



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

**NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: Sacramento Independent Animal Rescuers (SIAR) Minor Land Division (PMLD 20130167)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes the approval of a Parcel Map to subdivide a 20.3-acre Farm zoned property into two parcels, 10 acres for Parcel 1 and 10.3 acres for Parcel 2.

PROJECT LOCATION: 3830 Garden Bar Road and 4100 Mt. Pleasant Road, Lincoln, Placer County

APPLICANT: Sacramento Independent Animal Rescuers, c/o Carrie Moore, 4100 Mt Pleasant Road, Lincoln, CA 95648

The comment period for this document closes on **August 1, 2014**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx> Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Lincoln Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

Published in Sacramento Bee, Thursday, July 3, 2014



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Sacramento Independent Animal Rescuers (SIAR) Minor Land Division	Plus# PMLD 20130167
Description: The project proposes the approval of a Parcel Map to subdivide a 20.3-acre Farm zoned property into two parcels, 10 acres for Parcel 1 and 10.3 acres for Parcel 2.	
Location: 3830 Garden Bar Road and 4100 Mt. Pleasant Road, Lincoln, Placer County	
Project Owner/Applicant: Sacramento Independent Animal Rescuers, c/o Carrie Moore, 4100 Mt Pleasant Road, Lincoln, CA 95648	
County Contact Person: Roy Schaefer	530-745-3061

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **August 1, 2014**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx>, Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Lincoln Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96146.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3080 • www.placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

Project Title: Sacramento Independent Animal Rescuers (SIAR) Minor Land Division	Plus# PMLD 20130167
Entitlement: Parcel Map	
Site Area: 20.3 acres	APN: 026-141-037-000
Location: The property is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Mount Pleasant Road and Garden Bar Road. The property address is 3830 Garden Bar Road and also 4100 Mt. Pleasant Road, Lincoln.	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Parcel Map to subdivide a 20.3-acre Farm zoned property into two parcels (Parcel 1 is 10 acres and Parcel 2 is 10.3 acres). The property is currently developed with two single-family residences and residential accessory land uses that would remain as constructed. The proposed new parcel would be required to install a septic system, a well, and an access driveway.

This Minor Land Division project would require the construction of a Plate R-17 connection for Parcel 1 onto Garden Bar Road, to improve offsite roadway to the current county standard, to dedicate right-of-way along Garden Bar Road and Mt. Pleasant Road, and associated private driveway improvements for Parcel 1. Each lot will be a minimum of 10 acres in area.

The project does not propose any tree removal or grading, with the exception of the construction of the new driveway and off-site road improvements to Garden Bar Road.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The project site is characterized by two existing homes with residential accessory structures, two septic systems, a well, and two driveways (Mt. Pleasant Road & Garden Bar Road), typical of rural residential land uses. The project site is zoned F-B-X-10 Acre Minimum (Farm District, combining a minimum building site of 10 acres) and is designated Agriculture/Timberland – 10 acre minimum parcel size in the Placer County General Plan. The project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Mt. Pleasant Road and Garden Bar Road in the Lincoln area. The area immediately surrounding the project site and vicinity is characterized by residential agricultural properties.

Access to the property is from Garden Bar Road along the western project boundary and from Mt. Pleasant Road along the northern boundary. The rectangular-shaped parcel is bounded to the east, south, north, and west by developed parcels with the same zone district. The two existing single family residences with residential accessory structures are located on the northern half of the site. The site has several large Blue Oak trees within the northern half and slopes down toward the south end of the property. There is a new, proposed drainage easement within the middle portion of the site that would be located at the south end of Parcel 2. No grading is proposed, except for the new access driveway for Parcel 1.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	Farm District, combining a minimum Building Site of 10 acres (F-B-X-10 AC. MIN.)	Placer County General Plan / Agriculture/Timberland – 10 AC. MIN.	Two Single-Family Residences, two septic systems, a well, and two driveways
North	Same as Project Site	Same as Project Site	Single-Family Residence and Accessory Structures
South	Same as Project Site	Same as Project Site	Single-Family Residence and Accessory Structures
East	Same as Project Site	Same as Project Site	Single-Family Residence and Accessory Structures
West	Same as Project Site	Same as Project Site	Single-Family Residence and Accessory Structures

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" 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 earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be 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 Guidelines, 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 [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **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.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," 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.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. 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.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item I-1:

The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista as it is not located on or near a scenic vista.

Discussion- Item I-2:

The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway as it is not located on or near a scenic highway.

Discussion- Items I-3,4:

The project site is developed with two single-family residences and residential accessory land uses within the northern portion of the property. Subsequent to the recordation of the Final Map, two parcels will be developed with residential land uses permitted by the Zoning District. The potential construction of one new residence on Parcel 1 would be consistent with the character of surrounding properties and would result in a less than significant impact to the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. The potential construction of such residential improvements would also result in an incremental increase in the amount of nighttime light or glare in the project vicinity associated with residential lighting applications. However impacts from new sources of light or glare would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X

5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN)				X
---	--	--	--	----------

Discussion- All Items:

This project is within a rural area of Lincoln that is surrounded by low density residential developments and small mixed farm land uses. The project site has been historically used for agricultural (pasture and grazing) purposes and is not designated as Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Farmland as shown on maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The property is not under a Williamson Act contract.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:

The project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County. The project proposes a minor land division to create two parcels consistent with the land use designation. No construction is anticipated with the Minor Land Division. However, the project anticipates the future construction of a new residential unit on the southern parcel. The increase in density resulting from one additional parcel would not contribute a significant impact to Region, as the related emissions would be below the significant level. The project will not result in a significant obstruction to the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item III-2,3:

The SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO_x), nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM_{2.5}) and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).

Minimal future construction is proposed with the project (primarily the grading of the entrance driveway), as well as future anticipated grading resulting from the construction of one residential unit. These minor improvements will not result in the exceedance of any air quality thresholds, and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Operational related emissions would result from future construction of one additional dwelling unit. However, the levels of emissions would be below the significant level and will not violate air quality standards or substantially contribute to existing air quality violations. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item III-4,5:

The project includes future minor grading operations and at the time of construction, would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and diesel PM emissions and odor from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Because of the dispersive properties of diesel PM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use, short-term construction-generated odor and TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)			X	
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN)			X	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN)			X	
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items IV-1,2:

A Biological Resources Assessment was conducted by Biologist Michael Clary and was dated August 13, 2013. A review of resources and a field evaluation of the property (August 12, 2013) has resulted in identifying the presence of California native oaks such as Blue Oak and oak savanna communities. However, there was no evidence of wetlands or special status species. The drip lines for all trees have been identified and shown on the tentative Parcel Map. The proposed development of the property will not impact any of the existing native oak trees. The location of the proposed driveway for Parcel 1 would result in the removal of two trees. According to the

assessment, the project will not result in any adverse impacts to any sensitive or special status species as none are known or expected to occur on the project site. The project will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species because none are known or expected to occur on the project site.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

The project site to be developed contains several large blue oaks that are protected under the Placer County Tree Ordinance (See Discussion item IV-7). These trees do not constitute “oak woodlands” as they do not account for at least ten percent of the canopy onsite or do they signify any significant stand of oak trees. As such, the proposed project will not result in the conversion of oak woodlands.

Discussion- Item IV-4:

Project development would not occur within any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community on-site and any development would be required to incorporate the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and meet setback requirements as required by County Code.

Discussion- Item IV-5:

According to the Biological Resources Assessment there are no aquatic habitats onsite and no wetland presence was found.

Discussion- Item IV-6:

The project will not interfere with the movement of any known native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-7:

No protected oak trees are proposed to be removed with the proposed Minor Land Division improvements.

Discussion- Item IV-8:

The project site is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item V-1:

A Cultural Records Search by Sharon A. Waechter (MA/RPA) was conducted and the report is dated November 21, 2013. The review of available surveys and studies conducted in proximity to the proposed project has resulted in

identifying no cultural resources in the immediate area. No recorded sites of eligibility were identified through review of the California Office of Historic Preservation for the subject property. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items V-2,3,6:

The project site is not included in any known local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in the General Plan Background Report, Figure 8-4 “Concentrations of Historical Sites and Buildings”. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known unique archeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy any known unique paleontological resource, or site, or disturb any known human remains, including those that are located outside of a formal cemetery.

Although impacts are not anticipated to occur given the above project findings which are based on factual research and reports prepared by the North Central Information Center and the Native American Heritage Commission, construction of improvements required to vest the project could result in accidental discovery of previously unknown resources. Therefore, the following standardized condition of approval will be placed on the project in accordance with General Plan policy in the event of accidental discovery of archaeological or paleontological resources, or human remains:

“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 an archaeologist shall be 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 will 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.”

No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item V-4:

The project does not have the potential to cause a physical change that will affect any known unique ethnic cultural values.

Discussion- Item V-5:

No record exists of any known existing religious or sacred uses on the project site.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)			X	
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)			X	
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)			X	
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or			X	

lake? (ESD)				
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)			X	
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	

Discussion- Items VI-1,4,9:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on two different soils classified as: Caperton-Andregg coarse sandy loams (2 to 15 percent slopes), and Xerorthents (placer areas). The identified soil constraints for roads and dwellings are the moderate slope of the soil and severe depth to soft bedrock. The Soil Survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features for the existing soil types. No known unique geologic or physical features exist on the site that will be destroyed or modified. Construction of one additional house and associated improvements will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure. The project will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code to address building related soil issues and will obtain a Grading Permit as necessary to address grading issues. Therefore, these impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-2,3,5,6:

The project proposal will result in the construction of one new single family residence with associated infrastructure including a driveway. To construct the improvements proposed, disruption of soils on-site will occur, including excavation/compaction for driveway and building site improvements and various utilities. The area of disturbance for these improvements as shown on the preliminary grading plan is relatively small (approximately 6,000 square feet [0.15 acres]) and the associated earthwork is approximately 200 cubic yards. The proposed project improvements will generally be at the same grade as the existing topography. Also, any erosion potential will only occur during the short time of the construction of the improvements. The project will be constructed in compliance with the Placer County Grading Ordinance and will obtain a Grading Permit as necessary to address grading issues. Therefore, the impacts to soil disruptions, topography, and erosion are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The project is located within Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the project site as a low severity earthquake zone. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The future residential unit will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the additional residents, on-site fuel combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, and fireplaces/stoves; and off site emissions at utility providers associated with the project's electricity and water demands.

The project is anticipated to eventually result in minor grading for the addition of one dwelling unit. Construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (PLN, Air Quality)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Items VIII-1,2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

There are no known existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the site. The Carlin C. Coppin Elementary School is located approximately four miles southwest of the project location in the Lincoln area. However, the project does not propose a use that typically would involve any activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Discussion- Item VIII-5:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has been adopted, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. As such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Discussion- Item VIII-6:

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and as such, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

Based on the project analysis, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because there are no wildlands adjacent to residential parcels in the immediate developed area.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

The project create any health hazard or potential health hazard nor will it expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)			X	

7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)			X	
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)			X	
12. Impact 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? (EHS, ESD)			X	

Discussion- Item IX-1:

Each of the proposed parcel will utilize domestic water wells for drinking water. A well was constructed under permit with Environmental Health Services on Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 contains an existing well. Each well was tested for primary and secondary drinking water standards and total and fecal coliform. Test results were below the maximum contaminate level for all constituents tested.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

This minor land division will result in the creation of one additional parcel for residential development. Both parcels will meet the minimum parcel size of 10 acres. It anticipated that the relatively low density would result in limited water usage consistent with residential use, such that the risk of depletion of groundwater supplies would be expected to be less than significant.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The proposed project will ultimately include the construction of a new single family residential home and driveway improvements. The home and driveway improvements will be located at or near their existing grade. The overall drainage patterns from the proposed ultimate construction will not be changed. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The proposed project will ultimately include the construction of a new single family residential home and driveway improvements. These improvements will add only a small amount of impervious surfaces (approximately 0.15 acres) as compared to the entire project area, over 20 acres. No downstream drainage facility or property owner will be significantly impacted. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The area of disturbance for the ultimate project improvements is relatively small for the construction of a single family dwelling and driveway (approximately 0.15 acres) as compared to the entire project area, approximately 20 acres. The proposed improvements will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

The project could result in urban stormwater runoff. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used and as such, the potential for this project to violate any water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The ultimate project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows will be redirected after construction of any improvements. The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:

The minor land division will result in the creation of one additional parcel for residential development. This additional residential parcel will result in limited increased water usage consistent with residential use, such that the potential to alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-12:

The ultimate proposed improvements of a new single family dwelling and a driveway will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions of any watershed of important water resources. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item X-1:

The project will not divide an established community because the project and surrounding area has already been developed with residential land uses. This project would add one new residence and residential accessory land uses on Parcel 1. The Minor Land Division and subsequent residential development would be compatible with the Placer County General Plan and consistent with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion- Item X-2:

The project does not conflict with the Placer County General Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect as the property is already zoned residential (F-B-X 10 AC. MIN.) and single-family residences, secondary dwelling units and residential accessory structures are allowable land uses with a building permit.

Discussion- Item X-3:

The project site is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Discussion- Item X-4:

The project will not result in the development of incompatible land uses or create land use conflicts as the project is consistent with the Placer County General Plan, Placer County Zoning Ordinance and is compatible with surrounding land uses.

Discussion- Item X-5:

The project site does not include any commercial agricultural use and does not include timber resources. These allowed land uses will not result in significant impacts to agricultural or timber resources as the parcels allow for hobby farms and small scale agricultural activities.

Discussion- Item X-6:

The project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The project could potentially add two residential units (primary and secondary dwelling) on a newly created parcel within an established residential farm community.

Discussion- Item X-7:

The project will not result in any alteration of the present or planned land use of the project area. The planned land use of the site allows for the proposed parcel size.

Discussion- Item X-8:

The project will not cause economic or social changes that will result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

No valuable, locally important mineral resources have been identified by the Department of Conservation’s “Mineral Land Classification of Placer County” (dated 1995) on the project site. Development of the project would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)				X
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)			X	

4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XII-1,2:

The project will not result in any substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Completion of the project would result in one, new single-family residence with a new driveway and off-site road improvements, which will not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.

Discussion- Item XII-3:

The project may result in a moderate temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project resulting from construction of required project improvements such as one new single-family residence with a driveway and off-site road improvements. This temporary increase due to limited short term construction activities will be less than significant. A condition of approval for the project will be recommended that limits construction hours so that early evening and early mornings, as well as all day Sunday, will be free of construction noise. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XII-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIII-1:

The project will not directly or indirectly result in substantial population growth in the Lincoln area. Following recordation of the Parcel Map, the property owner will possess rights to develop one new lot with a single-family residence and associated residential accessory structures. The potential development of one additional residence would be allowed by the Placer County zoning ordinance. The addition of one single-family residence has already been accounted for in the Placer County General Plan (zoning and land use designation).

Discussion- Item XIII-2:

The project will not displace existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Schools? (ESD, PLN)			X	
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN)			X	
5. Other governmental services? (ESD, PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for fire protection services due to one new single-family residence constructed on Parcel 1. Any newly constructed dwelling unit will be required to comply with California Building Code Chapter 7A which, among other more specific requirements, requires new residences to be constructed with fire resistive exterior materials and prohibits unprotected exterior wall openings. Therefore, the project will not require the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities nor significantly impair service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of fire protection services. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for sheriff protection services. The addition of one new single-family residence would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of sheriff protection services. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items XIV-3,4,5:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for schools, roads, parks, and other governmental services. This increase would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact from the provision of new or expanded facilities or services. Additionally, the provision of these services would be offset by existing fee programs regulated by ordinance (such as the countywide traffic fee program, park fee program, school fees, etc.) that are integrated into the residential Building Permit process. No mitigation measures are required.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)			X	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- All Items:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the use of and need for neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. This increase would not result in a substantial physical deterioration of these facilities. This would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of recreational facilities because provision of these services would be offset by collection of Park Preservation Fund fees regulated by county ordinance (Sections 15.34.010, 16.08.100 and/or 17.54.100.D). No mitigation measures are required.

This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)		X		
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XVI-1,2:

This project proposal will ultimately result in the creation of one additional residential single family parcel. The proposed project will generate approximately 1 additional PM peak hour trips and approximately 10 average daily trips. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area’s transportation system. With the project traffic added to the existing traffic volumes, all area roadway segments and intersections will continue to operate within acceptable LOS standards. For potential cumulative traffic impacts, the Placer County General Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program, which with payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, will help reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project’s impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items XVI-1,2:

MM XVI.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Placer Central), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

- A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code
- B) South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPARTA)

The current estimated fee is \$3,829 per single family residential unit. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

Access to Parcel 1 from Garden Bar Road has vehicle safety impacts resulting from vehicle sight distance constraints at certain locations. One access encroachment location has been found to be acceptable to the County that meets the vehicle sight distance safety requirements. The proposed project's impacts associated with vehicle safety can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item XVI-3:

MM XVI.2 On the Final Parcel Map(s), provide the following easements/dedications to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) and the Development Review Committee (DRC):

- A) Designate a "no-access" strip on Parcel 1 onto Garden Bar Road excepting the proposed driveway location 25 feet in width (centerline of driveway 380' from the southern property line) as identified on the Tentative Parcel Map and to the satisfaction of the DPW/ESD.

MM XVI.3 Concurrent with the Final Parcel Map recordation, the applicant shall enter into and have recorded a Parcel Map Improvement Agreement for the construction of a public road entrance/driveway onto Garden Bar Road to a Plate R-17 Minor, Land Development Manual (LMD) standard as shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. The design speed of Garden Bar Road shall be 35 miles per hour (mph), unless an alternate design speed is approved by the Department of Public Works (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 the DPW. The Plate R-17 structural section within the main roadway right-of-way shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 7.0, but said section shall not be less than 3 inches Asphalt Concrete (AC)/8 inches Class 2 Aggregate Base (AB) unless otherwise approved by the DPW.

The Parcel Map Improvement Agreement shall be a Notice of Building Permit Restriction whereby no Building Permits will be issued on Parcel 1 prior to the construction of the improvements identified in the Parcel Map Improvement Agreement.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any impacts to emergency access. The proposed project does not impact the access to any nearby use. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

The proposed project would create one residential lot, which would be required to provide off-street parking for two vehicles per dwelling unit in conformance with Section 17.54.060 of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance (Parking Standards). Additionally, off-street parking would be provided within the private driveway. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVI-6:

The proposed project will be constructing roadway and driveway improvements that do not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-7:

The proposed project will not conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-8:

The proposed project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)			X	
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)			X	
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item XVII-1:

The proposed project will utilize septic systems for the method of sewage disposal and water wells for the method of water service. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-2:

This project will be served by individual water wells and onsite sewage disposal systems. Therefore, the project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

A minimum sewage disposal area (MUSDA) has been defined for Parcel 1 and a 100% repair are has been defined for Parcel 2. Through the completion of the soils testing the MUSDA and 100% repair are have been shown to meet the minimum effective soil depth requirements and to meet minimum standards of the Placer County Onsite Sewage Disposal Ordinance and Manual. The onsite sewage disposal systems are required to be installed under permit and inspection with Environmental Health Services and will be required to meet all applicable requirements of the Placer County Onsite Sewage Disposal Ordinance and Manual. Therefore, impacts from new onsite sewage disposal systems are expected to be less than significant. No mitigations measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

Storm water will be collected and conveyed in the existing drainage facilities. The existing system has the capacity to accept flows from the proposed project since the proposed project will only generate a minor increase in flows from the pre development condition. No new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-5:

Each proposed parcel will be served by an onsite domestic water well that meets minimum water quantity standards for single family residential development. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-6:

The project will be served by onsite sewage disposal systems and there will be no need for public sewer services to the project. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-7:

The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. 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.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds 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.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Roy Schaefer, Chairperson
 Planning Services Division, Air Quality, Lisa Carnahan
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Phil Frantz
 Department of Public Works, Transportation, Amber Conboy
 Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath

Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
 Environmental Engineering Division, Heather Knutson
 CALFire, Mike DiMaggio



Signature _____ Date June 30, 2014
 E. J. Ivaldi, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control District Rules & Regulations	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Services Division	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
	Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening		
	<input type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	