Granite Construction Company Esparto Mining and Reclamation Project Environmental Checklist Form (from CEQA Appendix G)

1.	Project title:
	Esparto Mining and Reclamation Project
2.	Lead agency name and address: Yolo County Parks and Resources Dept. 120 W. Main Street, Suite C Woodland, CA 95695
3.	Contact person and phone number: Warren Westrup, Director 530-406-4882
4.	Project location:
	West of County Road 87 approximately 1.5 miles north of the town of Esparto.
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: Yasha Saber
	Granite Construction Company
	4001 Bradshaw Road
	Sacramento, CA 95827
6.	General plan designation: <u>Agriculture</u> 7. Zoning: <u>AP (SGR) & A1 (SGR)</u>
8.	Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.) <u>Please see Project Description.</u>
9.	Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
	Land uses in the surrounding area are predominantly aggregate mining and agriculture.
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
	Department of Conservation – Office of Mine Reclamation
	Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

\checkmark	Aesthetics	\checkmark	Agriculture Resources	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Air Quality	
\checkmark	Biological Resources	\checkmark	Cultural Resources	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Geology/Soils	
$\overline{\checkmark}$	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Hydrology/Water Quality	\checkmark	Land Use/Planning	
$\overline{\checkmark}$	Mineral Resources	\checkmark	Noise	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Population/Housing	
$\overline{\checkmark}$	Public Services	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Recreation	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Transportation/Traffic	
V	Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Signature	gnifica	nnce	
DETE	RMINATION: (To be comp	leted	by the Lead Agency)			
On the	e basis of this initial evalua	tion:				
	• •		et COULD NOT have a sign 'E DECLARATION will be p			
	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.					
	• •		et MAY have a significant ef CT REPORT is required.	fect o	n the environment, and	
	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 that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.					
	S	Signati	ıre		Date	
	Prii	nted N	lame		For	

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show 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 where 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 off-site as well as on-site, 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.
- "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," as described in (5) below, 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(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, zoning ordinances). 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

Issues:

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

Discussion of Impacts:

- a) The Project site is not located within a scenic vista.
- b) The Project site is not located adjacent to a state scenic highway.
- c) Visual screens and landscape buffers have been incorporated into the Project design to minimize impacts to existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- d) Occasional nighttime operations could introduce a new source of light and glare which could affect nighttime views in the area. However, directional lighting is proposed to minimize impacts to off-site receptors.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			V	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Discussion of Impacts:				
a) Approximately 74 of the site's 104 acres of prime agricultural uses. An additional 38 acres of the site	_			ne
b) The project is consistent with the existing zoning for Act Contract. The Project parcels are zoned AP (Son Gravel Reserve). Pursuant to the Yolo County Zon operations are allowed in both the A-P and A-1 zon Gravel Combining Zone and with the approval of a zoned with the Sand and Gravel Reserve combining rezone to the Sand and Gravel combining zone.	Sand and Gravening Code, conness after the ana Conditional	el Reserve) and mmercial surfa pproval of a Sp Use Permit. The	d A1 (Sand a ce mining pecial Sand a hese parcels	and and were
c) The Project will result in changes to the existing er expected to result in the conversion of any off-site			-	
Mitigation Measures:				
None required.				
III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the	П	П	П	V
applicable air quality plan?		F		ت

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
sul	Violate any air quality standard or contribute bstantially to an existing or projected air quality lation?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
any atta qua	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of y criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-ainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air ality standard (including releasing emissions which ceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Ø			
	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant ncentrations?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial mber of people?				
Di	scussion of Impacts:				
a)	The Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation	nentation of a	an applicable a	ir quality pla	n.
b)	The Project will not violate any air quality standard projected air quality violation.	or contribute	substantially t	o an existing	or
c)	A permit will be obtained from the Yolo-Solano Air operations. The operator will comply with the cond	-	•	ict prior to	
d)	Sensitive receptors will not be exposed to substantia obtained from the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Manage minimize exposure of receptors to pollutants which	ement Distric	t with condition	ns designed t	0
e)	The Project will not create objectionable odors.				
Mi	itigation Measures:				
en	rmits obtained from the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Masure the Project is consistent with the District's air quality quired.	-			
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or ough habitat modifications, on any species identified as				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				\square

Loce Than

- a-b)The Project has the potential to adversely effect protected species and their habitat. A Biological Assessment has been prepared and is included as part of this application package. The Biological Assessment includes a discussion of Project-specific impacts to species and their habitats, and provides mitigation measures that will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant.
- c) The Project will not impact wetlands. Please refer to the Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands Delineation Report included as Appendix D to the Biological Assessment.
- d) Implementation of the Test 3 line will include construction of a stabilized bank on Cache Creek. These activities could interfere with the movement of a native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species and their corridors. These impacts are covered under permits issued by California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP).

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

Less Than

- e) The Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f) The Project will not conflict with any adopted habitat conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures:

- a-b)Please refer to the Biological Assessment for proposed mitigation measures. The incorporation of these measures will reduce Project impacts to a level that is less than significant.
- d) Prior to construction of the Test 3 line segment, a Flood Hazard Development Permit will be obtained from Yolo County to implement CDFG, Corps of Engineers, and RWQCB requirements. Construction of the Test 3 line segment will occur in accordance with the requirements of the Flood Hazard Development Permit.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	$\overline{\checkmark}$	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	\checkmark	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	\checkmark	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		\checkmark

- a-b)Please refer to Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report included as Appendix G of this application package.
- c) There are no known paleontological resources or site unique geological features on-site. However, pursuant to the Yolo County Surface Mining Ordinance, the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report includes mitigation that would minimize impacts in the event resources or unique features are found.
- d) The Project is not expected to disturb any human remains.

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

Laga Than

Mitigation Measures:

a-d)Mitigation measures are included in the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluated Report included as Appendix G of this application package.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		V	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on 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.			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		\checkmark	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		$\overline{\checkmark}$	
iv) Landslides?		$\overline{\checkmark}$	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		\checkmark	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			
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?		V	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			

Discussion of Impacts:

a) The Project is not located in a Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. There is no other substantial evidence of an active fault onsite. Ground shaking could occur during a regional seismic event. However, seismic-related ground failures (including liquefaction), and landslides are not expected based on project design and the conclusions of the Slope Stability Study included in Appendix I of

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
this application package.						
b) Measures have been incorporated into the Project to minimize soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.						
c) The Project is located on a geologic unit that is exp included as Appendix I of this application package		able. A Slope	Stability Stud	dy is		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d) Wash fines introduced in settling ponds may be considered expansive soils. However, people or structures will not be exposed to these soils; therefore, there is no expectation of substantial risks to life or property.					
e) Soils are adequate to satisfy the objectives of the Pr	roject. Septic	tanks are not p	proposed.			
Mitigation Measures:						
None required.						
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\overline{\checkmark}$			
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?						
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\overline{\checkmark}$		
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?						
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?						

Less Than Significant

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
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?					
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					
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?					
Discussion of Impacts:					
a-b)Hazardous materials to be used are primarily petroleum such as fuels and lubricating products that are commonly used without incident and applicable laws and regulations for transport, handling and disposal will be adhered to.					
c) The Project is not located within one-quarter mile	of an existing	or proposed sc	hool.		
d) The Project is not located on a site which is include	ed on a list of	hazardous mat	erials sites.		
e-f) The Project is not located within an airport land us public use airport, and is not located within the vic			a public air	port or	
g) The Project would not impair the implementation of emergency response plan or emergency evacuation		y interfere with	n an adopted		
h) The Project is not expected to increase the risk of v	wildland fires.				
Mitigation Measures:					
None required.					
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\checkmark	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there			$\overline{\checkmark}$		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				
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?				
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?			Ø	
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?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
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?				V
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
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?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\overline{\checkmark}$

- a) The Project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) A Hydrogeology Report of Findings is included as Appendix B to this application package. The Project is not expected to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c-d)The Project will modify existing on-site drainage patterns. However, these modifications are not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The Project has been designed

Significant Potentially with **Less Than** Significant Mitigation Significant No Impact Incorporated Impact Impact with measures to reduce the likelihood of any erosion or siltation to occur. The Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. Runoff from mined lands will be contained on-site. e) The Project is not expected to 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. f) A Hydrogeology Report of Findings is included as Appendix B to this application package. The Project is not expected to substantially degrade water quality. All mine operations and reclamation work will be in conformance with applicable state and federal requirements for preventing releases of materials that could result in contamination, and for reporting and mitigating releases if they should occur. g) The Project will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. h) The implementation of the Test 3 line includes construction of a stabilized bank on Cache Creek. A Flood Hazard Development Permit will be obtained from Yolo County prior to construction activities commencing. Because the implementation of the Test 3 line is considered a net benefit to the County and the condition of Cache Creek, this impact is considered less than significant. i) Levees will be constructed pursuant to design plans prepared by a registered engineer, and are designed to contain wash fine sediments. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. j) During a strong seismic event, a seiche could occur in open water mining areas or settling basins. However, inundation would not occur since water surfaces would be well below the surrounding ground elevation. No impact is expected. **Mitigation Measures:** None required. IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project: a) Physically divide an established community?

Less Than

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 zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
effect?	·	•	•	•
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
Discussion of Impacts:				
a) The Project will not physically divide an established	community.			
b) The Project will not conflict with any applicable land includes a request for rezone from AP(SGR) to AP(approval of a zoning change, this impact is consider	SG) and fron	n A1(SGR) to A		•
c) The Project will not conflict with any habitat or natu	ıral communi	ty conservation	n plan.	
Mitigation Measures:				
None required.				
X. 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?			\square	
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?				
Discussion of Impacts:				
a-b)The Project proposes the mining, processing and sal mineral resource zone to meet the construction mate Project is consistent with the beneficial use of an im- considered less than significant.	erial demands	of the region.	Therefore,	the
Mitigation Measures:				
None required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\overline{\square}$	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
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?				
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?				V

I aga Than

- a) An Environmental Noise Analysis has been prepared and is included as Appendix F of this application package. Impacts are within the standards established by the Yolo County General Plan and noise ordinance.
- b) The Project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- c-d)Noise produced by the proposed aggregate plant would cause potentially significant increases in ambient hourly noise levels at the two nearest houses south of Cache Creek during the hours of plant operation. These changes would be considered noticeable. However, the resulting noise levels would be well below the Yolo County hourly noise standard of 60 dB Leq, and the cumulative standard of 60 dB CNEL. Therefore, the fact that the resulting cumulative noise levels are well within the range of acceptable noise exposures for noise sensitive uses indicates that these noise exposures would be less than significant. Please refer to the Environmental Noise Analysis.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e-f) The Project is not located within an airport land use airport, or the vicinity of a private airstrip.	plan, two mi	les of a public	airport or pu	ıblic use
Mitigation Measures:				
c-d)The Environmental Noise Analysis includes a mitig increased ambient noise levels on nearby receptors.	ation measure	e that will redu	ce the impac	et of
XII. 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)?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			\square	
Discussion of Impacts:				
a) The Project would employ approximately 12-15 ski employment opportunities would not induce substantis considered less than significant.				
b-c)The Project will involve the removal of one on-site	single-family	residence.		
Mitigation Measures:				
None required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. 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:				
Fire protection?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Police protection?				
Schools?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Parks?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Other public facilities?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Discussion of Impacts:				
a) Approval of the Project will not lead to a need for up fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or considered less than significant.				
Mitigation Measures:				
None required.				
XIV. RECREATION	_	_	_	_
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				V

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

Discussion of Impacts:

- a) The Project will employ approximately 12-15 skilled workers. Thus, there is a potential negligible increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.
 However, these increases are not expected to accelerate or lead to substantial physical deterioration of these facilities. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- b) The Project does not propose the construction of new recreational facilities, nor are there any recreational facilities located on-site.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:		
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)?		
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		
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?		$\overline{\checkmark}$
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		\checkmark
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		\checkmark
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		$\overline{\checkmark}$

Dis	scussion of Impacts:							
a)	A Traffic Impact Study has been prepared and is attached as Appendix H of this application package.							
b)	Please refer to the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix H).							
c)	The Project would not result in any change in air traffic patterns.							
d)	Please refer to the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix H	I).						
e-f	The Project would not result in inadequate emergence	y access or	parking capaci	ty.				
g)	g) The Project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.							
Mi	Mitigation Measures:							
a)	Please refer to Appendix H, Traffic Impact Study.							
	I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the ject:							
a) E	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the policable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			V				
was faci	Require or result in the construction of new water or stewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing lities, the construction of which could cause significant vironmental effects?			$\overline{\checkmark}$				
dra con	Require or result in the construction of new storm water inage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the struction of which could cause significant vironmental effects?							
pro	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the ject from existing entitlements and resources, or are v or expanded entitlements needed?			$\overline{\checkmark}$				

Less Than Significant

with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
pro ade	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment ovider which serves or may serve the project that it has equate capacity to serve the project's projected demand addition to the provider's existing commitments?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and julations related to solid waste?				
Dis	scussion of Impacts:				
a)	The Project will not exceed wastewater treatment re Quality Control Board. All necessary permits will be operations.	_	* *	_	
b)	New water or wastewater treatment facilities or exp with approval of this Project.	ansion of exi	sting facilities	will not be r	equired
c)	The Project will involve the construction of settling agricultural tail-water, aggregate processing water, ponds and basins is not expected to cause significant	and stormwa	ter. The constr		ese
d)	There is sufficient water available on-site to meet P	roject deman	ds.		
e)	The Project will not result in a significant need for v	wastewater tr	eatment.		
f)	Nearby landfills currently have sufficient capacity t	o handle regu	ılar refuse and	garbage.	
g)	The Project will manage solid waste in accordance	with all relev	ant statutes and	d regulations	•
Mi	tigation Measures:				
No	one required.				
a) [qua of a	II. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the project have the potential to degrade the ality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitate a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife bulation to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to		V		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	V			
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).