

**ADDENDUM TO A PREVIOUSLY-ADOPTED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project Name: Troy Scott Custom Grading, Inc. (PLN16-00440)

State Clearinghouse Number: 2008022116

Project Location:

The project is located at 5095 Commercial Place in the community of Sheridan, approximately one-quarter mile south of Highway 65 (APN: 019-180-003-000).

Project Description and History:

On April 3, 2008, the Zoning Administrator approved a Minor Use Permit (PMPB20070423) to construct an 8,000 square-foot mixed-use office/warehouse building and equipment storage yard. The project included widening Commercial Place, construction of a road encroachment for access to the public roadway, construction of customer and employee parking areas, improvement of a one-acre outdoor storage yard, and incorporation of fencing and landscaping. The use permit was not exercised and the approval expired, and the applicant is now seeking re-approval in order to complete the project.

Revised Project:

The project is located on an industrial property in Sheridan on a site that was disturbed by grading activities prior to the original project approval. The northern half of the project site was and remains improved with a one-acre outdoor storage yard constructed of aggregate base rock, and the southern half of the property was and remains disturbed by grading activities and contains ruderal vegetation. The site does not contain trees, wetlands or other vegetative characteristics. The project remains an 8,000 square foot office/warehouse building and equipment storage yard. Frontage improvements to Commercial Place, in addition to parking and improvements to the storage yard are still proposed. The plans for fencing and landscaping remain unchanged from the 2008 proposal and will require subsequent Design Review.

CEQA Determination:

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

Under Section 15162, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR or negative declaration if there are any new significant environmental effects associated with the revised project. With respect to the proposed Minor Use Permit for Troy Scott Custom Grading, Inc., the revisions are only minor technical changes that do not result in any new significant environmental effect(s); therefore, an addendum to the mitigated negative declaration is appropriate to satisfy CEQA requirements for the proposed project.

The Addendum need not be circulated for public review; however, the addendum must be considered by the decision making body prior to making a decision on the project.

Analysis:

The following analysis identifies the new Initial Study sections and additional technical changes that staff has made in order to modernize and standardize language that was used in the previously adopted environmental document. These changes are also tracked in the Initial Study attached to this document.

General Updates

References to the *Engineering and Surveying Department* have been changed to reflect a new title, the *Engineering and Surveying Division*. Additionally, the *Department of Public Works (DPW)* has also been retitled to the *Department of Public Works and Facilities (DPWF)*.

In 2016, the Placer County Board of Supervisors updated the Design Detail Plates to include a different naming convention. As a result, Plate names have been updated accordingly.

Section C: Native American Tribes and Section XVIII: Tribal Cultural Resources

The addition of information to these sections establishes compliance with AB 52 and demonstrates that notification to California Native American tribes was conducted as part of the project review and referral process. As a result of this notification, no request for consultation was received and the Initial Study section pertaining to Tribal Cultural Resources was filled out to reflect as such.

Agricultural Resource, Question 4

A question pertaining to impacts on timberland production zones was added to reflect the most updated Initial Study checklist. In this case, the project is not proposed on a property zoned for timber production, therefore there is no impact and the Initial Study reflects as such.

Air Quality

The language in the Initial Study has been updated to reflect changes to Discussion Items III-1, 4, and 5. The changes reflect no additional impact to the project; however, the discussion was updated to fully disclose standard comments regarding construction-related air quality impacts and emissions associated with standard operations. This project does not conflict with an air quality management plan nor exceed thresholds requiring mitigation measures.

Geology & Soils

The language in the Initial Study has been updated to reflect new standards for the Improvement Plan and Drainage Report submittal, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, as well as updated language as it pertains to Best Management Practices and the requirement to show water quality treatment facilities on future plan submittals. Updates have been made to MM VI.1, VI.2, VI.3, VI.4, VI.5, AND VI.6 to reflect these modifications. For example, an update to MM VI.1 states that landscape plans must now be submitted with Improvement Plans in order to reconcile issues that may have an impact to traffic (i.e. visual site distance) and drainage. The updates to each mitigation measure are designed to modernize the language that is currently used as standard mitigation for Placer County and no new project impacts are identified.

Additionally, as project impacts pertain to Geology & Soils, Mitigation Measure VI.5 previously referenced an outdated *Plate C-4* and has been updated to *Plate 203*.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse Gas Emissions were previously not evaluated in the 2007 Initial Study; however, updates to the CEQA checklist require an evaluation of GHG emissions today. The project does not exceed current thresholds and the checklist and description reflect as such.

Hydrology & Water Quality

The language in the Initial Study has been updated to reflect new standards for the Improvement Plan submittal. Updates have been made to MM VIII.1, MM VIII.2, MM and VIII.3 to reflect these modifications. For example, MM VIII.1 states that maintenance of detention facilities proposed as part of the project shall be maintained by the property owner and reflected in future plan submittals. Updates to MM VIII.2 MM and VIII.3 duplicate updates from the Geology & Soils section and are designed to modernize the language that is currently used as standard mitigation for Placer County. As such, no new project impacts are identified.

Paleontological Resources

The addition of a separate section addressing Paleontological Resources, which were previously addressed under Cultural Resources, reflects the most updated Initial Study checklist. As such, the analysis that was previously done to evaluate archeological resources was duplicated in this section, and a standard condition of approval per the Cultural Resources section will be included for the project.

Transportation and Traffic

When the project was initially reviewed in 2007, the name of the road fronting the project was Riosa Road. Riosa Road was bisected by Old Hwy 65 and ran south from its northern intersection with Highway 65 to North Dowd Road. It then ran west from its intersection with North Dowd Road, which ran south to Nicolaus Road. Riosa Road was cut just west of North Dowd Road and realigned to intersect the Bypass and Old Hwy 65 farther north. North Dowd Road was also cut some distance south of Riosa Road and realigned to intersect Riosa Road farther west. The now dead-end segment of what was Riosa Road and North Dowd Road running south from Old Highway 65 (where the project is located) was renamed Wind Flower Place and the now dead-end segment of what was Riosa Road running west from North Dowd Road was renamed Townview Court. In 2016, the Board of Supervisors approved a name change request to Commercial Place. An exhibit is attached illustrating the changes to the roads in the vicinity over time. The road segment that the proposed project is located on is currently named Commercial Place and all references in the Initial Study to the previous road name (Riosa Road) have been updated to reflect the change.

Additionally, traffic impact fees have increased since 2007. Mitigation measure XV.1 has been updated to reflect the new estimated fee, as well as the correct Fee District, which is referenced as Placer West. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs. The current estimated fee is \$2,881.50 per 1,000 square feet of Manufacturing Space.

Tribal Cultural Resources

The addition of a separate section addressing Tribal Cultural Resources, which was previously addressed under Cultural Resources, reflects the most updated Initial Study checklist. The new section discusses that the project would not cause substantial or adverse change to a tribal cultural resource either listed under the California Register of Historical Resources nor a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American Tribe, and therefore would have no impact on tribal cultural resources.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY
Environmental Coordination Services
County of Placer

Utilities and Service Systems

The project originally proposed to utilize an onsite holding tank as the method of sewage disposal. Additional soils testing was conducted in 2015 and an area was defined that qualified for the use of a seepage pit onsite sewage disposal system. The discussion in XIX-1, 3 and 6 have been amended to reflect the change in the proposed method of sewage disposal. The original Mitigation Measure XIX.1 is no longer necessary for the project since this mitigation measure specifically addressed the previous proposed method of sewage disposal. As such, the new Mitigation Measure XIX.1 outlines the required standards for the current proposal.

Conclusion:

The analysis of this Addendum concludes that the implementation of the project modifications would not result in impacts that were not identified in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred, and thus an addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate to satisfy CEQA requirements for this project.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY
Environmental Coordination Services
 County of Placer

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 Environmental Impact Report (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: Troy Scott's Custom Grading	Plus# PLN16-00440
Entitlements: Minor Use Permit/Design Review	
Site Area: 2-acres	APN: 019-180-003-000
Location: 5095 Commercial Place, Sheridan, Placer County	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Minor Use Permit and Design Review to construct an 8,000 square-foot mixed use office/warehouse building and equipment storage yard. The project will include widening of Commercial Place, construction of a major road encroachment for access to the public roadway, construction of customer and employee parking areas, improvement of a one-acre outdoor storage yard, and incorporation of fencing and landscaping.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The project is located on industrial property in Sheridan, one-quarter mile south of the intersection of Commercial Place and State Route 65 in a mixed use industrial/agricultural area. The property is bordered by Riosa Road to the west, nonirrigated farmland to the south, and industrial development to the north and east.

The northern half of the project site is improved with a one-acre outdoor storage yard constructed of aggregate base rock. The southern half of the property has been disturbed by grading activities and contains ruderal vegetation. The site does not contain trees, wetlands, or other distinguishable vegetative characteristics.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	Industrial combining Agriculture combining Design Scenic Corridor	Sheridan Community Plan	Disturbed, Outdoor storage yard and minor landscaping improvements along Commercial Place
North	Same as project site	Same as project site	Industrial, Two warehouse buildings and outdoor storage
South	Farm, combining minimum building site of 80-acres	Same as project site	Rural farmland, One single-family dwelling unit and several agricultural outbuildings
East	Same as project site	Same as project site	Industrial, Two warehouse buildings and outdoor storage
West	Same as project site	Same as project site	Mixed agricultural and industrial uses, Crop production, outdoor storage, one industrial/commercial office space

C. NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES: Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Notification to Native American tribes was sent on February 3, 2017 in accordance with the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52. No request for consultation was received as of March 17, 2017, thereby exceeding the request for consultation period of 30 days.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

D. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigable 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
- ➔ Sheridan 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.

E. 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 onsite, 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, 2:

The project site is located 150 yards west of State Route 65, and is not designated as a scenic highway corridor. The area is characterized by mixed commercial and industrial development surrounded by commercial agricultural production to the northwest, west and south, and the Highway 65 corridor to the east. The project is not located within a scenic vista or within a state scenic highway and will not damage any known scenic resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item I-3:

The project will result in construction of an 8,000 square-foot mixed use office/warehouse building and a one-acre outdoor storage yard. The building is proposed as a modern industrial building constructed of tilt-up concrete panels with a three color stucco finish. It will include an articulated entry with symmetrical window facades and a multi-plane roof line. The project site will include entry landscaping features and perimeter landscaping around the parking lot. The storage yard will be surrounded by a six foot tall chain-link fence with opaque vinyl slats and will include landscape screening around the perimeter.

The project will not significantly degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as its design features are consistent with the requirements of the Placer County Design Guidelines. This project is located on property zoned as combing Design Review, and the following standard Condition of Approval will be conditioned for this project:

The project is subject to review and approval by the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC). Such a review will be conducted prior to the submittal of the Improvement Plans for the project and will include, but not be limited to: architectural colors, materials, and textures of all structures; landscaping; irrigation; signs; exterior lighting; pedestrian and vehicular circulation; recreation vehicle storage area(s); fences and walls; noise attenuation barriers; all open space amenities; tree impacts, tree removal, tree replacement areas, entry features, trails, wetland impacts, wetland replacement areas, etc. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item I-4:

The project will result in improvement of freestanding lighting for the parking lot and outdoor storage yard, which will result in an incremental increase in the amount of night lighting in the area. However, all lighting will be directed vertically downward and will consist of shoebox style fixtures with a fully shielded flat lens, which will minimize light trespass on adjacent properties. This incremental increase in lighting will not create a new source of light or glare that will have a significant adverse affect on day or nighttime views in the area. However, because this project is located on property zoned as a combing Design Review, the following standard Condition of Approval will be conditioned for this project:

The project is subject to review and approval by the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC). Such a review will be conducted prior to the submittal of the Improvement Plans for the project and will include, but not be limited to: Architectural colors, materials, and textures of all structures; landscaping; irrigation; signs; exterior lighting; pedestrian and vehicular circulation; recreation vehicle storage area(s); fences and walls; noise attenuation barriers; all

open space amenities; tree impacts, tree removal, tree replacement areas, entry features, trails, wetland impacts, wetland replacement areas, etc. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – 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, or a Williamson Act contract? (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 conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item II-1:

The project is located on property mapped as Other Land and Grazing Land, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. It is zoned Industrial combining Agriculture and Design Review. The project site is heavily disturbed and does not include existing agricultural uses. Properties mapped as Other Land and Grazing Land do not represent unique or important farmland and are not considered important on a statewide or local level. Therefore, conversion of this property to a non-agricultural use will not result in impacts to important farmland resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item II-2:

The project is located to the immediate north of property mapped as Farmland of Local Importance on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. It is zoned Farm 80-Acre Minimum and is designated as Rural Estate 5 to 20-Acre Minimum in the Sheridan Community Plan. The property is nonirrigated and does not currently support commercial agricultural uses. Development of the project site will result in construction of an outdoor storage yard immediately adjacent to locally important agricultural land. General Plan policies require implementation of land use buffers, where feasible, between agricultural lands and adjacent non-agriculture uses, and favors implementation of such buffers on the parcel for which a development permit is sought.

Development of the south half of the project site as a fenced outdoor storage yard will buffer important farmland resource from potentially incompatible non-agricultural uses that have the potential to result in land use conflicts, such as commercial office space. The project is therefore consistent with the requirements of the Placer County General Plan as there is no potential to significantly impact to the agricultural use of locally important farmland due to inadequate buffering. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item II-3:

The project site includes the Combining Agriculture zoning designation, which identifies areas where neighborhood conditions are suitable for limited agricultural uses. The area surrounding the project site includes large tracts of agricultural land, many of which are under commercial agricultural production. The project site may be suitable to support limited agricultural uses, such as a retail plant nursery, but does not include notable agricultural resources

or values. Development of the site for an industrial use is consistent with the base zoning and will not conflict with the Combining Agriculture zoning designation.

The project will not be located on property subject to a Williamson Act Contract. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item II-4:

The project does not impact land zoned for timberland production. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item II-5:

The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, may result in conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, there is no impact.

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 will not conflict with the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Management Plan and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item III-2, 3:

The proposed project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NOx) and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM10). Based upon the project analysis, the project will be below the District’s thresholds. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item III-4:

The project includes grading operations which would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from onsite heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Additionally, DPM would result from occasional delivery equipment during the operation.

Localized concentrations of Carbon Monoxide (CO) can be a Toxic Air Contaminant and are typically generated by traffic congestion at intersections. The anticipated traffic resulting from the proposed project would not impact the nearby intersections ability to operate acceptably and would therefore not result in substantial concentration of CO emissions at any intersection.

Sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations given the dispersive properties of DPM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use. Additionally, provided that the project would not

result in substantial CO emissions at intersections, short-term construction and operationally-generated Toxic Air Contaminant emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item III-5:

The project would result in additional air pollutant emissions generated by diesel-powered construction equipment, as well as long-term operational emissions vehicle exhaust that could create odors, however, use of construction equipment would be temporary. The operation of the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. 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 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 Item IV-1, 4, 5:

The project site has been previously disturbed by grading activities over its entirety and does not include discernable habitat characteristics of any type. Site drainage sheet flows predominantly from the northwest to the southeast with a marginal amount of the site draining to a roadside ditch at the western property boundary.

Following project construction, drainage will continue to sheet flow to the southeast corner of the storage yard where storm water will be directed to an underground detention basin via a surface drainage inlet. The detention basin will treat storm water for suspended sediments prior to being discharged from the project site. Water discharged from the detention basin will continue to flow off-site in a southeasterly direction, which is consistent with the current drainage pattern.

Property to the south of the project site may include low density vernal pool complex, a state and federally protected habitat type, which may support special status plant and animal species protected by state and federal law. Significant changes in the hydrology of the project site could affect the amount of seasonal storm water received by vernal pools and affect their seasonal saturation/inundation rates. The project proposes to discharge treated storm water from an underground detention basin at the southeast corner of the project site, which is consistent with current drainage patterns. The project proposes to discharge storm water through an energy dissipater to prevent soil erosion and contamination of discharged water. The onsite drainage pattern will not be significantly altered and will not result in directing storm water away from vernal pools.

Construction of the project will result in the creation of one-acre of new impervious surfaces. This will change the storm water absorption rate of the project site and will result in an increase in the amount of storm water discharged from the site. An increase in the amount of storm water runoff discharged from the site could result in significant impacts to vernal pool habitat located down slope from the project if storm water includes significant amounts of suspended sediments, debris, oil, grease and other industrial contaminants. However, any such impacts are less than significant because this project will be required to implement Water quality "Best Management Practices" (BMP's) in accordance with guidance of the California Storm Water Quality Association (CASQA) Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks for Industrial and Commercial with the project improvements, which will ensure that suspended sediments and contaminants are removed from storm water prior to discharge from the project site.

The project will not 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 because no special status or sensitive plant or animal species are known to exist at the site. Sensitive habitats that may support special status species located down slope from the project site will not be adversely affected because significant changes in the overall drainage pattern of the project site will not occur. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IV-2:

The project site has been previously disturbed by grading activities over its entirety and does not include discernable habitat characteristics of any type. The project does not have the potential to 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, or substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-3:

The project will not result in the conversion of oak woodlands. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-6:

The project will not interfere with the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife species, will not interfere with established native or migratory wildlife corridors, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because the site does not include streams, lakes, wetlands, or wildlife movement corridors. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-7:

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-8:

The project is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

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. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
4. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
5. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion Item V-1:

The project site does not contain any historical resources and will not have the potential to cause adverse change in the significance of a known historical resource as defined in the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Items V-2, 5:

The project site is heavily disturbed and does not include any known archaeological resources, unique paleontological resources, unique geologic features, nor include any known human burial sites including burial sites located outside of formal cemeteries. However, the following standard Condition of Approval will be placed on the Minor Use Permit in the event that previously unknown resources are discovered during project construction:

If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and an 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 will 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 will 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-3:

The project does not have the potential to cause a physical change that will affect known unique ethnic cultural values. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item V-4:

The project site is not used for religious or sacred uses. Therefore, there is no impact.

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 lake? (ESD)				X
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? (PLN, 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 Item VI-1, 2, 9:

The proposed project will disturb approximately two-acres and result in increases in the amount of impervious surface present on the site, from 17 percent existing impervious area to 38 percent post-development imperviousness. To construct the improvements proposed, significant disruption of soils onsite will occur, including grading, compaction for roadways, parking areas and foundations. The grading activity is expected to result in approximately 2,855 cubic yards of cut and approximately 584 cubic yards of fill. The export amount will be approximately 2,271 cubic yards which is intended to be hauled to the owner's property on Wise Road. Grading operations will consist of cuts and fills of five feet or less.

According to a preliminary geotechnical engineering report by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., dated March 2007, the surface soil profile is moderately weathered reddish arkosic sediments composed of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated gravel, sand, and silt. Perched groundwater is potentially present on less permeable layers well above the static ground water level. Five test pits were excavated during a subsurface exploration program at the site. A layer of clayey sand was encountered at the surface to a depth of one foot in one of the test pits. According to the report, in concentrated amounts, such clays could cause distress to concrete slab-on-grade floors and foundations if present in the upper three feet of the structural improvement area. However, the geotechnical study concludes that material blending in the subsurface during site grading under supervision of a geotechnical engineer could be performed to ensure that no concentrated pockets of expansive clays are present.

The proposed project's impacts associated with unstable earth conditions, soil disruptions, displacements, and compaction of the soil will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item VI-1, 2, 9:

MM VI.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 Engineering and Surveying Division(ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, onsite and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, will 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, will be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs will be paid. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities will 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 will 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 will be submitted to the ESD in both electronic and printed hard copy format as approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.

Any Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division.

Prior to the County's final acceptance of the project's improvements, submit to the Engineering and Surveying Division two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County's Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.

MM VI.2

The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance will 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 a maximum of at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 will include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan will be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).

The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent 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 will 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 will be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding.

Failure of the DRC/ESD 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 VI.3

The improvement plan submittal shall include a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval. . The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- A) Road, pavement, and parking area design
- B) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)
- C) Grading practices
- D) Erosion/winterization
- E) Special problems discovered onsite, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)
- F) Slope stability

Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report will be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

Discussion Item VI-3, 4:

There will be no substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features. There are no identified unique geologic or physical features at the site that will be destroyed, covered, or modified by this project. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VI-5:

The project proposal will result in the construction of an 8,000 square foot building for an office/shop and a construction storage yard. The disruption of soils on this property increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential for contamination of stormwater runoff with disturbed soils or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. The construction phase will create significant potential for erosion as disturbed soil may come in contact with wind or precipitation that could transport sediment to the air and/or adjacent waterways. Discharge of concentrated runoff in the post-development condition could also contribute to the erosion potential impact in the long-term. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. It is primarily the shaping of building pads, grading for parking areas, and trenching for utilities that are responsible for accelerating erosion and degrading water quality. This disruption of soils on the site has the potential to result in significant increases in erosion of soils both on and off the site. The proposed project's impacts associated with soil erosion will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item VI-5:

Refer to MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3

MM VI.4

As part of the improvement plan submittal process, the preliminary Drainage Report provided during environmental review shall be submitted in final format. The final Drainage Report may require more detail than that provided in the preliminary report, and will be reviewed in concert with the improvement plans to confirm conformity between the two. 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 proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, watershed maps, changes in flows and patterns, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction, as well as long-term post-construction water quality measures. The final Drainage Report shall be prepared in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of improvement plan submittal.

MM VI.5

The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions.

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate 203), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, gravel bags, diversion swales, limiting the soil disturbance, and concrete washout areas.

MM VI.6

Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall obtain a State Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Division evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees.

Discussion Item VI-6:

The project is not in close proximity to the channel of a river, stream, or lake, therefore, changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation as a result of this project are not expected. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VI-7, 8:

The preliminary geotechnical report by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. dated March 2007, states that no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones are located on the project site. No evidence of recent or active faulting was observed during the geotechnical field study. The nearest mapped faults to the site are related to the Bear Mountains and Melones Fault Zones located ten to 25 miles east of the site. If structures are constructed according to the current edition of the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards, the likelihood of severe damage due to ground shaking should be minimal. The potential for site liquefaction is considered to be very low due to the absence of a permanent elevated groundwater table and the relatively dense nature of the site materials. Therefore, there is no impact.

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 Item VII-1, 25:

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 residents and visitors, as well as onsite fuel combustion for landscape maintenance equipment. The project would result in grading, subsequent paving and the construction of the project site, along with the construction of associated utilities and roadways.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB32) signed into law in September 2006, required statewide GHG emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB32 established regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve this goal and provides guidance to help attain quantifiable reductions in emissions efficiently, without limiting population and economic growth. In September of 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was signed by Governor, to establish a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

On October 13, 2016, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) adopted CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions as shown below. The Brightline Threshold of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr threshold for construction and operational phases, and the De Minimis level of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr for operational, were used to determine significance. GHG emissions from projects that exceed 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr would be deemed to have a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. For a land use project, this level of emissions is

equivalent to a project size of approximately 646 single-family dwelling units, or a 323,955 square feet commercial building.

The De Minimis Level for the operational phases of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr represents an emissions level which can be considered as less than cumulatively considerable and be excluded from the further GHG impact analysis. This level of emissions is equivalent to a project size of approximately 71 single-family units, or a 35,635 square feet commercial building. Given the project size, the project would not exceed the PCAPCD's GHG thresholds and therefore will 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 Item VIII-1, 9:

The project is not likely to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project proponent does conduct minor maintenance on their fleet vehicles, but most of that work is completed off-site as they do most of their repairs in the field at their various job sites. As a condition of the project, the project proponent will submit a hazardous materials screening form (available from Environmental Health Services) to Environmental Health Services which details the quantities of fuels/oils/hazardous materials used in their business. This process is routine in nature and the impact is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item VIII-2:

Construction of the proposed project will involve the short-term use and storage of hazardous materials typically

associated with grading, such as fuel and other substances. All materials will be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including Cal-OSHA requirements and manufacturer's instructions. Therefore, the proposed project will not pose a risk of accident or upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item VIII-3:

Based upon the project analysis, the project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VIII-4:

The project will not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Items VIII-5, 6:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VIII-7:

The project is located in an area of valley uplands and is not listed by Placer County Fire to be an area at risk for wildland fires and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VIII-8:

The project has the potential to create a habitat for the breeding of mosquitoes from the collection of standing water on the property. The creation of standing water from the overwatering of landscaping has the potential to breed mosquitoes. As a condition of this project, it is recommended that drip irrigation be used for landscaping areas. No mitigation measures are required.

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:

The project will use domestic water well for its water supply. A bacteriological water sample was required of the project during initial environmental review. The bacteriological sample was tested by an independent third party analytical laboratory who determined that the water supply was free of fecal and total coliform bacteria. As a condition of this project, the proponent will conduct annual water testing of the well to monitor the bacteriological condition of this water supply source. This condition is considered routine and does not represent significant environmental effects. As the water well has been shown to be in good condition and free of bacteriological contaminants, the impact for this project to violate any potable water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-2:

The project will utilize individual water well for its domestic water supply. There will be approximately 23 employees at this facility. Most of the employees are field staff who either report to their job site in the field or they arrive at the office and then drive out to the field. Thus, there will be one or two employees who will be at office all the time. Therefore, the water use for this project will not be significant (the existing well supplies 11 gallons per minute which can supply approximately 7900 gallons of water in a 12-hour period; the office itself may only use 60 gallons of water for two people conservatively during that 12-hour period) and it will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

There will be an increase in impervious areas on the property, however, this will not interfere with groundwater recharge as the soils in this area are not conducive to groundwater recharge, except perhaps along major drainage ways. As this project does not involve disturbance of major drainage ways, impacts relating to groundwater recharge are considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-3:

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. The site drainage patterns will remain essentially the same as the existing conditions. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-4:

The project will disturb approximately two-acres in the Sheridan industrial area. The project proposes approximately 38 percent of the site to be paved or covered with impervious surfaces. The site imperviousness will create increased peak flows and volumes from stormwater runoff. The runoff flow rate and volume increases are potentially significant impacts.

A preliminary drainage report was prepared by Watermark Engineering, Inc. dated June 3, 2007. According to the report, approximately 0.3 acres of the site along Commercial Place drains north in a roadside ditch and approximately 2.0-acres drains to the southeast corner to an existing railroad ditch. The post-project northern water subshed will be reduced to 0.15-acres and the southern water subshed will be increased slightly to 2.12-acres. Post-project 10- and 100-year peak flows will be reduced to pre-development peak flow levels with the construction of a detention basin in the southeast corner of the site. The construction storage yard will be constructed with 6 inches of one inch gravel over a geotextile fabric. The detention area will be formed within the storage yard with sufficient detention volume above the gravel surfacing while allowing for full access and use of the property for truck parking. A final drainage report will be required with submittal of the improvement plans for County review and approval to substantiate the preliminary report drainage calculations.

The proposed project's impacts associated with increase in rate or amount of surface runoff will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item IX-4:

Refer to MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.4

MM IX.1

The Improvement Plan submittal and Drainage Report shall provide details showing that storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of detention facilities. Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). The ESD may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event onsite detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of any in-lieu fees prescribed by County Ordinance. Maintenance of detention facilities by the homeowner's association, property owner's association, property owner, or entity responsible for project maintenance shall be required. No detention facility construction will be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

Discussion Item IX-5, 6:

The project proposes approximately 38 percent of the site to be covered with impervious surfaces including structures and pavement. Potential water quality impacts are present both during project construction and post-project development. Construction activities will disturb soils and cause potential introduction of sediment into stormwater during rain events. Through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for minimizing contact with potential stormwater pollutants at the source and erosion control methods, this potentially significant impact will be reduced to less than significant levels. In the post-development condition, the project could potentially introduce contaminants such as oil and grease, sediment, nutrients, metals, organics, pesticides, and trash from activities such as parking lot runoff, outdoor storage, landscape fertilizing and maintenance, and refuse collection. According to the information supplied by the applicant, site runoff from the asphalt parking area will be captured onsite and treated via grassy swales located along the eastern property boundary before entering into the gravel detention basin and being filtered out of the proposed 12 inch culvert at the southeast property corner. The 12 inch perforated CMP will have filter fabric attached to the end to trap sediments. A final drainage report will be required with submittal of the improvement plans for County review and approval to substantiate the preliminary report drainage and BMP sizing calculations. The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality degradation will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item IX-5, 6:

Refer to MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, MM VI.4, MM VI.5, MM VI.6

MM IX.2

The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions.

Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) will be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs will be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. No water quality facility construction will be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All BMPs will be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, will be provided to ESD upon request. 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 catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map 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.

MM IX.3

Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to Placer County's Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Placer County Code, Article 8.28). This project shall reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable and prevent nonstormwater discharges from leaving the site, both during and after construction.

Discussion Item IX-7:

The project will produce urban stormwater runoff and will be required to install stormwater best management practices per Placer County Department of Public Works & Facilities policies. This impact is routine and less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-8:

The project is proposing an 8,000 square foot office/shop with paved parking and circulation areas as well as a construction storage yard. The project will not cause improvements to be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area which will impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-9:

The project is proposing an 8,000 square foot office/shop with paved parking and circulation areas as well as a construction storage yard. Flooding is not considered to be a concern given the project site is not in close proximity to a creek or waterway. People or structures will not be exposed to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-10:

The project is proposing an 8,000 square foot office/shop with paved parking and circulation areas as well as a construction storage yard. The watershed of an important surface water resource will not be impacted as a result of this project. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-11:

The project will utilize domestic water well for its potable water supply. The amount of water necessary to run this business is relatively minor as indicated in VIII.2. This project is not for a use which could use a large volume of water, such as, a concrete batch plant, for example. Thus, the project's proposed use is a grading contractor operation which has the potential of 23 full-time staff, most of whom work off-site at various grading contracting jobs. There will be two full-time office staff and their water use in minimal. Therefore, the ability of this project to alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-12:

The project is not situated nor located near a drainage area or watershed, thus it will not impact any important water resource downstream. Therefore, there is no impact.

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 physically divide any community. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-2, 4:

The project is located adjacent to agriculturally zoned property. Placer County General Plan policies require implementation of land use buffers between agricultural lands and adjacent non-agriculture uses, where feasible, and favor implementation of such buffers on the parcel for which a development permit is sought.

The project site is bordered to the south by agriculturally zoned property, and is characterized by nonirrigated pasture. Development of the south half of the project site as a fenced outdoor storage yard will buffer the adjacent agricultural property from potentially incompatible non-agricultural uses that have the potential to result in land use conflicts, such as commercial office space. The project is therefore consistent with the requirements of the Placer County General Plan because it does not have the potential to result in a significant impact to the agricultural use of the adjacent farmland due to inadequate buffering. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item X-3:

The project is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, and will not conflict with any County policies adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-5:

The project will not impact agricultural or timber resources or operations because the project site does not include agricultural uses nor does it include timber resources and adjacent agricultural property to the south of the project site will be buffered from potentially incompatible land uses associated with this project, such as commercial office space, by an outdoor storage yard. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-6:

The project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-7:

The project will not result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-8:

The project will not cause economic or social changes that will result in an adverse physical change to the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

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 Item XI-1, 2:

The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or result in the loss of availability of any locally-important mineral resource recovery site in the Placer County General Plan or in any other land use plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

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, 3:

Construction of this project will increase ambient noise levels. The project is located in an industrial area according to the Sheridan General Plan. There is a pre-existing noise condition from Highway 65 and from the Union Pacific Railroad Track. The existing traffic conditions on Highway 65 and the railroad tracks effectively shield any construction noise impacts from the residents who live nearby (across the highway). Therefore, the construction noise impact is considered to be temporary and 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-2:

There will be no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XII-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XII-5:

The project is not located within the vicinity of any known private airstrips. Therefore, there is no impact.

XIII. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XIII-1:

The project site is heavily disturbed and does not include any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features. Per the discussion under Section V. Cultural Resources, the following standard Condition of Approval will be placed on the Minor Use Permit in the event that previously unknown resources are discovered during project construction:

If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and an 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 will 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 will 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.

Therefore, there is no impact.

XIV. 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 XIV-1, 2:

The project will not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area nor will it displace housing or require construction of replacement housing. Therefore, there is no impact.

XV. 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 XV-1:

The proposed project will not increase the amount of fire protection services needed to serve this site and will not result in a significant demand for construction of new fire protection facilities, nor will it significantly impair service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XV-2:

The project will not increase the amount of sheriff protection services needed to serve this site creating the need to physically alter or construct facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XV-3:

The project will not result in an increased demand for construction of new schools or related administrative facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XV-4:

The project will not result in increased maintenance of public facilities or roads necessitating physical improvements. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XV-5:

The project will not result in increased demand for other governmental services creating the need to physically alter or construct facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

XVI. 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 Item XVI-1, 2:

The project will not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated. The project will not include public recreational facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

XVII. 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 onsite 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 Item XVII-1:

This project proposal will result in the construction of an 8,000 square foot office/shop building and construction storage yard on a site that is currently being used as a construction storage yard. 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 and roadway segment/intersection existing LOS, however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area’s transportation system. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This project is subject to this code and, therefore, required to pay traffic impact fees to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements. With the payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, the traffic impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures Item XVII-1:

MM XVII.1

This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Placer West Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and will be paid to Placer County DPWF 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 (SPRTA)

C) Placer County/City of Roseville JPA (PC/CR)

The current estimated fee is \$2,881.50 per 1,000 sq ft of Manufacturing Space.. The fees will be calculated using the land use and building square footage information supplied. If 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 XVII-2:

The level of service standard for Commercial Place will not be exceeded as a result of this project. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVII-3:

The project proposes road widening on both sides of Commercial Place to the full ultimate width of 32 feet of pavement. The striped centerline of Commercial Place will be shifted as much as 3.5 feet away from the Troy Scott property to improve the lane alignment, which currently veers closer to the Troy Scott property within the highway easement and then veers back to a more central easement location to the north, past the site. The project's proposed frontage improvements will improve vehicle safety due to road widening incorporating shoulders and a correction for the existing centerline shift. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVII-4:

The servicing fire district, the Placer County Fire Department, has conditionally approved the proposed office building and construction storage yard in a letter dated November 6, 2007, and concerns regarding inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses are considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XVII-5:

The project includes development of a 17 space parking lot and an outdoor storage yard, and will result in sufficient parking capacity onsite. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVII-6:

The proposed project will not cause hazards or barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVII-7:

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

Discussion Item XVII-8:

This 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				X
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the				X

resource to a California Native American tribe.				
---	--	--	--	--

Discussion Item XVIII-1:

The project would not cause substantial or adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources that are listed under the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVIII-2:

The project would not cause substantial or adverse change to a resource determined to be significant to a California Native American tribe. Therefore, there is no impact.

XIX. 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 onsite 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 XIX-1, 6:

Public sewer is not legally or physically available to the parcel. This project is not proposing to connect to public sewer, they will be installing an onsite sewage disposal system. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XIX-2:

The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection, or treatment facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XIX-3:

This project lies in an area where there are dense layers of clay and hard-pan soils. Typically in this area, the standard method of sewage disposal is the seepage pit disposal system.

Previously, the project proposed to use a onsite holding tank that would be maintained and pumped at specific intervals. Additional soils testing was conducted in 2015 and the parcel qualified for the use of a seepage pit septic system to serve the project. The onsite sewage disposal system is required to be installed under permit and inspection with Environmental Health Services. Impacts from the new onsite sewage disposal system are expected to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. For a commercial project, a seepage pit sewage disposal system is not allowed per the Placer County Onsite Sewage Program Ordinance and Manual

(PCOSSP). Soil testing was conducted on the project site and the result concluded that there wasn't adequate soil available for an onsite sewage disposal system. However, the project's projected wastewater use was determined by a consulting report by Lindbloom Septic Design Inc. (June 8, 2007) to be 130 gallons per day. This amount falls within the guidelines for a holding tank (200 gallons per day maximum) as permitted by the PCOSSP. The following mitigation measure presents the requirements for using a holding tank.

Mitigation Measures Item XIX-3:

MM XIX.1

As no area wide public sewer system is legally or physically available and the site cannot be approved for a standard or alternative onsite sewage disposal system, a holding tank meeting the following guidelines may be installed to provide sewage disposal for this project.

- The projected daily sewage flow cannot exceed 200 gallons per day; and
- The owner of the property will record a deed restriction agreeing to be served by a public sewer system if at any time a connection becomes legally available within three hundred (300) feet of the property; and
- The owner will provide EHS a copy of a contract with a County licensed septage hauler that shows the tank pumped at regular intervals or as needed to prevent use of greater than seventy-five (75) percent of the tank's capacity. The contents of the tank will be disposed of at an approved septage receiving facility, in an approved manner; and
- A record of pumping dates and amounts pumped will be maintained by the property owner and made available to EHS upon request; and
- The holding tank will have a minimum liquid capacity of fifteen hundred (1500) gallons; and
- Be equipped with both an audible and visual alarm, placed in a location approved by EHS, to indicate when the tank is seventy-five (75) percent full. The audible alarm only may be user cancellable; and
- The holding tank installation must meet all applicable requirements as indicated in the PCOSSP.

Discussion Item XIX-4:

The project proposes storm drainage collection, water quality treatment, and detention on site, with an outfall location at the southeast corner of the site, which is the low point of the property. The construction of the onsite stormwater conveyance system is not expected to cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XIX-5:

The project has sufficient water supplies available as discussed earlier in this document under Section VIII.1. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XIX-6:

The project will not require sewer service as the public sewer service is not legally or physically available to the project site. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XIX-7:

The project is served by the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill in Roseville which has sufficient capacity to handle this project's solid waste requirements. Therefore, there is no impact.

F. 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
--	--	----------

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

<input 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 type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

H. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a 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.
-------------------------------------	--

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

Planning Services Division, Nikki Streegan, Chairperson
 Planning Services Division-Air Quality, Angel Green
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Sarah Gillmore
 Environmental Engineering Division, Huey Nham
 Department of Public Works & Facilities-Transportation, Stephanie Holloway
 Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath
 Flood Control Districts, Brad Brewer
 Facility Services, Parks, Lisa Carnahan
 Placer County Fire/CDF, Mike DiMaggio

Signature _____ Date _____
 Crystal Jacobsen, Environmental Coordinator

J. 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, Suite 190, 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.

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 type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Services Division	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Planning Services Division, Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	