
(PROJECT #07PLN-25)

**Initial Study and
Proposed Negative Declaration**

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

April 22, 2008

Proposed **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: Daniel D. Chance, Associate Planner
(530) 274-4333

PROJECT APPLICANT: Brian Bisnett
Bisnett Design Associates
16046 Bear Court
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Contact: Brian Bisnett

REVIEW PERIOD: April 25, 2008 to May 27, 2008

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located at 454, 478 Carol Drive and 10530 Doris Drive, northwesterly of the Carol Drive and Doris Drive intersection, in the City of Grass Valley, Nevada County (APN 08-200-03, 08-230-14 & 21) in the R-1 (Single Family Residence) Zoning District.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Tentative Map Application (07PLN-25) to subdivide an 114,998 square foot parcel into eleven residential lots. The size of the eleven lots range from 9,652 to 11,742 square feet. Each lot would be developed with a detached single family residential unit and either an attached or detached one-car garage. A private road extends through the property providing access to eight of the residential units, a short driveway provides access to two residential units, and one residential unit is fronting on Carol Drive. The project includes two guest parking spaces along Iris Lane. The design of the proposed residential units is neo-craftsman, which includes large covered front porches and multiple pitched gable roofs. The sizes of the residential units range from approximately 900 to 1,700 square feet. The elevations of the site range from 2,496 to 2,552 feet above sea level. The steeper slopes located along the northern portions of the property are not proposed to be disturbed with this project. A 4 to 6 foot stacked rock retaining wall is proposed to be located behind the residential units on lots 5, 6, & 7. A small stream (Slide Creek Ravine) divides the property, with the proposed development on both sides of the swale. Iris Lane crosses over the stream at the same location of the existing driveway. The project includes roadway improvements and additional right-of-way dedication along the entire length of Carol Drive.

The 2.75 acre site currently has a detached single family residence and an older barn along Carol Drive. The vegetation on the project site consists of a coniferous forest on the hillside, riparian vegetation, and non-native landscape vegetation around the residence. The General Plan designates the property as

Urban Low Density Residential (ULD). This designation allows from 1 to 4 units per acre, which would be 2 to 11 units for this property. The properties are zoned R-1 (Single Family Residence) which would be consistent with the proposed Urban Low Density land use designation for the property. The project would be consistent with the development standards.

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

1. **Application Number:** 07PLN25
2. **Applicant's/Representative's Name and Address:** Brian Bisnett
Bisnett Design Associates
16046 Bear Court
Grass Valley, CA. 95945
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Grass Valley,
Community Development Department
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95949

4. **Project Description:** Tentative Map Application (07PLN-25) to subdivide an 114,998 square foot parcel into eleven residential lots. The size of the eleven lots range from 9,652 to 11,742 square feet. Each lot would be developed with a detached single family residential unit and either an attached or detached one-car garage. A private road extends through the property providing access to eight of the residential units, a short driveway provides access to two residential units, and one residential unit is fronting on Carol Drive. The project includes two guest parking spaces along Iris Lane. The design of the proposed residential units is neo-craftsman, which includes large covered front porches and multiple pitched gable roofs. The sizes of the residential units range from approximately 900 to 1,700 square feet. The elevations of the site range from 2,496 to 2,552 feet above sea level. The steeper slopes located along the northern portions of the property are not proposed to be disturbed with this project. A 4 to 6 foot stacked rock retaining wall is proposed to be located behind the residential units on lots 5, 6, & 7. A small stream (Slide Creek Ravine) divides the property, with the proposed development on both sides of the swale. Iris Lane crosses over the stream at the same location of the existing driveway. The project includes roadway improvements and additional right-of-way dedication along the entire length of Carol Drive.

The 2.75 acre site currently has a detached single family residence and an older barn along Carol Drive. The vegetation on the project site consists of a coniferous forest on the hillside, riparian vegetation, and non-native landscape vegetation around the residence.

5. **Project Location:** The project is located at 454, 478 Carol Drive and 10530 Doris Drive, northwesterly of the Carol Drive and Doris Drive intersection, in the City of Grass Valley, Nevada County (APN 08-200-03, 08-230-14 & 21) in the R-1 (Single Family Residence) Zoning District.
6. **General Plan Designation:** Urban Low Density
7. **Zoning:** R-1 (Single Family Residence)
8. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** Building Permit & Grading Permit
Department of Fish and Game and Army Corp of Engineers if work is proposed in the wetland/riparian habitat.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <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 | | |

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:

a-c. 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 view; as well a improving the entrances to the community. This project consists of subdividing a 2.7 acre parcel into eleven single family residential lots. The project would be located along Doris and Carol Drive. The development would not be visible from any designated scenic corridor or vistas. The development would not impact major views. The design of the new single family residential units would be consistent with the homes in the immediate neighborhood.

d. The site plan did not identify street lights through the project. No street lights would be required along Doris or Carol Drive. Any lighting associated with the residential development would not create a substantial glare or affect nighttime views.

Conclusion: Impacts associated with aesthetics are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the aesthetics section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AIR QUALITY 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. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			x	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			x	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?		x		
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			x	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				x

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a.-e. The project is located within the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD). 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 ozone 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 minor excavation work to accommodate the roads, building pads and parking areas. Dust generated by grading and construction activities could have a potential to create short-term air quality impacts. The project will be required to comply with adopted construction standards for dust control. The use and operation of the business will not generate pollutants, odors or impact air movement in the immediate area. The project will generate approximately 105 additional daily vehicle trips for the eleven residential units on the property.

Conclusion: With the implementation mitigation measure below to reduce potential dust impacts all other impacts associated with air quality resources are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 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 plan on-site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. 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

a.-d. The 2.7 acre site currently has a seasonal stream flowing through the center of the property. The project includes subdividing the property into eleven residential lots and construction of eleven detached residential units. The vegetation on the project site consists of a coniferous forest on the hillside, riparian vegetation along the stream, and non-native landscape vegetation around the residence. Riparian and wetland habitat associated with the stream extends through this property (Slide Ravine). The location of a large percentage of development is proposed in an area that has been previously disturbed and landscaped with non-native vegetation. A Biological Constraints Analysis was prepared for the site by North fork Associates on August 8, 2007. The analysis included on-site field surveys, mapping the extent of the wetland, and identifying the onsite biological communities and habitats. The vegetation on the property included upland vegetation and riparian vegetation:

- **Upland Vegetation** - Upland areas of the project site support mixed coniferous forest dominated by Ponderosa pine (*Pinus Ponderosa*). non-dominates include black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*), incense cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*), madrone (*arbutus menziesii*), Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), and coffeberry (*rhamnus tomentella*).
- **Riparian Vegetation** - The riparian areas along Slide Ravine supports a riparian habitat dominated by a canopy of white alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*) with an understory Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*) and herbaceous vegetation including curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multilorum*), Mexican rush (*Juncus Mexicanus*), and nipplewort (*Lapana communis*).

The wetland delineation identified the boundaries of the riparian wetlands and emergent wetlands. The wetland habitat is divided into two areas that include "Seep" (0.03 acres) and Perennial Stream/Slide Ravine (0.19 acres). The 0.22 acres of wetland area is located on both sides of the creek and running up the hillside along the northern property boundary. A driveway currently crosses Slide Creek, and the proposed private roadway (Iris Lane) would be located at the same location. The proposed roadway may be wider than the current driveway and could result in the loss of riparian wetland on either sides of the driveway. No wildlife corridor was identified on the property as part of the analysis. However, the scope of this project would not impede any wildlife using the area adjacent to the Slide Ravine as a corridor.

Special status plant and animal species are known to occur within the Grass Valley area and could occur onsite, although no specific occurrences have been documented. Based on a 6-quadrangle query of the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database, the special status species with potential to occur onsite include:

**Table 1
Potential for Occurrence of Special Status Plant and
Animal Species in the in the Doris Drive Area**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Habitat Description	Likelihood of Occurrence
Plants				
Stebbins' morning glory	<i>Calystegia stebbinsii</i>	FE/CE/ List 1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, red clay soils. Endemic to Pine Hill formation in El Dorado and Nevada Counties	Unlikely. No habitat is available onsite.
Brandegee's clarkia	<i>Clarkia biloba brandegeae</i>	FSC/List 1B	Foothill woodland, yellow pine forest, chaparral and cismontane woodland. Often found in roadcuts.	Unlikely. Marginal habitat onsite.
Pine Hill flannelbush	<i>Fremontodendron decumbens</i>	FE/CR/ List 1B	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, on rocky ridges, gabbro or serpentine soils. Endemic to gabbroic chaparral community in El Dorado and Nevada Counties	Unlikely. No habitat is available onsite.
Butte County fritillary	<i>Fritillaria eastwoodiae</i>	FSC/List 3	Chaparral; cismontane woodland; lower montane coniferous forest (openings); [sometime serpentine].	Unlikely. Marginal habitat onsite.
Red-anthered rush	<i>Juncus marginatus marginatus</i>	List 2	Marshes and swamps	None. No habitat is available onsite.
Cantelow's Lewisia	<i>Lewisia cantelovii</i>	FSC/List 1B	Broadleafed upland forest, lower	Unlikely. Marginal habitat onsite.
Bog club-moss	<i>Lycopodiella inundata</i>	List 2	Bogs and fens, lower montane coniferous forest, marshes and swamps.	None. No habitat is available onsite.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Habitat Description	Likelihood of Occurrence
Elongate copper-moss	<i>Mielichhoferia elongata</i>	List 2	Cismontane woodland.	Unlikely. Marginal habitat onsite.
Follett's monardella	<i>Monardella follettii</i>	FSC/List 1B	Lower montane coniferous forest, open rocky serpentine slopes.	Unknown. Marginal montane coniferous forest and limited serpentine onsite.
Scadden Flat checkerbloom	<i>Sidalcea stipularis</i>	FSC/CE/ List 1B	Marshes and swamps, wet montane marshes fed by springs.	None. No habitat is available onsite.
Reptiles				
Northwestern pond turtle	<i>Clemmys marmorata marmorata</i>	FSC/CSC	Inhabits ponds, marshes, rivers, streams, and irrigation ditches with aquatic vegetation. Needs suitable basking sites and upland habitat for egg laying.	Does not occur on the site due to limited habitat.
California horned lizard	<i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontate</i>	FSC/CSC	Found in a variety of habitats, but most common in sandy washes with scattered shrubs. Requires open areas for sunning, shrubs for cover, and sandy soil for hiding. Feeds on ants and other insects.	Does not occur on the site due to lack of any appropriate habitat.

*The abbreviations for the "Status" column are defined as:

Federal

FE = Federal Endangered

FT = Federal Threatened

FC = Federal Candidate

FSC = Federal Species of Concern

FSLC = Federal Species of Local Concern

State

CE = California Endangered

CT = California Threatened

CR = California Rare

CC = California Candidate

CSC = California Species of Special Concern

CFP = California Fully Protected

California Native Plant Society

List 1A = Extinct

List 1B = Rare, threatened, or endangered in CA or elsewhere

List 2 = Rare, threatened, or endangered in CA, more common elsewhere

List 3 = More information is needed; a review list

List 4 = Limited distribution; a watch list

Since no development is occurring in the creek, the project is not expected to have a significant impact on migratory fish. In addition, as stated in the geotechnical section, the grading on site includes Best Management Practices (BMP's) with on-site containment that further reduces the impacts of sediment flowing in to the Slide Creek. If grading associated with this development were to enter the Slide Creek, the sediment would have a significant impact on the sensitive riparian habitat on-site as well as downstream. The project would require protective fencing separating the riparian habitat from the developed area. The project shall be conditioned to provide protective fencing around the boundaries of the riparian habitat. The site currently has a 36-inch wide culvert that is 33-feet long under the existing driveway. The City has determined that the size of the existing culvert is adequate and would develop Iris Lane over existing culvert. The project developer shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine if a 1602, Streambed Alteration Agreement, is required for any drainage lines or roadway improvements that may extend into the Slide Creek riparian habitat.

e. There are a total of 175 trees on property. The project requires the removal of 23-pines, 8-oaks, 1-alder and 1-willow tree. The majority of the native trees on the property are located either on the hillside or within the riparian habitat, with no disturbance proposed with those trees. The project would preserve 81% of the trees on the property. The project proposes 20-alders and 13-pines to be planted with this project. Additional trees would be planted on the property as part of the landscaping for each of the proposed residential units.

f. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans, NCCP's, or local conservation plans in the area.

Conclusion:

As stated above with the implementation of the landscape plan, as well as the requirements of keeping all equipment outside of the riparian habitat, will create less than significant impacts of development adjacent to the riparian habitat. As stated above, the proposed disturbance area is located outside of the riparian and wetland habitat. Even though not proposed, if the grading for the project takes place within the riparian habitat the applicant will be required to obtain the appropriate permits and certifications from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404 nationwide or individual permit), Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401 nationwide) and (Section 401 water quality certification), and Department of Fish and Game (Section 1602 streambed alteration agreement). Since, the development occurs outside of the riparian habitat, this project would not have a significant impact on biological resources. The project would be required to provide a Riparian Management Plan that lists appropriate vegetation, and require the removal of non-native invasive vegetation along Slide Creek. With a condition requiring protective fencing adjacent to the riparian habitat, the project would not have a significant impact on the biological resources. In addition, the project is not expected to impact plants and wildlife listed as endangered species or species of special concern.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to recordation of the final map, the applicant shall submit a Riparian Management Plan for the property's riparian habitat along Slide Creek which establishes vegetation management approaches for removing invasive, non-native vegetation and the replanting with native vegetation. The plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect and be approved by the Community Development Department. The plan shall also be incorporated into the CC&R's.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. 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

a-d. Most of the area proposed to be developed with this project has been significantly disturbed from existing development. The site consists of a previously graded area that has been used as a residential use. The General Plan identifies the cultural sensitivity of the property as low. No cultural surface features are evident. Past development has disturbed the property which reduces the potential for cultural resources on the property. The CEQA guidelines does 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.

The project includes the removal of a single family residence. The single family residence may be approximately fifty years old, and is not listed on any federal, state or local list of historic structures. The building does not represent an identified historic design consistent with the design of buildings in Grass Valley. The structure is not located in an area of historic homes and would not represent a significant historic structure within the City of Grass Valley or the immediate area.

Conclusion:

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

Mitigation 3:

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
5. 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

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

a.-e. A preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared for the project by Holdrege & Kull on September, 2006. The Soil Survey of Nevada County identifies a majority of the soils on the project site as "Hoda sandy loam" in the northwestern portion, "Sities loam" on the majority of the site, "Sities Very Stony Loam" on the northeastern portion of the site and "Cohasset-McCarthy Cobbly Loam" on the northwestern portion. These soil types are well drained soil with an erosion hazard potential is medium to high, and run-off is medium to rapid. These soils are generally considered a stable soil. The development area includes a small area of stockpiled soil that includes a wide variety of soils and other debris. The Geologic Map of Western Nevada County identifies the geologic make-up of the immediate area as Lake Combie Complex. 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 proposed site does not contain any unique geologic or physical features. No landslides or subsidence of the site is expected. The average gradient of the site is approximately 10 to 20% over the majority of the area proposed for development, with steeper slopes along the western edge of the property. No landslides or subsidence of the site is expected.

Review by the Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer determined the project as proposed is not expected to result in significant short-term and long-term geologic impacts. Erosion hazard potential is considered low. All projects are required to incorporate measures into the grading plan to minimize any short-term risks. The soils associated with this site are stable and the small structures are not expected to impact the site's geologic or soil stability. The Geotechnical Report provides a series of recommendations that addresses the stability of the site for the proposed development that is required to be implemented as part of the City's standards conditions.

The City Engineer would require the developer to provide a plan for erosion and temporary drainage and/or sedimentation control of the project site, as part of the development of the properties, as determined appropriate by the City Engineer. Those requirements include detailed grading, permanent erosion control and landscaping plans to be submitted for review and approval by the Engineering Department, prior to commencing site grading. During grading the City ensures, through on-site inspections, all erosion control measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

No significant geologic impacts are expected to occur as a result of the project. No mitigation is required for the geology and soils section.

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

6. 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

a-h. The proposed residential use will not use hazardous materials in its operations. Development of the site is not expected to result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances as long as proper construction methods are used. Construction methods will be monitored by the Building Department during construction.

Nevada County and the City of Grass Valley have a high probability for naturally occurring serpentine, ultramafic rock or naturally occurring asbestos. The geologic make-up of this area is Lake Combie Complex, which does not contain serpentine or ultramafic rock containing asbestos.

The Nevada County Airport is located to the southeast of the property; however, the project site is not located within the flight path or approach zone. The project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The area does have a potential for potential impacts associated with wildland fire. The site is surrounded by urbanized residential development; however, the immediate area of the development is heavily forested. There could be a potential for impacts associated

with wildland fire. The Fire Marshall has reviewed the plans and determined the site would have three separate roadways providing alternative routes for emergency evacuation and emergency vehicle access. The development of the residential units would have to comply with all fire code regulation for landscaping and specific vegetation clearance.

Conclusion:

No significant impact associated with health hazards is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the health hazards section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. 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

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

a-j. The FIRM map produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency did not identify the property as being located in the 100-year floodplain. Slide Creek flows through the center of the property, with riparian vegetation along the along the stream through the property.

Existing drainage on the site flows to Slide Creek which eventually flows into Wolf Creek. Drainage associated with the new development of eleven single family residences and roadways will result in an increase in run-off. The project proposes a detention basin located at the north side of the Iris Lane and Carol Drive intersection. The location of the detention basins would be located outside of the riparian habitat. The project would be conditioned to provide pre-development stormwater flows from the site, as well as, conditioned to include methods to minimize the flow of sediment disturbed during construction, which would be approved by the City Engineer. The use of the detention basin would reduce the peak post development flow. The size of the detention facility would be designed to maintain pre-development stormwater runoff. Any drainage discharge in the riparian habitat could require review and approval by the California Department of Fish and Game.

Water quality in the Slide Creek could be impacted during the construction if sediment is allowed to flow into the creek area. The project would be conditioned to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMP's) to control erosion and sedimentation from the site flowing into the creek during all grading activities, as well as providing protective fencing around the riparian habitat. As identified in Mitigation Measure #2, the project requires a Riparian Management Plan that would further protect the riparian habitat.

The City Engineer standard condition includes a detailed engineered drainage plan to be submitted for the review and approval by the City Engineer. The drainage plan shall be designed to ensure that off-site concentrated storm water flows will be equal to or less than pre-development conditions for a model storm event. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the approved engineered drainage plan. The project will be required to incorporate "Best Management Practices" to address short-term impacts of on-site sediments, including silt, sand and mud flowing into Slide Creek and the Wolf Creek drainage during construction. This plan shall provide approved methods to keep sediment disturbed during construction, and approved by the City Engineer. A condition would be added that the project developer shall provide evidence to the Community Development Director and the City Engineer that the California Department of Fish and Game has reviewed the project and determined if a 1602, Streambed Alteration Agreement, is required for the placement of the discharge drain lines into the Slide Creek.

Conclusion:

Impacts associated with hydrology and water quality resources are considered less than significant with the incorporation of the BMP's and the City's standard conditions associated with stormwater runoff and detention. No mitigation measures would be required for the hydrology and water quality section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. LAND USE PLANNING Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				x

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

a-d. The property is identified in the General Plan as Urban Low Density, and the zoning as R-1 (Single Family Residence). The proposed residential use is a permitted use in the R-1 Zoning District. There are no habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or agricultural resources in the area.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with land use and planning are considered less than significant. 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
9. 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

a-b. The project is not expected to result in the use of mineral resources for the proposed site improvements. No significant impact on mineral resource use is anticipated. The project is not located near a possible Mining Conservation area as defined in the Mineral Management Element. The project would not have an impact associated with the potential Mining Conservation area.

Conclusions

Impacts associated with mineral resources are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the mineral resource section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. 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

a-d. The General Plan establishes maximum allowable noise levels for different land uses. The project site is located within a residential neighborhood, and is not anticipated to have a significant noise impact. 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 would not generate significant noise with the residential use. No significant impact associated with noise is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the noise.

No significant noise generators are located in close proximity to the proposed project. The noise generated by traffic along Carol or Doris Drive would not have the potential of impacting the residential activities on the property. This site would be well below the 60 decibels (dB) threshold that is generally acceptable and conditionally acceptable. Many of the modern construction materials required in the construction of buildings provide adequate sound insulation.

e-f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or near a private or public airport.

Conclusion

With the implementation of Impacts associated with noise are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the noise section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. 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

a-c. The proposed residential use is allowed and was planned for in the City's 2020 General Plan and therefore would not affect regional or local population or housing projections. The project includes eleven residential units providing additional housing. Therefore, the project will not impact population or housing in the area or City. Currently, the site contains one detached single family residence. The residence on the property is occupied. The existing unit would be demolished. The project would displace two to three people. The development of this project would not displace a substantial number of people.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with population and housing are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the population and housing section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
12. 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:				
i. Fire protection?			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. Police protection?			x	
iii. Schools?			x	
iv. Parks?			x	
v. Other Public Facilities?				x

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a. 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. The City of Grass Valley Fire Department has analyzed the roadways to the site and has determined the current access is adequate. Payment of new development fees will address the project's impact on City Fire and Police Department Services. The development of the eleven residential units will be required to pay the adopted school impact fees and therefore, not impact schools. The project includes improvements to the length of Carol Drive that includes road widening and dedication of right-of-way. The project will not require the need for new maintenance of new public facilities. 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. No mitigation measures would be required for the public services section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. 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

a-b. The project proposes eleven new residential units. The project would only slightly increase the demand on recreational facilities in the City of Grass Valley. The project would provide a small private trail along the rear of the property that accesses Carol Drive that would be used by the residents of the site and immediate neighbors. The project is located in close proximity to Mautino Park. This park would provide significant recreational opportunities to the residences of these units. As part of the project approval, recreational fees would be required to be paid by the applicant at the time of development of the structures. Those fees would provide recreational opportunities in the City of Grass Valley. With the proposed recreational fees and the recreational development with the project, the project would not have a significant impact on the recreational opportunities in the neighborhood or the City of Grass Valley.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with recreation are considered less than significant. 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
14. 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

a.– b. A trip generation Analysis was prepared for the project by Roundabouts and Traffic Engineering that determined the total number of trips associated with the eleven residential unit development is approximately 105 daily trips and 11 PM peak hour vehicle trips. At 11 PM peak hour vehicle trips the project is consistent with City’s traffic threshold policy for identified critical intersections. The number of trips would not impact the PM peak hour conditions at any identified critical intersection. The project would be required to pay the City and Regional traffic impact fees that fund necessary intersection improvements at identified critical intersections, those fees would be based on the 11 PM peak hour trips. With the collection of the local and regional fees, the project would not have a significant impact on the transportation and circulation in the area and region.

The traffic study reviewed potential traffic impacts associated with the narrow and unimproved roads on Carol Drive, Doris Drive and North Church Street. The project includes widening and roadway improvements to Carol Drive. The study determined all roadways would be adequate with a finding that narrower roadways provide built in traffic calming and are actually safer.

c.-e. The project is located outside of the Nevada County Airport flight patterns and would not have an impact on air traffic. The project would be conditioned to provide frontage improvements along Mill Street.

f. The project is consistent with the parking required in the City of Grass Valley's Zoning Ordinance to meet the parking needs of the residential use.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with traffic and circulation is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the traffic and circulation section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. 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

a-g. 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 project will be connected to the City's sewer system and within the City's water service area. Waste Management provides solid waste service to the City. 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. However, specific approval to connect to the sewer system must be obtained from the City at the time of building permit issuance.

Conclusion:

No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project. 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
16. 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

a-c. As discussed in sections 1 through 15 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.

Conclusion: No significant impact associated with cumulative impacts has been identified with this project and other projects in the immediate area. No mitigation measures would be required for this section.

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
- Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, prepared by Holdrege & Kull Consulting Engineers,

September 8, 2006

- Preliminary Drainage Report for the Iris Lane Project, prepared by Advantage Civil Engineering Inc., December 10, 2007
- Iris Lane Project, Biological Constraints Analysis, prepared by North fork Associates, August 8, 2007
- Slide Creek Project Trip Generation Analysis, prepared by Roundabouts and Traffic Engineering, January 11, 2007

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Vicinity/Location Map
2. Site Plan