



County of Calaveras

Department of Planning

Peter N. Maurer ~ Planning Director

Phone (209) 754-6394

Fax (209) 754-6540

www.planning.calaverasgov.us

Initial Study / Negative Declaration

Review Period: August 20, 2019 – September 20, 2019

Initial Study

ENVIRONMENTAL

CHECKLIST

For: Mara Naber and Russ Daly

ZA 2019-051

Assessor's Parcel Nos. 021-020-002 & 021-020-012

1. Project Title: 2019-051 Zoning Amendment for Mara Naber and Russ Daly
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Calaveras County Planning Department
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Madeleine Flandreau, (209) 754-6394
4. Project Location: APNs: 021-020-002 is located at 9099 Live Oak Lane in Mountain Ranch, 021-020-012 is adjacent, located at 8331 Sheep Ranch Road in Mountain Ranch. The parcels are located in the northwest ¼ of Section 36, Township 05 North, Range 13 East, MDM.
5. Project Sponsor's Names and Addresses: Mara Naber
P.O. Box 499
Mountain Ranch, CA 95246

Russ Daly
629 E. Maple Ave.
El Segundo, CA 90245
6. General Plan Designation: Future Single Family Residential
7. Zoning: U (Unclassified)
8. Project Description: The applicant is requesting approval of a Zoning Amendment to change the zoning of two parcels from RR (Rural Residential) to A1 (General Agriculture). APN 021-020-002 is located at 9099 Live Oak Lane in Mountain Ranch, is 53.91 acres and zoned RR-40 (Rural Residential- minimum 40 acres). APN 021-020-012 is adjacent, located at 8331 Sheep Ranch Road in Mountain Ranch, is 22 acres and zoned RR-18 (Rural Residential- minimum 18 acres).
9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Location	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Land Use
North	Future Single Family Residential	Rural Residential	Single Family Residential
South	Future Single Family Residential	Rural Residential, Unclassified	Single Family Residential
East	Future Single Family Residential	Rural Residential	Single Family Residential
West	Future Single Family Residential	Rural Residential-	Single Family Residential

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None
11. Have California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1? YES **NO**

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.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <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"/> Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency):

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 original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a potentially significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a potentially significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or its functional equivalent will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a potentially significant impact on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents.

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required.

Madeleine Flandreau

Madeleine Flandreau
Project Planner

8-19-2019

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
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 (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
 - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
 - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
 - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of 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. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
 - a) The criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question and
 - b) The mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

Environmental Impact Analysis:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Zoning Amendment to change the zoning of two parcels, APNs 021-020-002 and 021-020-012, from RR (Rural Residential) to A1 (General Agriculture). APN 021-020-002 is located at 9099 Live Oak Lane in Mountain Ranch, is 53.91 acres and zoned RR-40 (Rural Residential- minimum 40 acres). APN 021-020-012 is adjacent, located at 8331 Sheep Ranch Road in Mountain Ranch, is 22 acres and zoned RR-18 (Rural Residential- minimum 18 acres). Both parcels are developed with single family residences and contain former regulated commercial medical cannabis cultivation sites which were both issued registrations under the Calaveras County Urgency Ordinance. The stated reason for re-zoning the subject parcels is to give the owner the ability to be eligible for registration under a future County medical commercial cannabis cultivation ordinance. No new development is being proposed with this application.

The General Plan land use designation for the subject parcel is Future Single Family Residential 5 acre. The proposed land use designation under the General Plan Update is Working Lands. Land uses surrounding the subject parcels are residential on parcels ranging in size from 10-80 acres.

The proposed zoning amendment would not adversely impact a scenic vista, resource, degrade the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood or introduce a source of substantial light or glare. The site does not contain any ponds, streams or rivers that could potentially be suitable habitat for special status species. The site does not have any listing of emergent wetlands, forested wetlands or other water sources that are listed on the National Wetland Inventory.

Figure 1: Location Map





Figure 2: Aerial Photo



I. AESTHETICS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-d) **No Impact** - Calaveras County General Plan¹ (3.3 Areas of Outstanding Scenic Value) considers scenic vistas to include reservoirs, rivers, streams, rolling hills with oak habitat, ridgelines and forests. The property has limited scenic value because the scenic vistas outlined in the General Plan do not exist. Future agricultural operations could improve the property's visual appearance by reducing the amount of brush and improving the open landscape. There are no historical structures on the property and no State-designated highways adjacent to the project site. Future agricultural operations may create a new source of light or glare, but would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of

Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a. **No Impact** – The project consists of re-zoning the two subject parcels from Rural Residential (RR) to A1 (General Agriculture). The A1 zone is intended to be the main resource production zone. It is to classify areas for general farming and ranching practices, and assign such uses the primary emphasis for the area. It is the purpose

of the A1 zone that residential uses are placed in a position of secondary importance when compared to the commercial scale production of food and fiber. By zoning the property A1, the land will be identified explicitly for agricultural production, better utilizing the land's natural resources. According to the County General Plan, neither of the subject parcels are located on lands classified as high capability Agriculture. No prime farmland will be converted as a result of this project.

- b. **No Impact** – The rezoning of the two parcels will not conflict with lands in the Williamson Act. Both Agriculture Preserve and General Agriculture are resource zones established for the purpose of preserving land for agricultural production. The purpose of the two zones is compatible, and the permitted uses identified in both are nearly identical.
- c-e. **No Impact** – Neither of the subject parcels are classified as high capability Timberland in the General Plan, nor have they been utilized for the production of timber in the past. The land has historically been utilized agriculturally; therefore, zoning and continuing to utilize the property for agriculture, does not constitute a conversion.

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.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Calaveras County is part of the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). Air quality within the County is under the jurisdiction of the Calaveras County Air Pollution Control District (CCAPCD). The County has been classified as a non-attainment area for the State and Federal ozone standards (1-hour and 8-hour) and particulate matter standards (PM2.5 and PM10). To become designated as a non-attainment area for the State and Federal standards, there must be at least one monitored violation of the ambient pollutant standards within the area's boundaries. An area is designated in attainment of the State standard if concentrations for the specified pollutant are not exceeded. An area is designated in attainment for the Federal standards if concentration for the specified pollutant is not exceeded on average more than once per year.

- a-c. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Table 1, below, represents the County-established thresholds for any proposed project. Table 2 represents a project that proposed 150 vehicle trips per day in addition to the project's construction and operational emissions. Proposed emissions were calculated using URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4.

Table 1 – County Established Thresholds

Thresholds of Significance (lbs/day)			
	ROG	NOx	PM10
Construction Emissions	150	150	150
Operational Emissions	150	150	150

Table 2 – Proposed Project Emissions

Proposed Project Emissions (lbs/day)			
	ROG	NOx	PM10
Construction Emissions	2.4	17.6	10.8
Operational Emissions	5	5	6

As depicted above in Table 2, the project did not exceed the thresholds of significance identified for these air pollutants. The proposal to amend the zoning of two adjacent parcels totaling 75.9 acres from RR (Rural Residential) to A1 (General Agriculture) does not include a plan for development. The A1 zone will permit a wide range of agricultural uses on the land. However, typical agricultural uses do not generate a significant amount of traffic. Considering the analyzed project at 150 vehicle trips per day fell so far below the thresholds, it is estimated that the uses in the A1 zone will not come close to exceeding the established thresholds. Without a specified project outlining the operation, the County does not have the data necessary to enter into the model to receive actual construction and operational emissions; thus the comparison with another approved project. As proposed, the zoning amendment will have a less than significant impact.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project will not typically expose sensitive receptors (i.e. schools, residential neighborhoods, etc.) to substantial pollutant concentrations. Both parcels are large (22 and 53 acres) in a rural area with large

parcels and no schools are nearby. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact.

- e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project would not create any objectionable odors near a substantial amount of people. Odors that could be created by the proposed project, but on a temporary and intermittent basis, could include farming activities, and activities associated with diesel or gasoline exhaust fumes. The two adjacent parcels totaling 75.9 acres are located in a rural portion of County with residential development on large parcels. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the environment.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

- 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?

DISCUSSION

- a. **No Impact** - The project site is not located in a known habitat of a species protected by the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the project site is located within the 5 mile radius of tight coin (*Ammonitella yatesii*), a protected species identified by the Calaveras County General Plan. However, as this species is an endemic cave invertebrate, and there are no cave features on either parcel, the project will have no impact on the species or its habitat.
- b. **No Impact** - There is an intermittent stream bordering the eastern boundary of APN 021-020-002. However, there is no development proposed for this project. Both parcels have already been developed with single family residences and contain former regulated commercial medical cannabis cultivation sites. Both cultivation sites were inspected by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and received a Notice of Applicability under Water Quality Order R5-2015-0113.
- c. **No Impact** - The subject property does not contain any protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act.
- d. **No Impact** - The project site is already developed as are adjacent parcels. No new development is proposed.
- e. **No Impact** – No development plans have been submitted. Any future plans must be in accordance with applicable County standards at that time.
- f. **No Impact** - No federally protected wetlands exist on the subject property. Utilizing the land for agricultural purposes will preserve the open space. Calaveras County has not adopted a Habitat Conservation Plan or a Natural Community Conservation Plan. This area of the County is not regulated by any regional or state habitat conservation plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT</u>		
<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT</u>	<u>IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<u>IMPACT</u>		<u>IMPACT</u>	

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

a-d. **No Impact** – The project site is located within an area of low sensitivity for archaeological sensitivity as identified by the Calaveras County General Plan. Although some sites may exist in areas of low sensitivity, the discovery of significant sites is unlikely. The proposed project will be subject to State laws and regulations should any cultural resources or human remains be encountered during future excavation activities on the property, which will serve to assure that impacts associated with human remains and other cultural resources are insignificant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

- a. **No Impact** – Calaveras County lies within the Sierra Block, an area of historically low seismicity. Although the County has felt ground shaking from earthquakes with epicenters located elsewhere, no major earthquakes have been recorded within the County. The closest known source of large earthquakes is the Sierra Frontal Fault System along the eastern margin of the Sierra Nevada, which includes the Carson Valley Fault. This fault is located east of the County, and has been evaluated as capable of generating earthquakes of up to the magnitude 7.0. However, the risk of surface rupture is not considered sufficient to restrict the development found in the County. Sites in Calaveras County with liquefaction potential would be those on alluvial deposits having groundwater and sand or silt layers of uniform grain sizes within about 30 feet of the surface. The subject parcels are located above McKinney Creek on top of granite, and therefore, such conditions are not found on the subject parcels and are generally not present in the County.

- b-c. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The areas of particular landslide concern are those that include high elevations with steep ravines and gulches associated with river and stream channels. Located between 2600 and 2400 feet in elevation, the two parcels vary greatly in topography, but do not contain slopes greater than 20%. Soils groups on the property do have a moderate erosion potential, but the property in general is not characteristic of lands with a high hazard for erosion. If erosion of soils were to occur, the risk of loss, injury or death is low because the development potential is limited.

- d-e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcels contains Group 6 soil type, as defined in the Calaveras County General Plan¹. Group 6 soils are typified by acid, medium textured soils, which are rocky or stony over slate rock. Where water is available, annual range and irrigated orchards are the best uses. This soil type is

considered expansive as it has adequate drainage and low-clay composition. During the plan check process, building plans are examined for compliance with the uniform building code. This process requires a soils report be submitted with all construction plans to ensure the proposed structure will not be compromised do to unstable soil conditions. The standards vary depending on the location and type of structure proposed. Given the size of the subject parcels, it is unlikely that a suitable site cannot be found for the future construction of residential, agricultural structures or septic systems.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The County has not adopted a plan or program to reduce GHGs, therefore; the proposed project would not conflict with any such plan. The State of California has adopted legislation to reduce GHGs and charge local jurisdictions to develop plans for such reductions. While the County has not yet developed such a plan, potential future construction of agriculture accessory structures and a single family residence would have an insignificant impact by itself. Impacts to the environment due to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

a-b. **Less than Significant Impact** – The General Agriculture zoning will permit various agricultural operations to be conducted on the property. Hazardous materials associated with the agricultural operations may include (but are not limited to) diesel fuel, gasoline and engine oils for equipment. Materials such as pesticides and fertilizers may be routinely used in general farming activities. Pesticide use is regulated by permit through the County Agriculture Commissioner’s office to ensure safe handling of the materials. In addition, any future commercial cannabis operations will require a Waste Discharge Permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- c. **No Impact** – There are no existing or proposed schools within one quarter mile of the subject parcels.
- d. **No Impact** – There are no hazardous materials sites located on or near any of the subject parcels.
- e-f. **No Impact** – The subject parcels are not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip.
- g. **No Impact** – The proposal to re-zone the subject parcels General Agriculture will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an approved evacuation plan.
- h. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Based on many factors, this area of the County is designated as a very high fire hazard. In addition, introduction of agricultural operations whether it be the production of livestock or farming activities, will decrease the flammable vegetation on site thus decreasing the probability of a wildfire. The residential development potential will not increase by amending the zoning to General Agriculture. Therefore, amending the zoning of the subject parcels will not increase the risk to loss, injury or death from wildfire.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Any future commercial cannabis operations will require a Waste Discharge Permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The parcels are located in an area of the County known for having moderate to high groundwater potential. Land uses in the general area are residential and agricultural. Residential development in the general vicinity consists of single family dwellings on large parcels (10-80 acres in size). Therefore, impacts to residential development shall be minimal.
- c-d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – There is no development proposed with the application to re-zone the property. The applicant has expressed the desire to continue to use the land for commercial medical cannabis cultivation if and when an ordinance is adopted by the Board of Supervisors. There are no blue line streams identified on the property and agricultural uses will not alter drainage patterns and/or change the

course of a stream or river. The total acreage of the three parcels is 75.9 acres, and topography is such that the land can be utilized for multiple agricultural operations without significantly altering drainage patterns; thus, off-site flooding is not likely to occur. Although agricultural operations do not require a grading permit, County ordinances will ensure that proper erosion control measures are in place as needed to control run off and/or erosion.

- e-f. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcels are located in a rural part of the County where storm water drainage systems currently do not exist. Re-zoning the parcels to General Agriculture will not increase the permitted residential density of the property. Any potential runoff created by agricultural operations will be subject to applicable waste discharge permits, preventing the impacts from being significant.

- g-j. **No Impact** – The A1 zone is intended to be the main resource production zone. It is to classify areas for general farming and ranching practices, and assign such uses as the primary emphasis for the area. It is the purpose of the A1 zone that residential uses are placed in a position of secondary importance when compared to the commercial scale production of food and fiber. This is not a housing project. Re-zoning the parcels will not increase the residential density of the property. The subject parcels do not contain any flood zones, are not located in a dam inundation area, and there are no levees in the vicinity of the property. There are no enclosed or partially enclosed large bodies of water or oceans near the subject property; therefore, there is no danger of a seiche or tsunami occurring. There is no visual evidence of mudflows occurring on the subject parcels.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a. **No Impact** – The parcels are located in the rural outskirts of the Mountain Ranch Community. Re-zoning the land General Agriculture will not divide the established community.
- b. **No Impact** – The proposed zoning amendment is consistent with the current county General Plan. The land is designated as Future Single Family Residential- 5 acre minimum and is proposed to be designated Working Lands. The General Agriculture zone district is a resource zone, consistent in all land use designations.
- c. **No Impact** – Calaveras County does not have an adopted habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a-b. **No Impact** – The property is designated by the General Plan as Mineral Resource Area 3 which consists of lands that might contain minable deposits, but that up to now have not yet been sufficiently developed to demonstrate this. The primary use of the land has been agricultural. The project site does not contain any historic mines or mining features. The nearest mine is located 2 miles to the southeast in Sheep Ranch.

XII. NOISE

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

a-f. **No Impact** – Sound from any agricultural operations subject to Chapter 14.02 of County Code is exempt from the County’s noise ordinance. Potentially, groundborne vibrations and/or noise could occur during preparation of land for agricultural use. Preparation of the land is temporary. Noise generated from agricultural operations is minor and when located in a rural portion of the County such as the subject parcels, will cause no impact. The subject property is not located in the airport land use plan, nor is there a public or private airstrip within 2 miles.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

a-c. **No Impact** – The re-zoning of the land to General Agriculture will not increase the allowable density of the property, displace existing housing or displace people in any way.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

No Impact – The re-zoning of the land to General Agriculture will have no effect on public services.

XV. RECREATION

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-b. **No Impact** – Agricultural operations in a rural portion of the County will have no effect on parks or other recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

a-f. **No Impact** – Agricultural operations will not conflict with the circulation system in Calaveras County. Located off Sheep Ranch Road, the subject parcels are in a rural portion of Calaveras County. Sheep Ranch Road is a county maintained road of hilly terrain with no pedestrian or bicycle paths and no mass transit. Agricultural operations may generate a slight increase in traffic due to seasonal employees. Depending on the operations, traffic may be generated by truck and trailer traffic shipping livestock to market and/or temporary farm workers during pruning and harvest seasons, both increases being temporary in nature. Re-zoning the subject parcels to General Agriculture will not result in a change in traffic patterns, air traffic patterns, road re-alignments or re-construction of any off site road. There are no policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities in the area of Sheep Ranch Road adopted in Calaveras County.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

DISCUSSION

a-b. **No Impact** – As part of the processing of the project application, County staff initiated consultation with tribes that have requested formal notification of proposed projects within their geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation per AB 52 Notification Request, Public Resources Code Section 21080.3(b). Both the Calaveras Band of Miwok Indians and the California Valley Miwok Tribe were notified of this project. No responses were received from either tribe.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

- a-c. **No Impact** – The subject parcels are located in a rural part of Calaveras County where district water and wastewater services are not available and storm water drainage facilities do not exist.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcels are located in an area of Calaveras County known for having moderate to high groundwater potential. There are wells located on both parcels that are currently sufficient to provide for the parcels' needs.
- e. **No Impact** – The subject parcels are located in a rural part of Calaveras County which is not served by a sanitary district or utility district. The re-zoning of the subject parcels will have no effect on wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater needs are currently served by on-site sewage disposal systems.
- f-g. **No Impact** – Re-zoning the subject parcels will not increase the density of said parcels. Solid waste generated by future agricultural operations will be adequately handled on site and will have no impact upon any landfill.

IXX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | <u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u> | <u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u> | <u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u> | <u>NO IMPACT</u> |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Through the use of best management practices and compliance with established County code and state requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, significantly reduce habitat, or threaten or eliminate plant and/or animal communities. Amending the zoning to the County’s main resource production zone places an emphasis on agriculture as the primary use of the land and preserves open space necessary for plants and animals to thrive.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcels are designated as Future Single Family Residential located in a rural portion of the County. Proposed general plan land use is designated as Working Lands for both parcels. Amending the zoning to the main resource zone A1 does not create a cumulative impact to any of the items discussed in this checklist. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. The impacts associated with this project are minor in nature or in compliance with County standards, and do not trip established thresholds or create significant and unavoidable impacts.
- c. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The analysis of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the project is not expected to have substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Best management practices and compliance with standard regulations will reduce any impacts to a level of less than significant.

REFERENCES

1. Calaveras County General Plan (CCGP), revised December 9, 1996.
2. California Department of Transportation. California Scenic Highway Mapping System
Internet address:
http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm
3. California Department of Forestry. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas*. Adopted by CAL FIRE on November 7, 2007.
4. Calaveras County Municipal Code.
5. Calaveras County Planning Department. *Land Use Application completed by Mara Naber and Russ Daly, dated June 21, 2019*.
6. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. *Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State Of California; CDOC/DMG Open File Report 96-08 and USDI/USGS Open File Report 96-706; prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey; 1996*.
7. Calaveras County Air Quality Management District, *Best Management Practices*, 2004.
8. California Air Resources Board (CARB). *State and National Area Designations Maps of California*, 2004. Internet address: www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm