
**Annexation (10PLN-19),
General Plan Amendment (10PLN-21),
Prezone (10PLN-20)
and Development Review (10DRC-19)**

**Initial Study and
Proposed Negative Declaration**

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

February 28, 2011

Annexation (10PLN-19), General Plan Amendment (10PLN-21),
Prezone (10PLN-20) and Development Review (10DRC-19)

Initial Study & Negative Declaration

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: John Miller
Milco Development Inc.
13620 Lincoln Way, Ste 300
Auburn, CA 95603

Contact: John Miller

PROJECT LOCATION: The 7.73 acre project is located south of Whispering Pines Lane and west of Crown Point Circle next to the Whispering Pines Business Park (APN's 09-680-50, 09-680-53 and 09-680-49). The property is currently located within the County boundaries, with the eastern property line abutting the City limits.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project consists of the following four applications:

1. An annexation of the entire 7.73 acres into the City of Grass Valley which is within the Sphere of Influence for the 2000-2005 time horizon. Also includes annexing 7.52 acres into the Nevada Irrigation Water District (APN's 09-680-50 and 53)
2. A rezoning of the site to M-1 (Light Industrial/Manufacturing) to allow the type of proposed development consistent with the adjacent parcels.
3. A general plan amendment to change the proposed general plan from BP (Business Park) to M-I (Light Industrial/Manufacturing) in order to be consistent with the surrounding parcels and zoning designation.
4. Development Review for the construction of three, single-story light industrial buildings on the site. The buildings total 57,315 square feet and the project includes 169 parking spaces, a bocce ball court, horseshoe pit area and picnic area. Landscaping includes the use of boulders and shrubs throughout the site and shade trees located in the parking lot and around the buildings.

REVIEW PERIOD: (30 days) March 2, 2011 through April 1, 2011

Annexation (10PLN-19), General Plan Amendment (10PLN-21),
Prezone (10PLN-20) and Development Review (10DRC-19)

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

1. **Application Number:** Annexation 10PLN-19, Prezone 10PLN-20, General Plan Amendment 10PLN-21 and Development Review Application 10DRC-19.

2. **Applicant's/Representative's** John Miller
Name and Address: Milco Development
13620 Lincoln Way, Ste 300
Auburn, CA 95603

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 project consists of the following four applications:
 1. An annexation of 7.73 acres currently within the County's jurisdiction. This site was designated in the Sphere of Influence for 2000-2005 horizon for annexation. Also includes annexation of 7.72 acres into the Nevada Irrigation Water District (APN's 09-680-50 & 53)
 2. A pre-zoning of the land from the County's BP zoning district to the City's M-1 (Light Industrial) zoning district. This zoning would be consistent with the zoning of the adjacent properties.
 3. A general plan amendment to modify the 2020 General Plan from BP to M-I to allow light industrial and manufacturing consistent with adjoining properties.
 4. Development Review for the construction of three, single-story light industrial buildings on the site. The buildings total 57,315 square feet and include 169 parking spaces, a bocce ball court, horseshoe pit area and picnic area. The project also includes landscaping and shading in the parking lot and around the buildings.

5. **Project Location:** The 7.73 acres site is located along the south side of Whispering Pines Lane, west of the intersection with Clydesdale Court.

6. **General Plan Designation:** M-I

7. **Zoning:** M-1

8. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, Nevada Irrigation District

Annexation (10PLN-19), General Plan Amendment (10PLN-21),
Prezone (10PLN-20) and Development Review (10DRC-19)

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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input 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 | | |

Annexation (10PLN-19), General Plan Amendment (10PLN-21),
Prezone (10PLN-20) and Development Review (10DRC-19)

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 City of Grass Valley'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 view shed protection measures. Caltrans has noted 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 project site includes of a knolltop in the west central portion of the site. The site slopes away from the knolltop. The site has not previously had development although there are dirt roads and trails and many trees which were removed several years ago. The site is not within the highway 20/49 corridor. There is a Ponderosa Pine forest mixed with black oaks, firs, and incense cedars throughout approximately 5 acres of the site. A narrow band of Digger Pines Woodland is along the north side bordering Whispering Pines Lane. Numerous native species including poison oak, mountain misery and deerbrush are scattered over the site indicating previous disturbances on the site. Portions of the site have previously been graded with dirt roads winding through.

The proposed buildings include a design that is found within the Whispering Pines area. The Development Review Committee and/Planning Commission could request some additional architectural treatment (e.g. a wainscot, color changes) on the buildings. Such architectural changes would be considered minor. The landscape plan includes perimeter planting to screen the drive aisle, parking and loading/storage areas. The landscape plan also shows the location of new trees and location of those trees to be retained in close proximity to the developed areas of the site.

The site has previously been modified over the years being used originally for mining and storage of waste rock in the 1940's. A small earthen reservoir was below the property (located to the south) but has not had any activity since that time. The site has been allowed to revert to a more natural state. The proposed development area would require grading to accommodate the 57,315 square feet of commercial development. This will result in the need to remove approximately 29 trees with a diameter of 8" or greater. The applicant estimates roughly 180 trees would be preserved. This represents a preservation rate of approximately 86%, which exceeds the City's goal of 20% tree retention. The plan does provide for protection of trees around the perimeter of the site which will create screening along the western side of the property. Proposed lighting for the site incorporates twenty pole lights, 20 feet high in the parking areas and twenty seven wall light units on the buildings which are designed to be shielded and directed downward. The proposed lighting generated would be less than a three (3) foot candle radius.

The City's Development Code standard for lighting in parking lots is a maximum height of 14 feet although the Development Review Committee may allow fixtures to be up to 20 feet high. The Design Guidelines for industrial areas does state that light standards shall not exceed 20 feet. The adjoining property to south and west are currently vacant, and properties to the north and east abutting the City limits are also industrial uses where no light spillage will occur onto the neighboring properties. The levels would be considered within acceptable limits for light generation and distribution.

Conclusion:

The property is not designated as a scenic vista, and will not significantly degrade the visual character of the area. Additionally, the property is not within a scenic highway corridor. The proposed lighting plan demonstrates that the project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it is developed as proposed.

Mitigation:

No significant impacts associated with aesthetics or scenic resources are anticipated within his commercial development. No mitigation measures would be 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, the 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 standards but exceeds 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. The PM-10 is usually associated with dust generated during construction. The project will require excavation work to accommodate the building pads and roadways. Dust generated by grading and construction activities could have a potential to create short-term air quality impacts. The use and operation of the business will not generate pollutants, odors or impact air movement in the immediate area. Even though this is a relocation and expansion of an existing business, the project is expected to generate additional vehicular traffic which will increase local vehicle emissions. 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 NSAQMD threshold levels are divided into three levels (A, B, and C). Depending on which of the tiers the project falls within, the NSAQMD applies that level of mitigation. NSAQMD relies on the air quality program, URBEMIS 2007, version 9.2.4, to estimate criteria pollutants created by a project. Projects that generate 136 tons per day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), or Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) are considered significant impacts. The URBEMIS modeling indicates this project will result in total area source operational emissions of 0.38 tons/year ROG, 0.03 tons/year PM₁₀, 0.54 tons/year for NOx and 0.02 tons/year of PM_{2.5}.

Conclusion:

The modeling concludes this project will generate air emissions below the City threshold and no mitigation is needed. The project will be required to comply with NSAQMD standard mitigation measures. With the implementation of the mitigation measure, if necessary, the project would not have a significant impact on the environment associated with health hazards.

Mitigation:

1. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a Dust Mitigation Plan shall be submitted 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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- All areas with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions.
- All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.
- 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.
- No burning of waste material or vegetation shall take place on-site.

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
3. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES 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. Would the project:				
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?				X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
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))?				X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	
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?				X

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

This property is surrounded primarily by industrial uses. The project location is not considered as farmland or used for agricultural purposes. The property does not contain the Williamson Act contract, nor is it located near any active farms. There will be no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Conclusion:

Impacts associated with the agricultural and forest resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

No mitigation measures 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 is located on the south side of Whispering Pines Lane near Clydesdale Court. The topography of the site generally slopes away from a knolltop which is located in the west-central portion of the site. There currently is no development on the property. The site has previously undergone minor modifications which were not for any approved development project. There appears to have previously had a small earthen water reservoir/pond for possible lumber and or mining activity in varied locations. There are dirt roads and trails in and around the site. Aerial photos spanning from 1947 to 2005 indicate that any modifications which had occurred on the site appear to have reverted to resemble the undeveloped status of the late 1940's. A preliminary biological inventory conducted in 2007 did not show any indications of special-status plant or animal species on the site. There is an existing intermittent drainage ditch along the eastern side of the property with sparse seasonal riparian habitat. The pond does not appear to have been used during the past 40 years and does not contain wetland or riparian habitats.

The site contains thickets of ponderosa pines mixed with oaks, firs and incense cedars. A small band of Serpentine Foothill Pines (Digger) are located adjacent to Whispering Pines Lane which have been degraded from improvements along the road (Whispering Pines Lane). The project site has non-native grasses throughout.

The biological study indicates an intermittent drainage ditch that has seasonal riparian habitat located along the eastern boundary under existing power lines. The Army Corps of Engineers verified a wetland delineation for the area. The biological study includes mitigation, which will reduce these impacts to a level that is less than significant. The applicant has applied and received a Nationwide 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers (NWP39) for the loss of .018 acre of intermittent and .369 acre of riparian wetland. This was presented in a letter from the Army Corps of Engineers dated May 13, 2010. A 401 permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a 1602 permit from the California Department of Fish and Game will also be required.

The study also notes that there are a variety of larger trees on site that create a canopy cover and could potentially support nesting raptors. Since a number of trees will be removed for the project, there is a potential the project could impact nesting raptors. Therefore, a mitigation measure is included to reduce any impacts on these birds. The site does not contain, nor is it near, any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Conclusion:

With the incorporation of the following mitigation measures, impacts associated with biological resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

2. The applicant shall comply with the terms of the nationwide Section 404 permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This shall include obtaining a Section 401 water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a Section 1602 permit from the Department of Fish and Game. The project shall implement mitigation as approved by the agencies. Such mitigation actions shall include appropriate temporary and permanent BMP's to protect water quality, as well as compensatory mitigation for the loss of habitat by means of payment of in-lieu fees, construction or enhancement of habitat, or a combination of these actions.

3. Pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors should be conducted prior to construction activities between March 1 and September 30. Surveys should be completed no later than 7 days prior to commencement of grading activity. If a legally-protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, removal shall be delayed until after September 30th or until the adults and young are no longer dependent on the nest which will need to be determined by a biologist. If no raptor nests are detected, construction activities may proceed with no further mitigation.

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 site is currently vacant and surrounded by other business park or vacant land. The General Plan identifies this property as having moderate cultural sensitivity. This area is classified as moderate due to past mining activities that have occurred in the vicinity of the property. There are no visible signs of historical resources in the development area. The CEQA guidelines require, as part of the objectives, criteria and procedures required by section 21082 of Public Resources Code, a lead agency should make provisions if historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction. A mitigation measure is proposed to address this should cultural resources be discovered

during construction consistent with the cultural and historic element of the General Plan.

Conclusion

With the incorporation of the following mitigation measure, impacts associated with cultural resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

4. If grading or other construction operations unearth archeological or historical artifacts or resources, construction activities shall cease. The Planning Department shall be notified of the extent and location of discovered materials so that they may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist. Disposition of artifacts shall comply with state and federal laws. A note of this requirement shall be clearly delineated on the grading and building plans of the project.

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:				
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
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 Soil Survey of Nevada County identifies the soils on the western and central site as "Sites very stony loam" and on the eastern portion "Alluvial Land, Clayey, soil type". The Stony Loam is a well-drained soil which has a medium runoff potential and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. The Alluvial Land, Clayey is reported to be moderately to poorly drained soils. This soil is generally considered a stable soil, with moderate landslide potential. There are no identified active fault lines on the property. The project will require a substantial amount of grading

to accommodate the project. The preliminary grading plan shows the use of retaining walls which range in heights between 1 and 8 feet along the southwest and between 3 and 4 feet on the eastern portion of the site. The current standard for retaining walls in the City is 6 feet. This will be addressed by the Development Review Committee and the City Engineering Department since it is not visible from the public view. The southeast corner of the site has a 2:1 fill proposed. The City of Grass Valley is located in the low intensity zone for earthquake severity. A Geotechnical Report dated November 8, 2010 was submitted with the application. The geotechnical report concludes that the site is suitable for the proposed project. There are standard conditions in the report which the applicant will need to comply with. The project will be required to comply with the City's erosion control standards and Storm Water Management program during construction.

Conclusion:

With the incorporation of the following mitigation measure, impacts associated with geology and geologic hazards are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

5. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a detailed engineering plan shall be prepared that incorporates recommendations identified in the Geotechnical Report dated November 8, 2010. Geotechnical measures shall be incorporated into project grading and construction. A Geotechnical Engineer shall review the grading for implementation of those recommendations and design criteria.

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 nonindustrial 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. Although it is possible to estimate a project's CO₂ emissions, it is not possible to determine whether or how an individual project's relatively small incremental contribution might translate into physical effects on the environment. Specifically, the URBEMIS model indicates this project would emit approximately 437.85 tons of CO₂ annually. This number does not consider the project design and mitigation measures which will reduce this number. The project's emissions represent less than 0.0000037 percent of the projected statewide GHG emissions in the year 2010. Given the complex interactions between various global and regional-scale physical, chemical, atmospheric, terrestrial, and aquatic systems, it is not possible to determine whether the project's CO₂ emissions would result in any altered conditions. Therefore, an individual project's GHG emissions must be considered in the global and statewide context. This requires GHG emissions to be considered in a cumulative context.

Even though we are unable to quantify the level of impact a project may have on global climate changes, an applicant and the City can take steps to reduce GHG emissions on a project by project basis. The applicant has incorporated a number of energy efficient measures and designed the project to include many smart growth principles. Within the Project Summary document, the applicant also identifies other measures which will reduce GHG emissions. These measures are consistent with the California State Attorney General's Office, which provides guidance on methods for reducing GHG emissions. The Attorney General's document titled "Addressing Climate Change at the Project Level" includes recommendations for energy efficient buildings, appliances, heating and cooling systems, passive solar, energy efficient lighting, water conservation and landscaping, and many other design and operational measures that can reduce GHG emissions. Specific examples this project incorporates include a site design providing good southern exposure for most of the buildings, clustering buildings to reduce impacts on the land and preserve trees and native vegetation. Furthermore, Section 10 of this study discusses the City's General Plan and Development Code policies and standards that support the AG's guidelines.

Conclusion:

Given there are no state, regional, or local threshold to objectively determine the level of impact created by an individual project, and that this project would generate less than a 0.0000037 percent unmitigated increase in GHG emissions, the project is expected to result in an impact that is less than significant. Additionally, some air districts have estimated a CO₂ reduction factor for specific project design features and mitigation measures.

Mitigation:

- 6. All buildings shall include energy efficient indoor and outdoor lighting and light colored "cool" roofs.
- a. At least 75% of the landscaping within the open space and common areas shall include native and/or drought tolerant landscaping. Shade trees shall be provided at a rate of one for every 25 linear feet of landscaped area.
- b. Size & orientation of windows & doors shall be designed to take advantage of sun, shade & wind conditions to minimize the requirement on mechanical heating and cooling systems. Site buildings to take advantage of solar orientation. Proper building orientation facilitates the use of natural daylight.
- c. Incorporate Natural Cooling by utilizing shading from tree canopies (for east & west facing glass). Any combination of natural cooling techniques can be used to reduce overheating, reduce the need for air conditioning and reduce energy.
- d. All windows shall be Energy Star rated.
- e. Upgrade insulation to exceed California Title 24 requirements.

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 property is not listed as a hazardous materials site. The parcels are not located near any schools. The Nevada County Airport is located to the east of the property; however, the project site is not located within any of the four safety zones. The project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The property has a significant amount of vegetation which could expose people and structures to wildland fire hazards. The project will be required to reduce ladder fuels and dead vegetation as part of the standard Fire Department requirements.

The geotechnical report noted a potential concern regarding a possible open vertical shaft on the western portion of property. The site appears to be located over 100 feet from the proposed retaining wall and building site. The shaft will need to be excavated and a determination made on how to mitigate by either over excavation with removal of debris or capped with a concrete plug.

Conclusion:

Impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

7. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, the possible open vertical mine shaft on the western side of the project shall be excavated and evaluated by a Geotechnical Engineer to determine the proper method for closing/sealing shaft.

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 project site, as with a majority of the City, is located within the Wolf Creek Drainage Basin. Wolf Creek is located 600 feet to the north of the project site. The property has an intermittent tributary and seasonal riparian area which has been delineated by the Army Corp of Engineers. The FIRM map produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency did not identify the project site as being located in the 100-year floodplain that could expose people or property to flooding. The project will not utilize ground water and therefore should not impact the flow,

quality, or loss of ground water. The project will require grading and the addition of approximately 139,984 square feet of new impervious surfaces (41% of the property) to accommodate the proposed development. The project proposes to collect all storm water runoff and direct it through two storm drain conduits into stormceptors and then dispersed into drainage along Whispering Pines Lane (along northwest) and along the south side into natural drainage. The storm water detention facilities are proposed in pipes under the parking lot and would be designed so as to maintain pre-development storm water runoff. The runoff from the site may contain grease, oil and other petroleum by-product, as well as other sediments that may have the potential of impacting the Wolf Creek watershed. The City will require grease, oil and other petroleum by-product separators to be installed at the drainage inlets to prevent the pollutants from entering the storm water detention facility. The project may have short term impacts associated with sediment and run off during grading and construction. The project will be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Management Plans which incorporates "Best Management Practices" (BMP's) during the development of the property.

Onsite drainage to be directed to one of the two onsite drainage collection/detention systems and will be released at pre-development flow rates to the original basin.

Conclusion

With the inclusion of the City's standard conditions for storm water management, 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 project site is currently located within the unincorporated area of Nevada County. The 7.73 acre site is located adjacent to the City of Grass Valley city limits and is within the City's Sphere of Influence. The project includes an application for Annexation into the City and Prezone from the County's BP zoning to the City's M-1 (Light Industrial). The applicant has also applied for a General Plan Amendment to establish consistency between the zoning designation and the general plan. The City's BP zoning designation does not allow for the manufacturing/light industrial that the applicant has designated for this development. The proposal represents a logical expansion which was planned for within the Sphere of Influence and would not divide an established community. The area has not been used for agricultural purposes nor is it near any farming locations. The site is not near any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Included below are General Plan goals and policies as they relate to avoidance of, or mitigation of environmental effects and references to sections of the Development Code.

Land Use Element:

10- LUP Annex properties within the Grass Valley Planning Area prior to or in conjunction with their development.

29- LUP Promote the establishment and expansion of the businesses and industries offering professional, light manufacturing and technical employment opportunities related to the existing and developing forms of technology.

Circulation Element:

- 1-COSG Provide and balance between development and the natural environment, protecting and properly utilizing Grass Valley's sensitive environmental areas/features, natural resource and open space lands. COSO objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6-COSO include statements for minimizing impacts to sensitive and natural resources.
- 2-COSG Protect, enhance and restore hydrologic features, including stream corridors, flood plains, wetlands, and riparian zones.
- 6-COSG Assure compliance with and understanding of air and water quality regulations and standards.
- 7-CO Use of City standards throughout the Planning Area.
- 10-CO Protection of stream courses, riparian areas and other natural features.
- 13-CO Improvement of the transportation system to facilitate commerce and economic development.

Safety Element:

- 6-SP Incorporate fire hazard reduction considerations into land use plan/patterns, both public and private.
- 8-SI Require new developments to utilize on-site storm water detention techniques.
- 9-SI Establish site development standards designed to minimize the resulting area and percentage of impervious surface.

Community Design Policies:

- 14-CDP Integrate natural areas for runoff detention in all major new development.
- 17-CDP Assure adequate City design review of all new development.

The Grass Valley Development Code includes other chapters that apply to this project as well. Chapter 17.54 relating to Hillside and Ridgeline Development, and Chapter 17.34 for Landscaping Standards. Chapter 17.62 includes the standards for grading and erosion control.

Conclusion:

In response to the General Plan goals, objectives, and policies as they relate to avoiding or mitigating environmental effect as well as the key chapters of the Development Code that need to be addressed during the review and approval process. Impacts associated with land use and planning are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required for the land use section.

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 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:

No mitigation measure would be 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	
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 Noise Element establishes maximum allowable noise levels for different types of land uses. The project site is currently vacant and has residential uses to the southeast. Temporary noise will occur during construction. The City has established hours for construction which will minimize the neighbors expose to the construction noise. Once completed, the project can be expected to generate traffic related noise, and noise related to truck deliveries of products to the site. However, the vehicle-related noises will be limited to occasional deliveries and not create constant noise levels. 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:

No mitigation measures would be 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)?				X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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:

No mitigation measures would be 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	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Payment of new development fees will address the project's impact on City Fire and Police Department Services. The project will be required to pay the adopted school impact fees and therefore, not impact schools. The project will not require the need for new maintenance of new public facilities or roads. No significant impact on public services is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the public services section.

Conclusion:

Impacts associated with public services are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

No mitigation measures would be 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 development of proposed project would not have a significant impact on the recreational opportunities or demand in the City of Grass Valley. The City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan does not show any planned park sites on the property although there is a proposed trail which connects Whispering Pines Lane out to East Bennett and along to Kidder Avenue. While the City Park and Recreation Master Plan has been adopted, a formal Trail Master Plan and Design Guidelines have not been defined

Conclusion:

With no staffing or funding, the Trails Master Plan and Design Guidelines are considered only recommendations. The trail system would need to be implemented in order to allow commercial and residential areas to be connected. Impacts associated with recreation are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

No mitigation measures would be required for the recreation section.

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:

Based on the Traffic Analysis prepared by TJKM on January 25, 2011, the project is expected to generate 56 trips occurring during the p.m. peak hour. The City's traffic policy requires traffic reports for projects that are estimated to generate more than 50 p.m. peak hour vehicle trip and are not consistent with the General Plan. The traffic analysis concluded that the intersections that would be utilized with this project would continue to operate at an acceptable Level of Service "C" (LOS) and would not be considered significant per the City of Grass Valley Guidelines. Projects that generate less than this are considered less than significant but will pay AB 1600 traffic fees. The project does not affect air traffic patterns. No increase in traffic hazards are expected and the property has adequate emergency access. The Development Code requires 136 parking spaces for the uses on site, and the applicant proposes 169 spaces. The project does not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs.

Conclusion:

The Traffic Analysis/Study showed the traffic impacts to be less than significant which would not require a Comprehensive Traffic Impact Study. It is recommended and will be required by the City of Grass Valley that all applicable associated traffic fees for Regional Transportation and Grass Valley transportation be paid at time of building permit issuance. Impacts associated with traffic and circulation are considered less than significant.

Mitigation:

No mitigation measure required.

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 and will need to be annexed into the district boundary. Waste Management provides solid waste service to the City. The project will 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. However, specific approval to connect to the sewer system must be obtained from the City at the time of building permit issuance. The project will be required to provide for on-site storm water detention pursuant to the City's standard conditions of approval.

Conclusion:

No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project.

Mitigation:

No mitigation measures would be required for the utility services section.

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 16 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 as mitigated, it is not expected to create significant impacts on the environment. The project will not create cumulative impacts with the inclusion of the mitigation measures, by complying with the City's development standards, and by paying appropriate AB1600 fees.

Conclusion:

The project, as mitigated, will not create a significant adverse impact on the environment.

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,
- Geotechnical Report, by Holdrege and Kull, dated November 8, 2010
- Traffic Analysis Report, prepared by TJKM, dated January 2011
- Whispering Pines Specific Plan and EIR, 1984
- Biological Inventory Report, prepared by Marcus Boles dated September 2007
- Army Corps of Engineer Permit (NWP 39) letter dated May 13, 2010

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Vicinity/Location Map
2. Reduced site plan