permit shall be obtained by the applicant or authorized agent from DPW.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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**

Item 1a - Discussion: The proposed project will result in the development of five acres of currently undeveloped land. The Biological Assessment prepared for this project indicated that the subject parcel could provide suitable habitat for special-status species including two plants, Butte County fritillary and Brandegee's clarkia, and four birds, the white-tailed kite, Cooper's hawk, loggerhead shrike, and lark sparrow, however no special status species were identified on-site or in the immediate vicinity. The Biological Assessment prepared for this project also determined that the parcel provides habitat for 12 wildlife species and 34 plant species, however none of the plant or animal species identified on-site are considered endangered, threatened or rare, therefore this project is considered to have a less than significant impact on endangered, threatened, and rare species.

Item 1 b - Discussion: Grading for the proposed project will result in the removal of ten trees (161" diameter total) that are protected by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact.

Item 1b - Mitigation: The applicant shall replace trees on-site at a ratio of 2:1, or shall pay into the Tree Preservation Fund \$100.00 for each diameter inch removed (\$16,100.00).

**8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:**

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Environmental Health**

Item 9a - Discussion: The applicant has submitted a list of over 25 chemicals that are typically used in the concrete batch plant operations; some of these will be stored in large amounts. Hazardous waste generation related to vehicle

<b>Environmental Issues</b> (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

maintenance will also occur. The potential for a chemical spill could be significant. The scope of work for the EIR should address the use and storage of these chemicals and mitigations proposed to prevent groundwater contamination (e.g. a restriction on locating a sink in the shop building so as not to introduce work process chemicals to the on-site sewage disposal system, developing a spill prevention control and countermeasure plan if applicable, using secondary containment, etc). Hazardous materials storage areas (for instance large fuel tanks, and maintenance bays) should be noted as necessary on the project plan.

**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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Environmental Health**

Items 10 a & 10b - Discussion: Site operations have the potential to increase ambient noise levels. The applicant has previously submitted an acoustical analysis that indicates that the ambient transportation noise from Interstate 80 exceeds the expected transportation noise from project vehicle traffic. However, the most recent project design has multiple tall walls along the east property boundary that require a revised acoustical analysis due to the potential for reflected noise. Also, the one stationary noise source identified in the analysis (truck loading station) has a proposed mitigation of a sound wall (which needs to be included on the project plan). However, all project stationary sources (truck wash-out bays, wastewater process pumps, and the like) should be included in a revised analysis. Vegetation is not an acceptable mitigation for noise. All of this information should be integrated into the scope of work for the EIR.

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

**Planning Department**

Item 11 a - Discussion: The proposed project includes the construction of a concrete batch plant, which will include a 1,200 square-foot office building and a 2,400 square-foot shop building, in an industrial area. Although the type of use proposed does not specifically create an increase in fire hazard, the project could have an effect upon local fire protection agencies should fire protection services be required. This is considered a less than significant impact.

Item 11 b - Discussion: The proposed project includes the construction of a concrete batch plant, which will include a 1,200 square-foot office building and a 2,400 square-foot shop building, in an industrial area. Although the type of use proposed does not specifically create an environment generally associated with unlawful activities that would require the

<b>Environmental Issues</b> (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

services of the sheriff's department, the project could have an effect upon local sheriff protection services should such services be required. This is considered a less than 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Communication systems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Environmental Health**

Item 12d - Discussion: Site soil conditions have been assessed and only a limited area qualifies for on-site sewage systems. Limited soil depth and area indicate that only a small sand filter system is feasible. This type of alternative system is only allowed for residential uses. However, this commercial project now proposes a non-binding residential component (a care-taker residence) so that the wastewater is more diluted and less concentrated. Professional monitoring and maintenance would be needed to ensure system longevity. The scope of work for the EIR should address septic system area grading, adjacent restrictive features (such as any cuts, fills, drains, or retaining walls), methods of precluding any industrial wastewater (shop or process water) discharge into the septic system, and septic system monitoring and maintenance.

**13. AESTHETICS.** Would the proposal:

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

**Planning Department**

Item 13 a - Discussion: The project will result in a significant impact to a scenic vista and a scenic highway as the proposed 57-foot tall batch plant tower will be located approximately 220' from the northern edge of the right-of-way for Interstate 80 and will be in the direct line of sight of the Sutter Buttes to the northwest, which are visible from Interstate 80. The project also includes a 15,000 gallon water tank to be located on-site that may be visible from westbound Interstate 80. The 57-foot tall concrete batch plant and the 15,000 gallon water tank have the potential to create a significant aesthetic impact to Interstate 80.

**Environmental Issues**

*(See attachments for information sources)*

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

Item 13 b - Discussion: The proposed project requires the conversion of the 4.9-acre parcel from undeveloped land comprised of trees, shrubs and grasses to a concrete batch plant which will include a 1,200 square-foot office a 2,400 square-foot shop building, a 57-foot tall batch plant tower, a 15,000 gallon water tank, a tiered retaining wall reaching a total height of approximately 20', concrete trucks and various large equipment associated with the proposed operation. This project could have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on the surrounding area as it will be visible from several residences in the area as well as from Ophir Road, which is a highly traveled corridor between Ophir and Auburn. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

Item 13 c - Discussion: The proposed concrete batch plant will include the installation of "yard lights" that could create adverse impact to the surrounding land uses resulting from light or glare.

The focused EIR shall discuss/address potential aesthetic impacts resulting from the construction and operation of this project. Mitigation measures established in the EIR shall be reflected in the conditions of approval for the subsequent Conditional Use Permit and Design/Site Agreement.

**14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:**

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

**Planning Department**

Item 14a - Discussion: The proposed project requires grading and excavation that may result in the discovery of paleontological resources.

Item 14b - Discussion: The proposed project requires grading and excavation that may result in the discovery of archaeological resources.

Item 14a & 14b - Mitigation: If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a SOPA-certified (Society of Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. **(SR/CR/MM) (PD)**

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

Item 14 c - Discussion: The proposed project will be accessed off of Ophir Road, which is an historic highway. Because the majority of the traffic that will access the site will be concrete trucks there a potential for this project to affect a historical resource, however the Placer County Department of Museums has determined that the proposed project will not create a negative impact on the historic highway as the highway was constructed to withstand the weight of concrete trucks during the construction of the highway. This is considered a less than significant impact.

<b>15. RECREATION. Would the proposal:</b>				
a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Department of Public Works**

Items III-A & C – Discussion: As previously indicated, several areas analyzed indicate that the impacts as a result of the construction of the proposed project can be considered significant unless mitigations are incorporated to reduce these impacts to less than significant.

Items III A & C - Mitigations: Refer to above mitigations: MM 3.1, MM 3.2, MM 3.3, MM 3.4, MM 3.5, MM 3.6, MM 4.1, MM 6.1, MM 6.2 & MM 6.3

Item III-B - Discussion: The proposed project will create additional vehicle trips that will increase traffic volumes both locally and regionally thus creating an impact as a result of the cumulative effect of this project and others both existing and proposed. This cumulative impact will require that the project mitigate for these impacts.

EIR required to provide discussion on the projects impacts to the transportation system and to propose mitigations to reduce these impacts.

#### 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 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 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):**

Leah Rosasco, Planning Department  
 Robert Vrooman, Department of Public Works  
 Dana Wyingner, Environmental Health Services  
 Ann Hobbs, Air Pollution Control District

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

See Attached Memo from the Department of Public Works dated 10/14/04

T:\CMD\CMDP\LORI\EIAQ\3750