

---

**Community Resources Recovery  
Center for Hope Treatment Campus  
Development Review Application 09DRC-09  
General Plan Amendment Application 09PLN-14  
Rezone Application 09PLN-15**

**Initial Study and  
Proposed Negative Declaration**

---

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

July 31, 2009

# ***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:** Jeff Gold  
P.O. Box 1226  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The project is located on the west side of Sierra College Drive, at 139, 152, 159, 187 and 194 Brentwood Drive (APN's 35-330-01, 05, and 06)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The Community Recovery Resources (CoRR) Center for Hope project consists of a proposed campus for a health treatment center for substance and chemical dependency. CoRR currently operates its programs at 440 Henderson Street, along with residential care facilities at its Brentwood properties. The proposed project includes four buildings totaling 33,520 square feet on 3.08 acres of land. The project includes the following applications: 1) a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use designation from Residential to Commercial; 2) a Rezone Application to change the Zoning designation from R-1 to C-2; and 3) a Development Review Application for the buildings design and site plan review. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone applications include an adjacent 1.94 acre parcel. Therefore, the GPA and Rezone applications include a total of 5.02 acres. However, no development is proposed on the adjacent parcel.

The applicant proposes to develop the project in four phases, which includes: Phase I - the 13,433 square foot Service Center for offices and out-patient services; Phase II – the 12,955 square foot Residential Treatment/Housing facility; Phase III – the 4,682 square foot Support Housing building; and Phase IV – transitional housing within an existing 2,450 square foot home.

Other site improvements include a new main entrance (driveway) onto Sierra College Drive, 73 parking spaces, an exercise court, vegetable garden, a large patio, picnic and play areas. Brentwood Drive will be widened and used as a secondary access. The plans include a pedestrian access from both Sierra College Drive and East Main Street.

**REVIEW PERIOD:** **(30 Days) August 5 to September 4, 2009**

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

1. **Application Number:** Development Review 09DRC-09, General Plan Amendment 09PLN-14, and Rezone 09PLN-15
2. **Applicant's/Representative's Name and Address:** Jeff Gold  
P.O. Box 1226  
Nevada City, CA 95959
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 Community Recovery Resources (CoRR) Center for Hope project consists of a proposed campus for a health treatment center for substance and chemical dependency. CoRR currently operates its programs at 440 Henderson Street, along with residential care facilities at its Brentwood properties. The proposed project includes four buildings totaling 33,520 square feet on 3.08 acres of land. The project includes the following applications: 1) a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use designation from Residential to Commercial; 2) a Rezone Application to change the Zoning designation from R-1 to C-2; and 3) a Development Review Application for the buildings design and site plan review. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone applications include an adjacent 1.94 acre parcel. Therefore, the GPA and Rezone applications include a total of 5.02 acres. However, no development is proposed on the adjacent parcel.

The applicant proposes to develop the project in four phases, which includes: Phase I - the 13,433 square foot Service Center for offices and out-patient services; Phase II - the 12,955 square foot Residential Treatment/Housing facility; Phase III - the 4,682 square foot Support Housing building; and Phase IV - transitional housing within an existing 2,450 square foot home.

Other site improvements include a new main entrance (driveway) onto Sierra College Drive, 73 parking spaces, an exercise court, vegetable garden, a large patio, picnic and play areas. Brentwood Drive will be widened and used as a secondary access. The plans include a pedestrian access from both Sierra College Drive and East Main Street.

5. **Project Location:** The project is located on the west side of Sierra College Drive, at 139, 152, 159, 187, and 194 Brentwood Drive (APN's 35-330-01, 05, and 06)
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):** Grass Valley Building Department, Grass Valley Engineering Department, Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

**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 type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils        | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" 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
<b>1. AESTHETICS</b>				
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; as well as improving the entrances to the community. The project site currently has three homes and other urban improvements. The site sits slightly below Sierra College Drive. The site contains 80 trees with a diameter at breast height of at least 5 inches. This project will remove 59 of those trees, retaining 26%. The project will also require 12,200 cubic yards of excavation work to accommodate the proposal. Most of the retaining walls are less than 5 feet in height. A portion of the retaining wall behind building #2 is 14 feet in height. This larger wall is screened from public views.

Building materials include composition shingle roofing, cement stucco, fiber cement panels, and metal panels. The colors are primarily shades of green with off white and terra cotta accents. The service center is the closest building to Sierra College drive and is over 50 feet from that road. The nearest parking spaces are approximately 15 feet from Sierra College Drive. There is a significant amount of landscaping proposed between the road and the parking area.

The exterior lighting plan identifies shielded building and parking lot lights. All lights include shields to direct lighting downwards. The plan has a combination of 12 to 18 foot tall lights and 42-inch tall bollard lights in the parking areas, paths, and exercise court. The photometric plan prepared for the proposed project demonstrates the lighting would not exceed the City's standards as expressed in the City's Community Design Guidelines, and will not result in adverse light glare.

The project as proposed would be consistent with the Grass Valley Community Design Guidelines and the Community Design Element of the General Plan. The property is not designated as a scenic vista, does not contain any scenic resources, nor within a scenic highway. The proposed lighting plan demonstrates the project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it is developed as planned.

**Conclusion:**

The project is not anticipated to have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it is fully built as planned.

**Mitigation:**

None required

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

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>2. AIR QUALITY</b> 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	
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:**

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 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. However, the project could improve existing air quality since all of CORR’s services will be consolidated at one site. 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 will require an analysis to determine what tier the project falls within. Those tiers are divided into three areas. Depending on which of the tiers the project falls within, the NSAQMD will apply that level of mitigation.

The project provides two pedestrian access points to two major roads adjacent to the site. The applicant will construct a bus stop and bus turn out on Sierra College Drive. The project provides 24 bicycle parking spaces. The three new buildings include solar panels. The application package includes information that the buildings incorporate energy-efficient, sustainable principles. Landscaping within the parking areas will provide 50% shade coverage. All of these efforts are considered best management practices for improving air quality.

**Conclusion:**

With the implementation of the mitigation measure, if necessary, the project would not have a significant impact on the

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

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:

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

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>				
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		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 within a foothill woodland environment and contains three homes, road improvements, and disturbed urban mix landscaping. Elevations range from approximately 2,632 to 2,678 feet and slopes in a southwest direction. A biological resource assessment was conducted on the parcels. The assessment concludes that there are no special status plants or wildlife on the property. The property does contain several wetland features, two wetland swales and a seep.

The project will not conflict with any local ordinances or polices, or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The City's General Plan Background Report and General Plan EIR, do not designate this property as an important biological resource area. Since a large number of trees will be removed, there is a potential the project could impact nesting raptors. Therefore, a mitigation measure is included to reduce any impacts on these migratory birds. North Fork Associates prepared a Wetlands Delineation, which concludes there are a total of 0.166 acres of wetlands on this property. The report did include the adjacent parcel to the south with contains 0.258 acres of wetlands, but no development is proposed for this parcel. Since the project will impact less than ½ acre of wetlands, the applicant will need to obtain a Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and a 401 permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Conclusion**

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

**Mitigation:**

2. If tree removal takes place between March and May, the applicant, prior to issuance of a tree removal permit, shall have a qualified biologist conduct field surveys for nesting raptors. A minimum of three separate surveys should be conducted during this time frame to determine if nests are present, if juveniles are seen or heard begging, and if courtship behaviors are observed. If no raptor nests are detected, construction activities may proceed with no further mitigation. If active raptor nests are identified within 500 feet of the proposed project, they will be mapped, and a report stating the survey results will be submitted to the Grass Valley Planning Department prior to grading activities. The appropriate buffer zones shall be established in consultation with CDFG. Construction activities shall be prohibited within this buffer zone until the end of the nesting season (April through July) or until the young have fledged. A qualified biologist shall monitor the nest site(s) to determine when the young have fledged and submit weekly reports to CDFG throughout the nesting season.

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

<b>4. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
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 project site is not located within an area listed as having high or moderate cultural sensitivity in the General Plan EIR. Additionally, an archeological survey was conducted for the entire Litton property in 1984. This survey concluded the area does not contain any prehistoric or historically significant resources. The two buildings proposed for removal do not reflect any historical characteristics.

**Conclusion:**

Impacts associated with cultural resources are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:**

None required

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>5. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>				
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	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 property as "Aiken" loam 9 to 15% slopes and Alluvial Land, Clayey. While the Aiken loam is well drained, the Alluvial Land, Clayey drains moderately to poorly. Both soils have moderate to slow permeability, and a slight to moderate hazard to erosion. 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 geotechnical report prepared for this project concludes there is a potential that expansive soils could impact construction, but includes recommendations to address this concern,

The development of the project requires an estimated 12,200 cubic yards of grading work.

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared by Holdrege & Kull in February 2009. The report concluded that the site is suitable for the proposed improvements, with the incorporation of the recommendations and design criteria as described in the report. The development of the site requires implementation of the geotechnical recommendations as part of the building and grading permits to insure the development would not result in exposing people or property to geologic hazards such as ground failure, or similar hazards. Therefore the following mitigation will reduce any potential geologic impacts to levels that are less than significant.

**Conclusion:**

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

**Mitigation:**

3. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a detailed engineering plan shall be prepared that incorporates recommendations identified in the Preliminary Geotechnical Report dated February 5, 2009. 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
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<b>6. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL</b>				
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 proposed project does not use hazardous materials. The property is not listed as a hazardous materials site. Sierra College and Nevada Union High School are located to the north of the site. 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 property has some vegetation, which could expose people and structures to wildland fire hazards. The project will be required to reduce ladder fuels and dead vegetation within the undeveloped portions of the site as part of the standard Fire Department requirements. Holdredge and Kull prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment on the property, which concludes the property does not contain environmental conditions that could impact the property.

**Conclusion**

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

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

**Mitigation:**  
None required

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> 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 is located within the Wolf Creek watershed. As noted in section 3, the site contains 0.166 acres of wetlands. Nevada Irrigation District's Grass Valley Ditch, is located over 160 feet from the proposed development. The FIRM map produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency did not identify the project site as being located in a 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 result in approximately 66,222 square feet of impervious surfaces (49% of the property) to accommodate the proposed development. The storm water detention pond is proposed at the southwest corner of the lot, which incorporates cobbles, stones and riparian vegetation. This is designed so as to maintain pre-development storm water runoff. The plans show the proposed storm drain extending from the detention pond to the existing City system on East Main Street. The runoff from the site may contain grease, oil and other petroleum by-product, as well as other sediments that may impact the 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. Furthermore, the design of the detention pond will provide additional treatment of the storm water. 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.

**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
<b>8. LAND USE PLANNING</b> 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 Grass Valley 2020 General Plan Land Use Map designates the three parcels as Urban Low Density. The properties are zoned R-1, Single Family Residence. The applicant proposes to change the General Plan and Zoning designations to Commercial and C-2, respectively. These three parcels are in effect a small pocket surrounded by commercially designated land to the south and east, business park-designated land to the north, and recreational-designated land (golf course) to the west. This is sometimes referred to as spot zoned land. Since these properties are surrounded by commercial-related uses, the proposed amendments do not represent a conflict with the General Plan. As noted previously, CoRR currently operates some of its services at the site. Some related Land

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

Use policies to address the amendments include maintaining the General Plan to meet the needs of the total community, promoting infill development, encouraging the convenience of services, and maintaining appropriate zoning to protect existing single family uses. This project provides a needed community service, and allows CoRR to consolidate and expand its operations. It will more effectively allow the redevelopment and utilization of land within a commercial-oriented area adjacent to two major roads.

This property does not contain any open space easements. There are no adopted environmental plans or policies that conflict with this proposal. No active agricultural activities occur on site or adjacent to the project. The proposed development will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

**Conclusion:**

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

**Mitigation:**

None required

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>9. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b>				
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 not located in, or adjacent to, the two areas identified in the Mineral Management Element as being targeted for mining conservation.

**Conclusions**

Impacts associated with mineral resources are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:**

No mitigation is required for mineral resources.

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
<b>10. NOISE.</b> 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 establishes maximum allowable noise levels for different land uses. The project site contains several homes and surrounded by commercial or business-related uses. 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 the clients of CoRR and its residents. The City's General Plan EIR predicts the 2020 60 dB noise contour along Sierra College Drive to be approximately 65 feet from the road. These noise levels are within the acceptable level for commercial uses. The property is not located near any airports.

**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

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>11. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b>				
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 project will allow for the consolidation and expansion of CoRR's operations. It does not propose any new long-term housing. Therefore, the project would not affect regional or local population or housing projections. The project will remove two existing housing units used by CORR and replace them with larger facilities. The project will not displace any permanent housing units or people. 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
<b>12. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>				
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

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

The project is located within the city limits of Grass Valley, and within the service boundaries of the City. The project would be served by the City of Grass Valley Fire and Police Departments. With proper fire prevention measures as required under the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code, the project is not expected to significantly impact Fire Department services. 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 will 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
<b>13. RECREATION.</b> 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 or trail sites on the property.

**Conclusion:**

Impacts associated with recreation are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:**

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

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
<b>14. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>				
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:**

Currently, the project has access to the property from Brentwood Drive, which intersects with East Main Street. Brentwood Drive is a narrow road that primarily serves five homes. Additionally, Brentwood Drive is very close to the East Main Street/Sierra College Drive intersection. This creates some existing traffic conflicts. The applicant proposes to develop a new access road to Sierra College. This will serve as the primary access for the project, while Brentwood will be the secondary access road. As noted previously, the applicant will widen a portion of Sierra College Drive and provide a bus stop. The site plan shows 73 parking spaces, which includes 11 compact spaces and 5 handicap stalls. Additionally, the plans include 5 motorcycle spaces and 24 bicycle spaces. The Development Code requires 70 spaces for this use.

Based on the Volume/Capacity Analysis prepared by Kimley-Horn, the project will generate 60 vehicle trips occurring during the p.m. peak hour. The traffic analysis concludes that all study intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service both with and without the project. The applicant will need to pay the City and Regional traffic impact fees. These fees are already in place and paid prior to issuance of a building permit, so no additional mitigation is needed.

Kimley-Horn also prepared a site distance and access evaluation of both driveways serving the site. This analysis concludes: 1) there is obstructed site distance to the right for vehicles exiting Brentwood, and because of the proximity to the Sierra College intersection, this access point needs to be limited to right in and right out; 2) the new driveway at Sierra College Drive, with the proposed improvements, provides adequate site distance.

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

The project is not located near any airports. The plans include two access points for emergency access, meets and exceeds the parking standards, provides a bus turn out and shelter, and bicycle parking.

**Conclusion:**

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.

**Mitigation:**

None required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			x	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects?			x	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements necessary?				x
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				x
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				x
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				x

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

The project will require connections to the existing water, sewer, storm drainage, power, and communication systems. All these systems and utilities are available to the site. The property is within the Nevada Irrigation District service area. Waste Management provides solid waste service to the City. The project 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. A recent expansion of the sewer plant capacity from 1.72 to 2.78 MGD (million gallons per day), provides

*DR(09DRC-09), GPA (09PLN-14), and Rezone (09-PLN-15) - Initial Study & Negative Declaration*

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. The project includes on-site storm water detention pursuant to the City's standard conditions of approval. The applicant proposes to extend a storm drain line down Brentwood to connect to an existing storm drain system. This will require some trenching off site to install the improvements. The applicant will be required to comply with standard construction practices for all the installation and extension of the proposed utilities and infrastructure.

**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
<b>16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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 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:**

The project, as mitigated, is not expected to create a significant 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 Holdredge & Kull, dated February 5, 2009
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, by Holdredge & Kull, dated March 17, 2009
- Biological Resources Assessment and Rare plant Survey, prepared by North Fork Associates, dated February 17, 2009 and May 21, 2009, respectively
- Wetland Delineation, prepared by North Fork Associates, dated April 20, 2009
- Tree Resources Assessment, prepared by North Fork Associates, dated February 17, 2009
- Traffic Analysis prepared by Kimley-Horn, dated July 24, 2009

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Vicinity/Location Map
2. Neighborhood Plan
3. Site Plan