
Pacific Pride Cardlock Project Development Review Application 11PLN-05

Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration

Prepared by
City of Grass Valley
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95949

March 8, 2011

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Grass Valley has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the City finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this Negative Declaration has been prepared.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Grass Valley
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Contact: Thomas Last, Planning Director
(530) 274-4711

PROJECT APPLICANT: Bruce Boyd
17894 Tyler Foote Road
Nevada City, CA 94959

PROJECT LOCATION: The 1.84 acre project site is located at 335 Railroad Avenue (APN 09-24-02, 03, 26) in the M-1 Zoning District

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of a Development Review Application to redevelop an existing gas station/bulk fuel distribution facility. The project includes the removal of the four existing buildings, three, above-ground and ten, below-ground gas tanks, all gas distribution equipment, and debris and materials from the site. The redeveloped site will include a 5,040 square foot building, a 510 square foot covered storage area attached to the building, 11 fuel dispensers, five, 20,000 gallon, above-ground fuel tanks, and related site improvements. The fuel tanks will be enclosed within a four-foot tall concrete block wall. A four foot tall chain link fence with 1'-6" high barbed wire will be on top of the fuel tank enclosure. An 8'-6" tall open ornamental fence and gate system with sections of corrugated tin will separate the bulk storage, loading and filling racks, and a portion of the building from the fueling station. The proposed building will have a standing seam metal roof, steel and recycled corrugated tin siding, and a brick wainscot. New landscaping, curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be provided along Railroad Avenue. A monument sign is proposed to replace an existing 35-30' tall pole sign. The applicant proposes to enhance the riparian corridor and provide an area for a potential trail along Wolf Creek.

REVIEW PERIOD: March 10, 2011 to April 11, 2011

**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY
INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

1. **Application Number:** 11PLN-05
2. **Applicant's/Representative's Name and Address:** Bruce Boyd
17894 Tyler Foote Road
Nevada City, CA 94959
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Grass Valley, Community Development Department
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95949
4. **Project Description:** The proposed project consists of a Development Review Application to redevelop an existing gas station/bulk fuel distribution facility. The project includes the removal of the four existing buildings, three, above-ground and ten, below-ground gas tanks, all gas distribution equipment, and debris and materials from the site. The redeveloped site will include a 5,040 square foot building, a 510 square foot covered storage area attached to the building, 11 fuel dispensers, five, 20,000 gallon, above-ground fuel tanks, and related site improvements. The fuel tanks will be enclosed within a four-foot tall concrete block wall. A four foot tall chain link fence with 1'-6" high barbed wire will be on top of the fuel tank enclosure. An 8'-6" tall open ornamental fence and gate system with sections of corrugated tin will separate the bulk storage, loading and filling racks, and a portion of the building from the fueling station. The proposed building will have a standing seam metal roof, steel and recycled corrugated tin siding, and a brick wainscot. New landscaping, curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be provided along Railroad Avenue. A monument sign is proposed to replace an existing 35-30' tall pole sign. The applicant proposes to enhance the riparian corridor and provide an area for a potential trail along Wolf Creek.
5. **Project Location:** The 1.84 acre project site is located at 335 Railroad Avenue (APN 09-24-02, 03, 26).
6. **General Plan Designation:** M-I (Manufacturing/Industrial)
7. **Zoning:** M-1 (Light Industrial)
8. **Other public agencies whose approval is, or may be, required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, Nevada County Environmental Health Department, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____ For _____

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be significantly affected by this project as indicated by the checklist in the following sections:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/ Hazardous Materials | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

CEQA GUIDANCE

Appendix I of the State CEQA Guidelines was used in answering the checklist questions:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the discussion. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the discussion shows that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained when it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “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.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The 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).
5. 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 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063[c][D]). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plans, Land Use Codes). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Identification of the potential for residual significant adverse environmental impacts would trigger the need for preparation of an EIR. For issue areas in which no significant adverse impact would result or impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation, further analysis is not required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tree, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic state highway?				X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in this area?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The property contains four buildings, three above-ground fuels tanks, and miscellaneous 55-gallon drums, tanks, and other debris. A large portion of the site is covered with concrete, asphalt, and gravel driveways and parking. There are a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees and blackberries on the northern end of the site. Wolf Creek runs along the northern end of the property. The site is visible from the Highway 20/49 Idaho-Maryland off ramp. Surrounding uses consist of a towing business to the west, 49er Fun Park to the south, Highway 20/49 to the north, and a vacant parcel to the east.

The City's General Plan includes objectives for the protection of major views in the planning area, including hillsides, ridgelines and forested areas. The General Plan's Conservation/Open Space Element includes a discussion about the 1972 and 1982 General Plans establishing Highway 49/20 as a scenic highway. The 1972 General Plan proposed policies prohibiting billboards and off-premise signs, and encouraged landscaping and tree planting along scenic corridors. The 1982 General Plan reinforced those policies and efforts through new policies designed to enhance City "entryways". The plan also identified the need to address viewsheds, specifically, prominent hills and ridgelines. The 2020 General Plan states the City has implemented some aspects of scenic highway/entryway and hillside/ridgeline provisions through the zoning and design guidelines. However, the adopted policies focus on further implementing viewshed protection measures. Caltrans notes that the Highway 49/20 corridor is on the eligibility list to become a State Scenic Highway. The entire length of Highway 49, from Madera to Sierra Counties, is on the "eligibility list", with only a small section in Sierra County being "officially designated". To become "officially designated" as a State Scenic Highway, each local jurisdiction must conduct a substantial amount of research, adopt a scenic corridor protection program, and comply with the State's process and obtain the State's approval for the designation.

The City's Design Guidelines identifies the Idaho-Maryland Road area as a Special Planning Area. This section states "The design emphasis for Idaho Maryland Road shall concentrate on aesthetically pleasing structures, and screening of unsightly areas from public view through the use of natural landscaping." One of the four specific policies applies to this project. This policy requires building designs to be attractive, interesting, and safe and shall reflect the character of Grass Valley. It also emphasizes attention to detail in the building articulation.

The proposed building design reflects many of the architectural elements of Grass Valley's mining past. Building materials include the use of metal siding and metal roof, and a brick wainscot. The applicant proposes to remove the blackberries and other invasive plant species along Wolf Creek and plant native trees, shrubs and grasses in this area. New landscaping is proposed along the Railroad Avenue street frontage and along Wolf Creek. The proposed lighting plan includes 16 foot tall pole lights and wall lights. The monument sign is externally illuminated. The lighting plan photometric plan confirms the lights will be shielded and be directed on site.

Conclusion: The property is not designated as a scenic vista and will not substantially degrade the visual character of the area. The removal of the existing buildings and improvements, in conjunction with the proposed building and landscaping will provide a significant enhancement to visual character of the property. Additionally, the property is not within a scenic highway corridor. The proposed lighting plan demonstrates the project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it is developed as planned.

Mitigation: None required

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AIR QUALITY</p> <p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>			X	
<p>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>			X	
<p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant 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)?</p>			X	
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>		X		
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The overall air quality in Nevada County is good but two known air quality problems exist, Ozone and Suspended Particulate Matter (PM-10). Nevada County is considered to be “non-attainment” for both pollutants. PM-10 in Grass Valley meets federal ambient ozone standards but exceeds the more stringent State standards in the winter, primarily due to smoke created from wood stoves and fireplaces. Violations in the summer months have been noted during forest fires or periods of open burning. PM-10 is usually associated with dust generated during construction. Western Nevada County is non-attainment for the federal 8-hour ozone standard and the entire county is non-attainment for the state one-hour ozone standard. The transport of ozone from the Sacramento and San Francisco Bay areas is the primary factor as to why Nevada County exceeds the ozone standards. The project is located within the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD). The NSAQMD has adopted standard regulations and mitigation measures for projects that exceed certain air quality threshold levels to address and mitigate both long and short-term emissions.

The project will require the removal of several buildings and structures, underground fuel tanks, and all the existing improvements on the site. Dust generated by grading and construction activities could have a potential to create short-term air quality impacts. Since the redeveloped project is expected to generate the same level of vehicular traffic as with the existing operations, the operation of the business will not generate new pollutants, odors or impact air movement in the immediate area. Furthermore, all fuel delivery, storage and distribution systems will comply with the most current state and federal vapor recovery systems to reduce air pollutants. Since the project will replace all the existing, older fuel systems, the City expects the redeveloped site to actually improve the local air quality. As noted in Section 6, the project site has may contain ultramafic or serpentine rock, and site grading or tank removal operations could expose naturally-occurring asbestos.

Conclusion: The redevelopment activities could create construction related dust and is within an area containing serpentine rock. The following mitigation measures will reduce the potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Mitigation:

1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a Dust Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District and City Engineer. Dust mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Dust Mitigation Plan. The dust mitigation plan shall include the following:

- a. The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction.
- b. All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated, or covered to prevent dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage.
- c. All land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities on the project shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph.
- d. All inactive portions of the development site shall be covered, seeded, or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, the applicant shall be responsible for applying City approved non-toxic soil stabilizers (according to manufactures specifications) to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours) in accordance with the local grading ordinance.
- e. All areas with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions.
- f. All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.
- g. Paved streets adjacent to the project shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to remove excessive accumulations of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the project site.
- h. No burning of waste material or vegetation shall take place on-site. Alternatives to burning include chipping, mulching or converting to biomass.

2. During site grading operations, the applicant will be required to follow the air toxic control measures as required by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District for dust control related to potential asbestos.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</p> <p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?</p>				X
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X
<p>c. 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))?</p>				X
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X
<p>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The property is fully developed and the proposed redevelopment will occur within an area of existing site disturbance. There are no agricultural or timber harvesting operation on or near the project site. The site is not classified as any type of farmland or forest land.

Conclusion: The project will not impact agricultural or forest resources.

Mitigation: None required

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:				
a. 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 and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native residents or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f. Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The property contains four buildings, three above-ground fuels tanks, and miscellaneous 55-gallon drums, tanks, and other debris. A large portion of the site is covered with concrete, asphalt, and gravel driveways and parking. There are a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees and blackberries on the northern end of the site. Wolf Creek runs along the northern end of the property. The property is almost fully developed and the proposed redevelopment will occur within an area of existing site disturbance. The applicant proposes to maintain a 30' minimum setback from the top of the bank for all development. The applicant also notes the intent to enhance the Wolf Creek riparian area by removing the blackberries and non-native vegetation, and replanting native trees, shrubs and grasses in this area. It is likely the applicant will be required to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to the removal of any vegetation within Wolf Creek. The City will include a condition of approval to address this issue.

Conclusion: The applicant proposes to avoid site disturbance beyond the areas already disturbed by urban development. The project provides an opportunity to enhance the riparian corridor along Wolf Creek, which is seen as a beneficial impact. Therefore, impacts associated with biological resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the proposal:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The property contains four buildings, three above-ground fuel tanks, and miscellaneous 55-gallon drums, tanks, and other debris. A large portion of the site is covered with concrete, asphalt, and gravel driveways and parking. There are a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees and blackberries on the northern end of the site. Wolf Creek runs along the northern end of the property. The property is almost fully developed and the proposed redevelopment will occur within an area of existing site disturbance. The project will require the removal of four buildings. These buildings are primarily metal, with some wood, sheds and storage buildings. They do not include architectural characteristics that reflect historical significance. The main site disturbance will be associated with the removal of the underground fuel tanks.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with cultural resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structure to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv. Landslides?				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?				X
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable because of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The project site is primarily developed and the redevelopment will occur within the same general area of the existing site improvements. The general area of this site contains ultramafic rocks, which is the type of rock that contains serpentine or rock containing asbestos. Since the project is expected to disturb less than one acre of land, the applicant will need to follow the air toxic control measures adopted by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD). These measures address dust control related to potential asbestos. These measures include standard procedures adopted by NSAQMD to address asbestos. There are no identified active fault lines on the property. The City of Grass Valley is located in the low intensity zone for earthquake severity. The site is relatively level and minimal grading activity is expected. The site does not contain any unique geologic or physical features. No landslides or subsidence of the site is expected. The City has not noted any geology or soil-related issues with the existing development.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with geology and geologic hazards are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers: Greenhouse gases (GHG) include gases that can affect the earth's surface temperature. The natural process through which heat is retained in the troposphere is called the greenhouse effect. The greenhouse effect traps heat in the troposphere through process of absorbing different levels of radiation. GHG are effective in absorbing radiation which would otherwise escape back to space. Therefore, the greater the amount of radiation absorbed, the greater the warming potential of the atmosphere. GHG are created through natural process and/or industrial processes. These gases include water vapor (H₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), Perfluorocarbons (PFcs), and sulfur hexafluoride

(SF₆).

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies the following four primary constituents that represent the greenhouse gas emissions of most importance:

- Carbon Dioxide (CO₂): CO₂ is primarily generated by the burning of fossil fuels. Other sources include burning of solid waste and wood products.
- Methane (CH₄): CH₄ is emitted from the incomplete combustion of forest fires, landfills, livestock and animal land uses, and leaks in natural gas lines.
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O): N₂O is produced by agricultural and industrial activities.
- Fluorinated Gases (HFCs and PFCs): These gases are emitted from industrial activities and refrigerants used in both stationary refrigeration and mobile air conditioning.

The US EPA estimates nearly 85% of the nation's GHG emissions are comprised of carbon dioxide. For most non-industrial development projects, motor vehicles make up the bulk of GHG emissions. According to the California Air Resources Board, the primary GHG emitted by vehicles are CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, and HFCs.

Since 2005, the California legislator has adopted several bills, and the Governor has signed several Executive Orders, in response to the impacts related to global warming. Assembly Bill 32 states global warming poses a serious threat to California and directs the Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Senate Bill 97 requires an assessment of a project's GHG emissions as part of the CEQA process. SB 97 also required the Office of Planning and Research to develop guidelines to analyze GHG emissions.

The NSAQMD has not adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. Additionally, CARB has not yet adopted any tools to measure the impact of a project on global warming. Due to the nature of global climate change, it is not anticipated that a single project would have substantial impact on the global climate change. As it pertains to this project, the redevelopment of the site is not expected to increase traffic more than the existing operation and it will not add a new use or activity. Therefore, the project is not expected to add any new cumulative greenhouse gases. Furthermore, since the new facility will be required to use the most state of the art fuel storage and distribution equipment, it is likely the project may actually improve the overall air quality.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with greenhouse gases are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b. 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?			X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

d. 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?			X	
e. 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?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h. 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?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The project site is on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites list, Cortese List, and classified as a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST). The specific issue of concern is petroleum contamination. Since 1991, the site has been monitored to determine whether there was any on-going leakage from underground tanks. A remediation program started in 1998 to extract vapor from the sites. The site contains 11 monitoring wells. The latest reports in 2009 indicate the fuel hydrocarbon constituents have been reduced to concentrations near, or below, applicable state standards. The Regional Water Quality Control Board classifies the site as "Open-Verification Monitoring". This means the remediation phases are essentially complete, but the monitoring program is still in place to confirm site cleanup. The project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school site, nor located near any public or private airport. The site is not adjacent to any wildland areas and the project will not impact an existing emergency evacuation plan.

The project will require continue to require the transportation, storage and distribution of fuel products. However, the new facility must comply with the most current state and federal standards and guidelines related to all of these aspects of the operations. The above-ground fuel tanks are double steel walled and located within a four-foot high concrete block wall.

Conclusion: Since the project includes the removal of all the underground tanks, and will be required to install the most state-of-the-art fuel storage and distribution systems, the proposed project is expected to be an environmental benefit over the existing conditions. Therefore, impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., 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)?				X
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g. 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?				X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i. 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?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The property contains four buildings, three above-ground fuels tanks, and miscellaneous 55-gallon drums, tanks, and other debris. A large portion of the site is covered with concrete, asphalt, and gravel driveways and parking. There is no formal landscaping on the property. The property frontage does not have curb, gutter, sidewalk, or a storm drain system. It appears most of the site currently drains towards the north to Wolf Creek. Drainage currently sheet flows over site and is not directed towards any formal storm drainage system. The applicant proposes to install curb, gutter, and sidewalks along Railroad Avenue. The proposed project will also collect onsite drainage, where improvements are installed, direct this into a sand filter and detention tank, and then connect this into the City's storm drainage system along Railroad Avenue.

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shows a large portion of the site within the 100-year floodplain. Currently three of the buildings and the above-ground storage tanks are located within zone AE of the 100-year flood plain. A portion of the fourth building and some of the underground fuel tank are also located with zone AE. Zone AE represents the floodway fringe, or the area which allows encroachment. The proposed building will be located at least two-feet above the 100-year flood level, and a small portion of this building will encroach within Zone AE. The proposed fuel tanks and containment area are located in Zone AE and the finished floor will be located above the 100-year flood level. Even though buildings can be developed in the floodway fringe, the project will result in the removal of approximately 3,500 square feet of structures in the existing floodway fringe. This represents reduction the amount of obstructions which in turn should improve the on-site and off-site flooding potential. The City includes a standard condition of approval, for all development in the floodway fringe that requires a floodplain elevation certificate be provided by an applicant prior to issuance of building permits. Therefore, a specific mitigation measure is not necessary.

Conclusion: The proposed stormwater system is expected to improve the water quality over existing conditions. By removing existing structures and other improvements within the 100-year floodplain, the project is expected to reduce on-site and off-site flooding. Therefore, impacts associated with hydrology and water quality are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE PLANNING				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or Land Use Code) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmland from incompatible uses)?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The City of Grass Valley's General Plan designates the property as Manufacturing/Industrial. The proposed redevelopment is consistent with this designation. The zoning for the property is M-1. The Development Code allows petroleum product storage and distribution, and gas stations as permitted uses in the M-1 Zone. There are no habitat conservation plans or farming operations in the area. The proposed project will be redeveloping an older fuel distribution facility which will incorporate more efficient and environmentally effective fuel storage and distribution systems.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with land use and planning are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	
b. Result in 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?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The General Plan Mineral Management Element states a good portion of the City is classified as having significant mineral deposits; but, it also notes there is limited opportunity to mine these areas because of the existing incompatible urban development. This property is located adjacent to one of the two areas identified in the Mineral Management Element as being targeted for mining conservation. However, the proposed M-1 uses are considered compatible with potential mining activities.

Conclusions: Impacts associated with mineral resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?			X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. 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?				X
f. 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?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The General Plan establishes maximum allowable noise levels for different land uses. The project site is currently developed and surrounded by one vacant property and industrial and commercial buildings. Temporary noise will occur during the demolition and reconstruction. Once completed, the project can be expected to generate the same level of traffic related noise, and noise related to the movement of products on the site. However, there are no noise sensitive land uses adjacent to the proposed project which could be impacted by this project. Even though the property is exposed to noise from Highway 20/20, proposed use is not considered a noise sensitive use. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or near a private or public airport.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with noise are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The proposed commercial use is allowed and a commercial use was planned for in the City's 2020 General Plan and therefore would not affect regional or local population or housing projections. The project will not displace any existing housing or affect the affordability of housing. Therefore, the project will not impact population or housing in the area or City.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with population and housing are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental 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:				X
i. Fire protection?				X
ii. Police protection?				X
iii. Schools?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other Public Facilities?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The project is located within the city limits of Grass Valley, and within the service boundaries of the City. The project would be served by the City of Grass Valley Fire and Police Departments. With proper fire prevention measures as required under the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code, the project is not expected to significantly impact Fire Department services. Since the project will not add any new building square footage, the applicant will not impact any other City services.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with public services are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. RECREATION.				
Would the Project:				
a. 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?				X
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The redevelopment of the site will not lead to a new demand for the recreational opportunities. The City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan does not show any planned park or trail sites on the property.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with recreation are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
Would the proposal:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street 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)?				X
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c. 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?				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The redevelopment of the site will not lead to an increase in traffic, change traffic patterns, or impact emergency access or parking. The project will reduce the total amount of buildings on the site and the use is remaining the same; therefore, no increase in traffic is anticipated. Currently, there is no defined ingress and egress on the property. With the installation of curb, gutter, and sidewalks, the project will improve access to the site by directing vehicles to specific locations for ingress and egress.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with traffic and circulation are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects?			X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements necessary?				X
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers: The project will require connections to the existing water, sewer, storm drainage power, and communication systems. All these systems and utilities are available to the site. The property is within the Nevada Irrigation District service area. Waste Management provides solid waste service to the City. The project is, and will continue to be, connected to the City's sewer system. The City has approved development projects involving potential increased demands on the City's waste water treatment plant, recognizing the potential limits on sewer availability. A recent expansion of the sewer plant capacity from 1.72 to 2.78 MGD (million gallons per day), provides adequate sewer capacity for the proposed project. The project will be required to provide for on-site storm water detention pursuant to the City's standard conditions of approval and be required to connect this to the stormwater drainage system on Railroad Avenue.

Conclusion: No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project.

Mitigation: None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife species population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and the effects of probable future projects)			X	
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

Discussion of Checklist Answers: As discussed in sections 1 through 17 above, the project, as mitigated, will not impact habitat of a fish, wildlife or plant species, nor will it create substantial adverse impacts on human beings. The project is consistent with the City's General Plan and, as mitigated, it is not expected to create significant impacts on the environment. No short-term impacts were noted that could lead to potential long-term impacts. Since the project is consistent with the General Plan the project can rely on established impact fees to address any potential cumulative impacts created by this development.

REFERENCES: The following references used in preparing this report have not been attached to this report. The reference material listed below is available for review upon request of the Grass Valley Community Development Department, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945 (530) 274-4330.

- City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan and General Plan EIR
- Background Report, City of Grass Valley General Plan Update, November 1998
- Soil Survey of Nevada County, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service
- Flood Insurance Rate Map 06057C0631E, dated February 3, 2010
- Correspondence related to the monitoring

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Vicinity/Location Map