



**INITIAL STUDY/
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
TSTM2021-0008 (Alberta Ranch)**

Project Title: Tentative Subdivision Tract Map TSTM 2021-0008 (Alberta Ranch)

Lead Agency Name and Address: County of Yuba
Planning Department
915 8th Street, Suite 123
Marysville, CA 95901

Project Location: Assessor's Parcel Number: 019-291-010-000

Applicant/Owner: Tejinder Maan
4090 Nicolaus Road
Lincoln, CA 95648

General Plan Designation(s): Valley Neighborhood

Zoning: "RS" Single Family Residential

Contact Person: Ciara Fisher, Planner III

Phone Number: (530) 749-5470

Date Prepared: December 2021

Project Description

The project consists of a tentative subdivision tract map that would create 57 residential lots on an 11.28 acre property. The project site is located at 6142 Alberta Avenue, 850 feet north of North Beale Road and 1,000 feet south of Hammonton Smartsville Road, in the Linda Community (APN: 019-291-010). The 2030 General Plan designates the land use as Valley Neighborhood and the zoning is "RS" Single Family Residential. The Alberta Ranch Subdivision proposes 57 residences on roughly 11.28 acres for a density of 5.05 dwelling units per acre. The "RS" zoning allows a density on the site of 3 to 8 units per acre.

The property is currently undeveloped and vacant. Access will be on Alberta Avenue via two new 48 foot roads, Raymond Drive and Dellavon Drive. In addition, there are two new internal streets proposed: Zoller Way and Maan Court that will also meet the 48 foot residential road width requirements. All roads will be required to be built to County Urban Local Road standards as a Condition of Approval of the map.

All proposed parcels will be required to connect to Linda County Water District (LCWD) for water and sewer services and the Linda Fire Protection District will provide fire protection services.

Environmental Setting

The project area consists of approximately 11.28-acres of land located immediately adjacent to the west side of Alberta Avenue, a short distance north of North Beale Road, a short distance south of Simpson Dantoni Road and the Linda Levee, within the community of Linda, Yuba County, California. Lands affected are located within a portion of Section 21 of Township 15 North, Range 4 East, as shown on the USGS Yuba City, California, 7.5' Series quadrangle.

The project area consists of northern Sacramento Valley lands located approximately 1.5- miles southeast of the Yuba River, within a basin that receives winter storm runoff from a significant watershed. The basin is formed in deep sediments of the Sacramento Valley, which in turn has been uplifted along its eastern margin where it interfaces with the lower foothills of the Sierra Nevada, and along its western margin where it interfaces with the Coast Range.

Topography within the APE is nearly vertical with an elevation averaging approximately 70- feet above sea level. The region is characterized by a Mediterranean climate, with cool,rainy winters and hot, dry summers. The average annual temperature for the project area ranges from 51-75°F, with the hottest temperatures occurring in July, reaching on average a maximum of 94°F. The average yearly rainfall totals for the area are approximately 19.37 inches, with the maximum annual precipitation occurring in January.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- Regional Water Quality Control Board (for grading over 1 acre in size)
- Yuba County Building Department (building, electrical and plumbing permits)
- Yuba County Public Works Department (roadways and other public improvements)
- Yuba County Environmental Health Department(well and septic improvements)
- Feather River Air Quality Management District (fugitive dust control plan)

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages:

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the 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 proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Ciara Fisher
 Planner's Signature
 Ciara Fisher, Planner III

01/05/22
 Date

Tejinder Maan
 Applicant's Signature
 Tejinder Maan

01/05/22
 Date

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Tentative Subdivision Tract Map TSTM 2021-0008 (Alberta Ranch), as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) 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 project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. 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.

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, development code). 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) 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.

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

I. AESTHETICS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) & b) The project area consists of single family homes. The project site provides no prominent views to or from adjacent residences, public roadways, or officially recognized scenic vistas. View sheds are primarily within the boundaries of the project; impacts to scenic resources and vistas would not be affected resulting in *less than significant impact*.

c) It is acknowledged that aesthetic impacts are subjective and may be perceived differently by various affected individuals. Nonetheless, given the urbanized environment in which the project is proposed, it is concluded that the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity. A *less than significant impact* will result.

d) Outdoor lighting is proposed in conjunction with the residential use. General Plan policy 122-LUP directs new development to minimize light and glare through application of several measures, including careful siting of illumination on a parcel, screening or shielding of light at the source, use of vegetative screening, use of low intensity lighting, lighting controlled by timing devices or motion-activated lighting. To implement this policy, mitigation measure 1.1 is recommended for the project:

Mitigation Measure 1.1 Exterior Lighting

All exterior lighting shall be directed downwards and away from adjacent properties and rights of way. Lighting shall be shielded such that the element is not directly visible, and lighting shall not spill across property lines.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that potential impacts from outdoor lighting would be reduced to a *less than significant level with mitigation incorporated*.

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.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The Yuba County Important Farmland Map from 2016, prepared by the Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, classifies the project site as “Other Land” which is defined as any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments, such as the proposed project. Moreover, there will be no conversion of any protected agricultural lands such a Prime Farmland or Statewide Importance. Therefore, ***no impact*** to agricultural lands is anticipated.

b) The property is zoned Single Family Residential “RS”, which allows for low density residential uses. In addition, there is no Williamson Act contract for the subject property. The project would result in ***no impact*** to Williamson Act contracts or existing agricultural uses.

c) and d) The property is not zoned for or used as forestry land. The project would result in ***no impact***.

e) The project will not involve any changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use as the property is not zoned for agricultural or forest land. The project would result in ***no impact***.

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) In 2018, an update to the 2010 Air Quality Attainment Plan was prepared for the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which includes Yuba County. The plan proposes rules and regulations that would limit the amount of ozone emissions, in accordance with the 1994 State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone. The 2018 update summarizes the feasible control measure adoption status of each air district in the NSVAB, including the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD). The 2018 update was adopted by the FRAQMD, and development proposed by the project would be required to comply with its provisions. The 2018 Plan is available here: <https://www.fraqmd.org/california-air-quality-plans>.

The Air Quality Attainment Plan also deals with emissions from mobile sources, primarily motor vehicles with internal combustion engines. Data in the Plan, which was incorporated in the SIP, are based on the most currently available growth and control data. The project would be consistent with this data. As is stated in the guidelines of FRAQMD, projects are considered to have a significant impact on air quality if they reach emission levels of at least 25 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG), 25 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides (NOx), and/or 80 pounds per day for PM10. FRAQMD has established a significance threshold of 130 single-family homes, which is the number estimated to generate emissions of 25 pounds per day of ROG and 25 pounds per day of NOx. It is expected that motor vehicle traffic, the main source of ozone precursor emissions, generated by this 57 lot residential development would not substantially add

to the ozone levels to the extent that attainment of the objectives of the Air Quality Attainment Plan would not be achieved. Therefore, impacts to air quality plans would be *less than significant*.

b) The California Air Resources Board provides information on the attainment status of counties regarding ambient air quality standards for certain pollutants, as established by the federal and/or state government. As of 2019, Yuba County was re-designated as non-attainment-transitional status for state and national (one and eight hour) air quality standards for ozone, and state standards for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10). The County is in attainment or unclassified status for all other pollutants for which standards have been established.

Under the guidelines of FRAQMD, projects are considered to have a significant impact on air quality if they reach emission levels of at least 25 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG), 25 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and/or 80 pounds per day for PM10. ROG and NO_x are ingredients for ozone. Also, FRAQMD has established a significance threshold of 130 single-family homes, which is the number estimated to generate emissions of 25 pounds per day of ROG and 25 pounds per day of NO_x. For PM10, it is estimated by FRAQMD that 4,000 homes must be built in order to reach the 80 pounds per day threshold. The proposed subdivision is below the FRAQMD thresholds. However, FRAQMD does recommend the following construction phase Standard Mitigation Measures for projects that do not exceed district operational standards:

Mitigation Measure 3.1 FRAQMD

- Implement FRAQMD Fugitive Dust Plan
- Shall adhere to District Rule 3.16, which states that the developer or contractor is required to control dust emissions from earth moving activities, handling, or storage activity from leaving the project site.
- Implement FRAQMD standard construction phase mitigation measures.
(<https://www.fraqmd.org/ceqa-planning>)

These mitigation measures are to be incorporated as part of the project to reduce dust emissions associated with construction of the project and implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce project impacts on air quality standards would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

c) As previously noted, the project consists of a subdivision tract map that would allow the creation of 57 single-family residential properties. Therefore, the project would not exceed the thresholds for ROG and NO_x, which have been equated with the construction of 130 single-family homes. The project also would not exceed the 80 pounds per day threshold for PM10, as that would require approximately 4,000 homes. The project is not expected to generate a significant quantity of air pollutant emissions. Therefore, impacts on emissions would be *less than significant*.

d) Construction associated with future development is expected to generate a limited amount of PM10, mainly dust and possible burning of vegetation. Rule 3.16 of FRAQMD Regulations

requires a person to take “every reasonable precaution” not to allow the emissions of dust from construction activities from being airborne beyond the property line. Reasonable precautions may include the use of water or chemicals for dust control, the application of specific materials on surfaces that can give rise to airborne dust (e.g., dirt roads, material stockpiles), or other means approved by FRAQMD. FRAQMD Regulations Rule 2.0 regulates the burning of vegetation associated with land clearing for development of single-family residences. Enforcement of these rules would reduce the amount of PM10 that would be generated by residential development on the project site. Additionally with mitigation measure, **MM3.1**, prior to the issuance of any grading, improvement plan, or building permit a Fugitive Dust Permit will be required to be obtained from FRAQMD. Therefore, construction related impacts to the air would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

e) The proposed subdivision is located in an area of residential development with an allowable density of 3-8 dwelling unit per parcel. As mentioned previously, the addition of 57 single family residence is not expected to generate pollutant concentrations at a sufficient level to be noticed by any nearby rural residence nor affect any nearby schools. It is probable that any pollutants generated as a result of proposed future development would dissipate before it reached any sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be *less than significant*.

f) Development proposed by the project is not expected to create objectionable odors. The project does not propose activities that generate odors, such as an industrial plant or an agricultural operation. Therefore, there would be *no impact* related to odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) & b) A review of the US Fish and Wildlife Services revealed that no critical habitat for sensitive fish or mammal species would be impacted by this project. The site is relatively flat with native/annual grasses. The project site is not likely Swainson's hawk foraging habitat and other various special/native habitat species due to the distance from known nesting habitats and the lack of vegetation for foraging on-site.

There is a Heritage Blue Oak (*Quercus Douglasii*) on the Lot 18 that will require Mitigation if it is to be impacted or removed. Therefore, there would be *a less than significant impact with the following Mitigation Measures:*

Mitigation Measure 4.1 Oak Tree Protection During Construction

All native oak trees that are 6 inches dbh or larger on the project site and all off-site native oak trees that are 6 inches dbh or larger which may be impacted by utility installation and/or improvements associated with this project, shall be preserved and protected as follows:

1. A circle with a radius measurement from the trunk of the tree to the tip of its longest limb shall constitute the dripline protection area of each tree. Limbs must not be cut back in order to change the dripline. The area beneath the dripline is a critical portion of the root zone and defines the minimum protected area of each tree. Removing limbs that make up the dripline does not change the protected area.
2. Any protected trees on the site that require pruning shall be pruned by a certified arborist prior to the start of construction work. All pruning shall be in accordance with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 pruning standards and the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) "Tree Pruning Guidelines."
3. Prior to initiating construction, temporary protective fencing shall be installed at least one foot outside the driplines of the protected trees within 100-feet of construction related activities, in order to avoid damage to the tree canopies and root systems. This measure shall be followed except for allowed construction beneath the tree on Lot 18. During construction, orange construction fencing shall be placed a maximum of 1 foot off the limit of the work area which is the proposed curb or building foundation along the perimeter of the lot.
4. No signs, ropes, cables (except those which may be installed by a certified arborist to provide limb support) or any other items shall be attached to the protected trees. Small metallic numbering tags for the purpose of preparing tree reports and inventories shall be allowed.
5. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile home/office, supplies, materials or facilities shall be used, driven, parked, stockpiled or located within the driplines of protected trees.
6. No grading (grade cuts or fills) shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees except as allowed on the approved site plan.
7. Drainage patterns on the site shall not be modified so that water collects or stands within, or is diverted across, the dripline of any protected tree.
8. No trenching shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the dripline of a protected tree, the utility line shall be bored and jacked under the supervision of a certified arborist.
9. The construction of impervious surfaces within the driplines of protected trees shall be stringently minimized.
10. No sprinkler or irrigation system shall be installed in such a manner that sprays water or requires trenching within the driplines of protected trees. An above ground drip irrigation system is recommended or a similar irrigation system approved by the County's Parks & Landscape Coordinator
11. All portions of the proposed iron fence that will encroach into the dripline protection area of any protected tree shall be constructed with posts spaced in a manner as to

maximize the separation between the tree trunks and the posts in order to reduce impacts to the trees.

12. Trunk protection measures, per Yuba County standards, shall be used for all protected trees where development/ construction activity, including the installation of the iron fence, occurs within 10 feet of a tree.
13. Landscaping beneath oak trees may include non-plant materials such as bark mulch/wood chips. The only plant species which shall be planted within the driplines of oak trees are those which are tolerant of the natural semi-arid environs of the trees. A list of such drought-tolerant plant species is available at the Office of Planning and Environmental Review. Limited drip irrigation approximately twice per summer is recommended for the understory plants.

Mitigation Measure 4.2 Oak Tree Compensation

In the event the Heritage Blue Oak (*Quercus Douglasii*) on Lot 18 is removed, the County shall be compensated for by the planting of native oak trees (blue oak/*Quercus douglasii*) equivalent to the dbh inches lost, based on the ratios listed below, at locations that are authorized by the Parks & Landscape Coordinator. Up to a total of 50% of native oak tree loss shall be compensated.

Equivalent compensation based on the following ratio is required:

- One 15-gallon tree = 1 inch dbh
- One 24-inch box tree = 2 inches dbh

Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or building permits, a Replacement Oak Tree Planting Plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect and shall be submitted to the Parks & Landscape Coordinator for approval. The Replacement Oak Tree Planting Plan(s) shall include the following minimum elements:

1. Species, size and locations of all replacement plantings;
2. Method of irrigation;
3. A Tree Planting Detail;
4. Planting, irrigation, and maintenance schedules;
5. Identification of the maintenance entity and a written agreement with that entity to provide care and irrigation of the trees for a 3-year establishment period, and to replace any of the replacement oak trees which do not survive during that period.

No replacement tree shall be planted within 15 feet of the driplines of existing oak trees or landmark size trees that are retained on-site, or within 15 feet of a building foundation or swimming pool excavation. The minimum spacing for replacement oak trees shall be 20 feet on-center. Examples of acceptable planting locations are publicly owned lands, common areas, and landscaped frontages (with adequate spacing). Generally unacceptable locations are utility easements (PUE, sewer, storm drains), under overhead utility lines, private yards of single family lots (including front yards), and roadway medians. If oak tree replacement plantings are demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Parks & Landscape Coordinator to be infeasible for any or all trees removed, then compensation shall be through payment into the contribution to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund. Payment shall be made at a rate of

\$325.00 per dbh inch removed but not otherwise compensated, or at the prevailing rate at the time payment into the fund is made.

c) & d) The property is not located within a federally protected wetland and an Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) that would allow for substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity (Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) §3). There is no habitat within the Project Area that provides "waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity," or special-status fish species managed under a fishery council (i.e chinook and coho).

The nearest water feature is 600 feet to the north of the property. Pursuant to Action NR5.3 Wetlands and Riparian Buffers, the County requires buffering to protect those habitats. Setbacks range from 33 to 150 feet in width – the project location exceeds the buffer setback and therefore will not impact the water feature. Therefore there is no EFH or the need for federal fisheries consultation and there is a *less than significant* impact.

e) There would be no conflicts with General Plan policies regarding Mitigation of biological resources. The County has no ordinances explicitly protecting biological resources. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

f) No habitat conservation plans or similar plans currently apply to the project site. Both Yuba and Sutter Counties recently ended participation in a joint Yuba-Sutter Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). The project site was not located within the proposed boundaries of the former plan and no conservation strategies have been proposed to date which would be in conflict with the project. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) – d) A Cultural Resource Study which included a pedestrian field survey was conducted for the project by Sean Michael Jensen, M.A. from Genesis Society in August, 2021. Here is a summary of the study and proposed mitigation measures:

Project Background

This report details the results of a cultural resources inventory survey involving creation of a residential subdivision, involving approximately 11.28-acres of land located immediately adjacent to the west side of Alberta Avenue, a short distance north of North Beale Road, a short distance south of Simpson Dantoni Road and the Linda Levee, within the community of Linda, Yuba County, California.

The proponent proposes to create a residential subdivision, which will include grading and land recontouring, construction of new single-family homes, creation of access roads, placement of buried utilities, and general landscaping.

Since the project will involve physical disturbance to ground surface and sub-surface components in conjunction with residential development, it has the potential to impact cultural resources that may be located within the area of potential effects (APE). In this case, the APE would consist of the circa 11.28-acre land area within which the residential development work will be undertaken. Evaluation of the project’s potential to impact cultural resources must be undertaken in conformity with Yuba County rules and regulations, and in compliance with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq. (CEQA), and The California CEQA Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, California Administrative Code, Section 15000 et seq. (Guidelines as amended).

Location

The project area consists of approximately 11.28-acres of land located immediately adjacent to the west side of Alberta Avenue, a short distance north of North Beale Road, a short distance south of Simpson Dantoni Road and the Linda Levee, within the community of Linda, Yuba County, California. Lands affected are located within a portion of Section 21 of Township 15 North, Range 4 East, as shown on the USGS Yuba City, California, 7.5' Series quadrangle.

Environment

The project area consists of northern Sacramento Valley lands located approximately 1.5- miles southeast of the Yuba River, within a basin that receives winter storm runoff from a significant watershed. The basin is formed in deep sediments of the Sacramento Valley, which in turn has been uplifted along its eastern margin where it interfaces with the lower foothills of the Sierra Nevada, and along its western margin where it interfaces with the Coast Range.

Topography within the APE is nearly vertical with an elevation averaging approximately 70- feet above sea level. The region is characterized by a Mediterranean climate, with cool, rainy winters and hot, dry summers. The average annual temperature for the project area ranges from 51-75°F, with the hottest temperatures occurring in July, reaching on average a maximum of 94°F. The average yearly rainfall totals for the area are approximately 19.37 inches, with the maximum annual precipitation occurring in January.

The region once supported a variety of flora and fauna taxa which have been subsequently replaced with domesticated plants and a slimmer variety of animals, including marsh birds, ducks, geese, raptors, reptiles, amphibians and small mammals.

In view of the substantial surface water sources throughout this area, prehistoric use and occupation was generally intensive, but the population was not randomly distributed. Clearly, the most intensively occupied land areas were at elevated locations along the river systems and along the Valley/Foothill interface.

Historic Context

Recorded history in the project area begins with the attempts of Spanish colonists to explore parts of California beyond the coastal zone. Gabriel Moraga's expedition was undertaken in 1806, with additional incursions occurring through the late 1830's and 1840's, including John Work's fur trapping expedition through central California in 1832-33, one of the best documented of the early forays into the Great Central Valley. Work's expedition introduced several communicable diseases to the Native inhabitants that turned out to be devastating to Nisenan culture and society (Work 1945; Cook 1976).

Additional major incursion by European American populations followed John Sutter's petition for and award of the New Helvetia Land Grant colony in 1839, with the Grant defining much of present-day Sacramento. Operating initially from Sutter's Fort, the Swiss emigrant planted wheat and raised cattle and horses, and employed many local Nisenan people on his Hock Farm on the

west side of the Feather River, approximately eight miles southwest of the present project area. The establishment of this farm set a precedent for farming in Yuba City and Sutter County.

Discovery of gold in 1848 at Coloma resulted in the influx of thousands of fortune seekers into California and the Sacramento area, ultimately destroying Sutter's hopes for a northern agrarian empire. The embarcadero became a trading center instead, with supplies from San Francisco sold to miners departing for the foothills east of Sacramento and elsewhere in the Sierra Nevada.

By 1849, Sutter's son had assumed title to New Helvetia, and began a systematic survey of the extensive land grant, resulting eventually in a network of straight 80-foot wide streets and 20-foot wide alleys within Sacramento. Proximity to the American and Sacramento Rivers prompted levee construction as early as 1850.

The city of Marysville lies at the confluence of the Yuba and Feather Rivers in Yuba County on a portion of John Sutter's 1841 land grant. Sutter leased part of his land to Theodor Cordua, who built a rancho on the north bank of the Yuba River. In 1848, Cordua sold a half interest in the land to a former employee of his, Charles Covillaud, and later sold his remaining interest to Michael Nye and William Foster. Covillaud's partners in the land grant soon changed so that by 1849 four men, Covillaud, Jose Manuel Ramirez, John Simpson, and Theodore Sicard had become Covillaud and Company. In 1850, town lots were mapped out, parcels sold, and the name of Marysville chosen for the new town in honor of Mary Murphy, the wife of Charles Covillaud and a survivor of the Donner Party. Marysville became the Yuba County seat in 1850, and was incorporated the following year.

The position of Marysville at the confluence of the Feather and Yuba Rivers, and its relative proximity to San Francisco, Sacramento, and the gold mines of the Sierras, made the location a hub in the newly burgeoning economy.

The population grew steadily, reaching around 4,000 by 1900. As the population grew during these last decades of the 19th century, so too did the demand for various commodities and services. Consequently, a diverse number of businesses sprang up throughout the City.

As elsewhere in California, many of the Valley communities were purposefully created and funded by the railroads, with one of the objectives being to provide necessary services for the system itself (water, fuel), and another being to benefit from housing construction spurred by the extension of the railroad. Several towns both north and south of Marysville represent such communities whose early growth was directly related to the railroad and to the benefits to local agriculture and ranching (both sheep and cattle) which accompanied expansion of the market created by the extension of long-haul freight into the Valley. Both the Western Pacific and the Southern Pacific Railroad lines passed through the northern portion of the City in, enhancing commercial freight service in the region.

In addition to the availability of freight service, the Northern Electric Railroad provided passenger service across the Feather River. In 1909, the Northern Electric Railroad had constructed a steel truss bridge alongside a covered wagon bridge connecting Marysville and

Yuba City. The construction of a passenger and railroad link between the Cities of Marysville and Yuba City was crucial to the overall growth and development of both cities.

As Marysville continued to grow into the 20th century, the city developed further northeast away from the confluence of the two rivers. The land area immediately surrounding the APE has been subjected to agricultural development throughout the 20th century, while greater residential and commercial development, first following the end of World War II, and more intensively into the 21st century is evident throughout the region.

Episodic flooding and limited navigation along the Feather River initially limited the magnitude of settlement in the area, and the mid-19th century decades witnessed multiple efforts to reduce the threat of flood within the river's floodplain. On May 31, 1861, the California State legislature passed AB54 which was intended to promote organization of "swampland districts" which would be instrumental in developing flood protection facilities. Structural and jurisdictional limitations resulted in piecemeal levees being erected, which resulted in the program's failure.

Five years later, in 1868, the Green Act was passed which further complicated the matter of flood protection as levees were constructed, not in accordance with the topographical and hydrological setting in mind, but rather based on board-elected districts which "acquired" swamplands for the purposes of reclamation, and ultimately conversion to private property.

After the devastating floods of the early 1860s, it soon became clear that a new levee system was needed to protect the city from flooding. A continuous levee around the city was constructed, but again the system could not withstand the flooding of the following winter. Construction and development of the levees continued throughout the 1860s and 1870s. The winter of 1874-1875 brought particularly heavy flooding to the city, and again the city strove to build a levee system that would protect it. A Board of Levee Commissioners was formed to oversee the levee system. A new levee was built around the city, which incorporated portions of the existing levee. The new levee was built with a wider crown and base and was increased in height. During the construction in 1875, a major source of the flooding was addressed. Winter flooding continued to plague the city in 1904, 1907, 1909, and 1937, with contemporary flooding destroying numerous buildings and businesses again in 1955, 1986 and 1997. These last two flood episodes resulted in direct damage to the 17th Street storm water pump discharge pipeline, and following each of these catastrophic floods, segments of the discharge pipe were replaced.

RECORDS SEARCH and SOURCES CONSULTED

Several types of information were considered relevant to evaluating the types of archaeological sites and site distribution that might be encountered within the project area. The information evaluated prior to conducting the pedestrian survey includes data maintained by the North Central Information Center, and available published and unpublished documents relevant to regional prehistory, ethnography, and early historic developments.

Records at North Central Information Center

The official Yuba County archaeological records were examined on August 3, 2020 (I.C. File # YUB-21-828). This search documented the following existing conditions for a 0.25- mile radius centered on the APE:

- According to the Information Center’s records, no cultural resources have been documented within the APE. Eight (8) cultural resources have been documented within the 0.25-mile search radius.
- According to the Information Center, no cultural resources investigations have been conducted within the present APE. Three (3) investigations have been documented within the 0.25-mile search radius. All three (3) of these investigations are summarized as follows:

NCIC#	Date	Author(s)
008370	2002	Williams, Huberland, Westwood, Kraft, Thomas, Dwyer,
011626	2013	Crawford
012325	2015	Kaptain

Other Sources Consulted

In addition to examining the archaeological site and survey records of Yuba County maintained at the North Central Information Center, the following sources were also included in the search conducted at the Information Center, or were evaluated separately:

- The National Register of Historic Places (1986, Supplements).
- The California Register of Historical Resources.
- The California Inventory of Historic Resources (State of California 1976).
- The California Historical Landmarks (State of California 1996).
- The California Points of Historical Interest (May 1992 and updates).
- The Historic Property Data File (OHP 2012).
- 1860 GLO Plat, T14N, R4E.
- 1911 USGS Ostrom (Olivehurst), CA quadrangle.
- 1952 USGS Olivehurst, CA 7.5’ quadrangle.
- NETR topographic maps (1911, 1953, 1959, 1966, 1974, 1983, 1985, 2012, 2015, 2018).
- NETR Aerials (1947, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016).
- Existing published and unpublished documents relevant to prehistory, ethnography, and early historic developments in the vicinity. These sources, reviewed below, provided a general environmental and cultural context by means of which to assess likely site types and distribution patterns for the project area.

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY and CULTURAL INVENTORY

Survey Strategy and Field Work

All of the APE was subjected to intensive pedestrian survey by means of walking parallel transects spaced at 20-meter intervals.

In searching for cultural resources, the surveyor considered the results of background research and was alert for any unusual contours, soil changes, distinctive vegetation patterns, exotic materials, artifacts, feature or feature remnants and other possible markers of cultural sites.

Fieldwork was undertaken on August 4, 2021 by Principal Investigator, Sean Michael Jensen, M.A. Mr. Jensen is a professional archaeologist, historian and architectural historian, with 35 years of experience in archaeology, architectural history and history, who meets the professional requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (Federal Register, Vol. 48, No. 190), as demonstrated in his listing on the California Historical Resources Information System list of qualified archaeologists, architectural historians and historians. No special problems were encountered and all survey objectives were satisfactorily achieved.

General Field Observations

Fieldwork identified the following general conditions within the project area. All of the present APE has been impacted directly by a series of intensive disturbances, including past episodic flooding and subsequent agricultural activities. As well, the entire APE has been subjected to plowing which has impacted both surface and subsurface soils. Finally, buried and overhead utilities were observed within the APE, and construction of, and ongoing maintenance to, Alberta Avenue, has impacted the APE's eastern margin.

Examination of the USGS quadrangles, NETR topographic maps and historic aerials, confirmed that no structures or other historic features have ever been documented, or ever likely existed within the APE during the historic period.

Prehistoric Resources

No evidence of prehistoric activity or occupation was observed during the present pedestrian survey. The absence of such resources may be explained, at least in part, by the historic through contemporary disturbances to the entire APE. As previously noted, the entire APE has been subjected to intensive agricultural development (including deep ripping of soils to a depth in excess of 3-feet), and episodic flooding.

Historic Resources

No historic-era sites were observed within the present APE. The absence of such resources is best explained by the degree of disturbance to which all of the APE has been subjected.

ELIGIBILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Sites identified within the project area were to be evaluated for significance in relation to CEQA significance criteria. Historical resources per CEQA are defined as buildings, sites, structures, objects, or districts, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or

scientific significance. CEQA requires that, if a project results in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered; however, only significant historical resources need to be addressed. Therefore, before developing mitigation measures, the significance of cultural resources must be determined in relation to criteria presented in PRC 15064.5, which defines a historically significant resource (one eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, per PRC SS5024.1) as an archaeological site which possess one or more of the following attributes or qualities:

- 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage
- 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past
- 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values
- 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

In addition, CEQA further distinguishes between archaeological sites that meet the definition of a significant historical resource as described above (for the purpose of determining effects), and "unique archaeological resources." An archaeological resource is considered "unique" (Section 21083.2(g)) when the resource not merely adds to the current body of knowledge, but when there is a high probability that the resource also:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

PROJECT EFFECTS

A project may have a significant impact or adverse effect on significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources if the project will or could result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance or values of the historic resource would be materially impaired. Actions that would materially impair a cultural resource are actions that would alter or diminish those attributes of a site that qualify the site for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

Based on the specific findings detailed above under Cultural Resources Survey and Cultural Inventory, no significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources are present within the project area and no significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources will be affected by the undertaking, as presently proposed.

PROJECT SUMMARY

This report details the results of a cultural resources inventory survey involving creation of a residential subdivision, involving approximately 11.28-acres of land located immediately adjacent to the west side of Alberta Avenue, a short distance north of North Beale Road, a short distance south of Simpson Dantoni Road and the Linda Levee, within the community of Linda, Yuba County, California.

The proponent proposes to create a residential subdivision, which will include grading and land recontouring, construction of new single-family homes, creation of access roads, placement of buried utilities, and general landscaping.

Existing records at the North Central Information Center document that no cultural resources investigations had been conducted within the APE, and that no cultural resources have been documented within the APE. As well, the present effort included an intensive-level pedestrian survey. No prehistoric or historic-era cultural resources were identified during the pedestrian survey.

Consultation was undertaken with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) re. sacred land listings for the property. An information request letter was delivered to the NAHC on July 31, 2021. The NAHC response is pending.

The probability of encountering buried archaeological sites within the APE is low. This conclusion is derived in part from the observed soil matrices which have been subjected to a high degree of disturbance associated with past agricultural/ranching activities. Evidence of ground disturbance assisted in determining whether or not subsurface resources were present within the APE. Overall, the soil types present and contemporary disturbance would warrant a finding of low probability for encountering buried archaeological sites.

Based on the absence of significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources within the APE, archaeological clearance is recommended for the project/undertaking as presently proposed. For these reasons, cultural resources in the project area are *less than significant with the following mitigation measures*:

Mitigation Measure 5.1 Inadvertent Discovery Of Human Remains

Consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery of human remains: In the event that human remains are inadvertently encountered during trenching or other ground-disturbing activity or at any time subsequently, State law shall be followed, which includes but is not limited to immediately contacting the County Coroner's office upon any discovery of human remains.

Mitigation Measure 5.2 Inadvertent Discovery Of Cultural Material

Consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery of cultural material: The present evaluation and recommendations are based on the findings of an inventory-level surface survey only. There is always the possibility that important unidentified cultural materials

could be encountered on or below the surface during the course of future development activities. This possibility is particularly relevant considering the constraints generally to archaeological field survey, and particularly where past ground disturbance activities (e.g., road grading, livestock grazing, etc.) have partially obscured historic ground surface visibility, as in the present case. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of previously unidentified cultural material, archaeological consultation should be sought immediately.

VI. ENERGY				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION/MITIGATION:

a) & b) While the project will introduce 57 new homes and increase energy consumption, compliance with Title 24, Green Building Code, will ensure that all project energy efficiency requirements are net resulting in *less than significant impacts*.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 to 1808.6 of the 2010 California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) (i-iii) According to the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist, Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42, Yuba County is not one of the cities or counties affected by Earthquake Fault Zones, as of August 16, 2007. Therefore, strong seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction is not an anticipated side effect of development in the area. A *less than significant impact* from earthquakes is anticipated.

(iv) The Yuba County General Plan identifies the area as one that has a low risk for landslides, and states that grading ordinances, adopted by Yuba County and based on Appendix J of the 2013 California Building Code, serve as effective measures for dealing

with landslide exposure. Hazards associated with potential seismic and landslide result in a ***less than significant impact***.

b) c) and d) According to Exhibit 4.6-4 Soil Erosion Hazard, of the 2030 General Plan EIR, the project site has a slight potential for soil erosion hazards. Exhibit 4.6-5 Shrink/Swell Potential indicates that the project site also contains expansive soils with a low shrink/swell potential. Should application be made for a building permit, Yuba County Building Department staff will determine appropriate building foundation systems for all proposed structures, in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Building Code. The Building Official may require additional soils testing, if necessary; and will result in a ***less than significant impact***.

e) The project site is surrounded by residential properties and has will be used for residential purposes. The project is within the Linda County Water District (LCWD) and is required to connect to their district for public water and sewer. Through implementation of the County Environmental Health Department conditions of approval and connections to LCWD, the project would result in a ***less than significant impact*** to wastewater.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) Global Warming is a public health and environmental concern around the world. As global concentrations of atmospheric greenhouse gases increase, global temperatures increase, weather extremes increase, and air pollution concentrations increase. The predominant opinion within the scientific community is that global warming is currently occurring, and that it is being caused and/or accelerated by human activities, primarily the generation of “greenhouse gases” (GHG).

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California. Greenhouse gases, as defined under AB 32, include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydro fluorocarbons, per fluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020.

In 2008, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the Scoping Plan for AB32. The Scoping Plan identifies specific measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and requires ARB and other state agencies to develop and enforce regulations and other initiatives for reducing GHGs. The Scoping Plan also recommends, but does not require, an emissions reduction goal for local governments of 15% below “current” emissions to be achieved by 2020 (per Scoping Plan current is a point in time between 2005 and 2008). The Scoping Plan also recognized that Senate Bill 375 Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) is the main action required to obtain the necessary reductions from the land use and transportation sectors in order to achieve the 2020 emissions reduction goals of AB 32.

SB 375 complements AB 32 by reducing GHG emission reductions from the State’s transportation sector through land use planning strategies with the goal of more economic and environmentally sustainable (i.e., fewer vehicle miles travelled) communities. SB 375 requires that the ARB establish GHG emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 for each of the state’s 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPO). Each MPO must then prepare a plan called a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that demonstrates how the region will meet its SB 375 GHG reduction target through integrated land use, housing, and transportation planning.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the MPO for Yuba County, adopted an SCS for the entire SACOG region as part of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) on April 19, 2012. The GHG reduction target for the SACOG area is 7 percent per capita by 2020 and 16 percent per capita by 2035 using 2055 levels as the baseline. Further information regarding SACOG's MTP/SCS and climate change can be found at <http://www.sacog.org/2035/>.

While AB32 and SB375 target specific types of emissions from specific sectors, and ARBs Scoping Plan outlines a set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions it does not provide a GHG significance threshold for individual projects. Air districts around the state have begun articulating region-specific emissions reduction targets to identify the level at which a project may have the potential to conflict with statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions (establish thresholds). To date, the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) has not adopted a significance threshold for analyzing project generated emissions from plans or development projects or a methodology for analyzing impacts. Rather FRAQMD recommends that local agencies utilize information from the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), Attorney General's Office, Cool California, or the California Natural Resource Agency websites when developing GHG evaluations through CEQA.

GHGs are emitted as a result of activities in residential buildings when electricity and natural gas are used as energy sources. New California buildings must be designed to meet the building energy efficiency standards of Title 24, also known as the California Building Standards Code. Title 24 Part 6 regulates energy uses including space heating and cooling, hot water heating, ventilation, and hard-wired lighting that are intended to help reduce energy consumption and therefore GHG emissions.

Based on the project description, the project would generate additional vehicle trips in conjunction with the potential for four additional single family residence. Although the project will have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions, the impact would be negligible. The impact related to greenhouse gas emissions would result in *less than significant*.

b) The project is consistent with the Air Quality & Climate Change policies within the Public Health & Safety Section of the 2030 General Plan therefore, the project has *no impact* with any applicable plan, policy or regulation.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a), b) & c) There would be no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or the release of hazardous materials into the environment related to this residential project. The closest school site is Yuba College, which is approximately 0.2 miles southwest from the project site –

therefore, less than a ¼ miles away. However, *impacts would be less than significant* because this project would not produce or create significant hazardous materials.

d) The project site is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to [Government Code Section 65962.5](#). The site has historically been used for agricultural/ranching activities and is currently vacant. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and there would be *no impact* to the environment from hazardous materials.

e) and f) The project site is not located within the scope of an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project would have *no impact* on public or private airstrips.

g) There are four new roads within the proposed subdivision: Raymond Drive, Dellavon Drive, Maan Court, and Zoller Court. All of the new roads will connect to the existing road Alberta Avenue. These new roads and associated road improvements would not interfere with the existing road system. Since there would be no major physical interference to the existing road system, there would be *a less than significant impact* with an emergency response or evacuation plan.

h) The project is not located in a high wildlife fire hazard severity zone as reported by the Cal Fire 2008 Fire Hazard Severity Zones map. The property is within the jurisdiction of the Linda Fire Protection District, who will respond to fire emergencies within the project site. For this reason, the impact would be *less than significant*.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The project would not require the use of septic tanks, as it would require any new residences built by the project to connect to public sanitary sewer services. As a result, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements with regards to sewage disposal. There would be a *less than significant impact*.

b) The project design proposes a connection to the existing municipal water system, and would not use individual wells. The Linda County Water District (LCWD) has sufficient water service to provide service to the project. The applicant will be required to adhere to all rules and regulations governing water service hook-up. While the project would introduce impervious

surfaces, which has the potential to alter recharge patterns, storm water drainage is proposed through the use of gutters on the new public roads, therefore percolation and groundwater recharge activity would remain generally unchanged. There would be a *less than significant impact*.

c) i) The project will result in the disturbance of approximately 11.28 acres of vacant land. The project will result in a total of 57 single-family residences along with accompanying streets, driveways, and open space. The project will involve the grading of the entire site.

The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which develops and enforces water quality objectives and implementation plans that safeguard the quality of water resources in its region. Prior to construction of a project greater than one acre, the RWQCB requires a project applicant to file for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit. The General Permit process requires the project applicant to 1) notify the State, 2) prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and 3) to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. Mitigation Measure 10.1 shall be incorporated to reduce any substantial siltation or erosion.

Mitigation Measure 10.1 National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Permit

Prior to the County's approval of a grading plan or site improvement plans, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board a National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Permit for the disturbance of over one acre. Further, approval of a General Construction Storm Water Permit (Order No. 99-08-DWQ) is required along with a Small Construction Storm Water Permit. The permitting process also requires that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be prepared prior to construction activities. The SWPPP is used to identify potential construction pollutants that may be generated at the site including sediment, earthen material, chemicals, and building materials. The SWPPP also describes best management practices that will be employed to eliminate or reduce such pollutants from entering surface waters.

There would be a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

i-iv) The project would introduce impervious surfaces through the addition of 57 single-family residences and accompanying roads and driveways. This has the potential to generate higher run-off rates that could potentially cause flood either on or off site. Mitigation Measure 10.2 is recommended to reduce any potential flooding on or off site to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 10.2 Drainage Plan

Prior to recordation of a Final Map, a plan for a permanent solution for drainage shall be submitted to and approved by Yuba County and the Public Works Division. The drainage and improvement plans shall provide details relative to drainage, piping, and swales. Further, the Drainage Plan shall specify how drainage waters shall be detained onsite and/or conveyed to the nearest natural or publicly maintained drainage channel or facility

and shall provide that there shall be no increase in the peak flow runoff above existing conditions.

There would be a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

d) The project is not located within a 100-year flood plain, it is located within a 500-year flood plain. Yuba County is an inland area not subject to seiche or tsunami. Mudflow is not an identified issue at this location; therefore, there would result in a *less than significant impact* from flooding, mudflow, seiche, or tsunami.

e) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because Yuba County has not adopted a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. There would be a *less than significant impact*.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation

a) and b) The project site is within an area of urban development within the Linda Community of unincorporated Yuba County. The proposed land division is not anticipated to create any physical division of an established community. Therefore, the development would result in *no impact* or division of an established community.

b) The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Single Family Residential (RS) zone and Valley Neighborhood general plan designation by creating parcels 57 parcels on 11.28 acres. The RS zone allows a density of 3-8 units per acre – the applicants are proposing approximately 5 units per acre (57 units/11.28 acres = 5.05 units per acre). Moreover, there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists for or near the project site. Land use impacts are anticipated to have *no impact* on habitat or conservation plans.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) and b) The project site is not known to contain any mineral resources that would be of value to the region or residents. Additionally, according to the Yuba County 2030 General Plan EIR, the project site is not delineated in an area identified to have surface mining activities or contain mineral resources. The project is expected to have *no impact* on mineral resources.

XIII. NOISE				
Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The creation of 57 single family residential lots would create a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above currently existing levels. However, these permanent noise levels would be residential in nature and similar to those noises created from other surrounding residential uses.

The project would create temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity during construction. However, Article 3 of Chapter 8.20 of the Yuba County Ordinance Code governs construction related noise. It states, "It shall be unlawful for any person within a residential zone, or within the radius of 500 feet therefrom, to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on buildings, structures or projects or to operate any pile driver, power shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, power hoist, or any other construction type device between the hours of 10:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day in such a manner that a reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area is caused discomfort or annoyance unless a permit has been duly obtained beforehand from the Director of the Community Development Department as set forth in Section 8.20.710 of this chapter. No permit shall be required to perform emergency work as defined in article 1 of this chapter." With the incorporated standard requirements impacts related to construction noise shall be *less than significant*.

b) The creation of 57 single family residential lots and their continued operation as single family homes would not expose persons to excessive noise levels or excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. There would be *no impact*.

c) As mentioned previously, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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. There would be ***no impact***.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The project will result in an increase in population in the immediate area as the project proposes the construction of 57 single-family residences where none currently exist. Based on 2.9 people per dwelling unit, this will result in a population increase of roughly 165 people within the project area. As discussed in Land Use and Planning Section, the property is zoned Single Family Residential (RS), which allows a density of 3-8 units per acre – the applicants are proposing approximately 5 units per acre (57 units/11.28 acres = 5.05 units per acre). Therefore, this project will result in a density that is planned for this property. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

b) The project does not involve the removal of housing or the relocation of people who currently utilize the site and would cause *no impact* to individuals

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The project is located within the Linda Fire Protection District and new development is required to install fire hydrants and water main extensions, paid for by the individual developer. At the time building permits are issued, fire fees are paid on a per square footage basis. The fees are established by the District to offset the cost of providing additional fire suppression. The project will be conditioned to comply with all requirements of the Linda Fire Protection District. Based on the collection of fees, any impacts the project may have on Fire protection are expected to be less than significant. The increased fire protection capability of the Linda Fire Protection District will not cause significant environmental impacts. With the payment of fire fees and adherence to the requirements from the Yuba County Development Code and Fire Codes, impacts to fire protection would be *less than significant*.

b) The project area is located within unincorporated Yuba County and would be served by the Yuba County Sheriff’s Department. Increased property tax revenue and annual police protection assessment Countywide would support additional civic services including law enforcement. Impacts related to police protection would be *less than significant*.

c) Marysville Joint Unified School District (MJUSD) was consulted during early consultation of this project. MJUSD has stated their facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the new students from the project and that new development proposals must mitigate the impacts proportional to the intensity of the development. The Board adopted Resolution No. 2019-20/31, authorizing the County to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other form of requirement against residential development projects for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities. Specifically, the purpose of the fees is to finance the construction and reconstruction of school facilities in order to provide adequate school facilities for the students of the District. The resolution states that the maximum fee is \$4.08 per square foot for residential

development. For this reason, the proposed development will be paying its fair share of school fees to pay for the construction of new school facilities. With the incorporated standard requirement for school fees, impacts related to schools would be *less than significant*.

c) The project involves the construction of 57 single-family residences. Thus, it would generate an additional demand for parks and recreational facilities. As discussed in above in the Public Services section, the project will addresses the impacts from the increased usage through a combination of 0.8265 acres of parkland dedication or the payment of in-lieu fees. The dedication of parkland and/or the payment of in-lieu fees will ensure that parkland dedication for the proposed project is in compliance with the Yuba County standard of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Compliance with Yuba County parkland dedication requirement will ensure that substantial deterioration of recreational facilities would not occur. Because the payment of this fee would offset impacts to parks and recreational facilities, impacts would be *less than significant*.

d) In addition to the fees collected above for various services, the per-unit capital facility fees, collected at the time of the building permit issuance, would go toward the costs associated with general government, social services, library, and traffic. With the incorporated Development Code requirements, impacts on public facilities would be *less than significant*.

XV. RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) & b) The project would result in a small increase in the use of neighborhood and regional parks, and would create the need for additional recreational facilities. There are no parks proposed with this project. Yuba County Development Code Chapter 11.45.060 requires parkland dedication at a ratio of 5 acres per 1000 new residents (assuming 2.9 persons per household for single-family lots). This condition of project approval for this land division would ensure that in-lieu fees get paid to offset park needs. This requirement would ensure adequate neighborhood parks and funding for regional improvements are in place prior to parcel map recordation. With the incorporated standard requirements, impacts related to increases in park usage would result in a *less than significant impact*.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The project is not located in an area where a plan, ordinance or policy measures the effectiveness for the performance of a circulation system. This includes evaluating all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel. Therefore, the project will have **no impact**.

b) A Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Impact Analysis was conducted for the project by Kenneth Anderson from KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. in August, 2021. Here is a summary of the study:

Level of Service and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Level of Service (LOS) has been used in the past in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents to identify the significance of a project’s impact on traffic operating conditions. As noted in the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) document *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 2018),

“Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013), which was codified in Public Resources Code section 21099, required changes to the guidelines implementing CEQA (CEQA Guidelines) (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Div. 6, Ch. 3, § 15000 et seq.) regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. OPR has proposed, and the California Natural Resources Agency (Agency) has certified and adopted, changes to the CEQA Guidelines that identify vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts. With the California Natural Resources Agency’s certification and adoption of the changes to the CEQA Guidelines, automobile delay, as measured by “level of service” and other similar metrics, generally no longer constitutes a significant environmental effect under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21099, subd. (b)(3).)”

VMT Methods and Significance Criteria

The OPR *Technical Advisory* provides general direction regarding the methods to be employed and significance criteria to evaluate VMT impacts, absent policies adopted by local agencies. The directive addresses several aspects of VMT impact analysis, and is organized as follows:

- **Screening Criteria:** Screening criteria are intended to quickly identify when a project should be expected to cause a less-than-significant VMT impact without conducting a detailed study.
- **Significance Thresholds:** Significance thresholds define what constitutes an acceptable level of VMT and what could be considered a significant level of VMT requiring mitigation.
- **Analysis Methodology:** These are the potential procedures and tools for producing VMT forecasts to use in the VMT impact assessment.
- **Mitigation:** Projects that are found to have a significant VMT impact based on the adopted significance thresholds are required to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level (or to the extent feasible).

Screening Criteria. Screening criteria can be used to quickly identify whether sufficient evidence exists to presume a project will have a less than significant VMT impact without conducting a detailed study. However, each project should be evaluated against the evidence supporting that screening criteria to determine if it applies. Projects meeting at least one of the criteria below can be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact, absent substantial evidence that the project will lead to a significant impact.

- **Small Projects:** Defined as a project that generates 110 or fewer average daily vehicle trips.
- **Affordable Housing:** Defined as a project consisting of deed-restricted affordable housing.
- **Local Serving Retail:** Defined as retail uses of 50,000 square feet or less can be presumed to have a less than significant impact.
- **Projects in Low VMT-Generating Area:** Defined as a residential or office project that is in a VMT efficient area based on an available VMT Estimation Tool. The project must be consistent in size and land use type (i.e., density, mix of uses, transit accessibility, etc.) as the surrounding built environment.
- **Proximity to High Quality Transit:** The directive notes that employment and residential development located within ½ mile of a high-quality transit corridor offering 15-minute headways can be presumed to have a less than significant impact.

Screenline Evaluation. The extent to which the proposed project's VMT impacts can be presumed to be less than significant has been determined based on review of the OPR directive's screening criteria and general guidance.

The OPR *Small Project* criteria is not applicable to this project. Table 1 notes the Alberta Ranch Subdivision trip generation estimate.

Land Use	Unit	Daily Trip Per Unit	Quantity	Daily Trips
Single-family Residence	Dwelling unit (du)	9.44	57 du's	538

The project is projected to generate 538 daily vehicle trips. As the 110 ADT threshold for automobiles is exceeded, the project's VMT impacts cannot be presumed to be less than significant based on this criteria.

The OPR directive provides this explanation for a Presumption of Less Than Significant Impact for *Affordable Residential Development*.

Adding affordable housing to infill locations generally improves jobs-housing match, in turn shortening commutes and reducing VMT.^{24,25} Further, "low-wage workers in particular would be more likely to choose a residential location close to their workplace, if one is available." In areas where existing jobs-housing match is closer to optimal, low income housing nevertheless generates less VMT than market-rate housing. Therefore, a project consisting of a high percentage of affordable housing may be a basis for the lead agency to find a less-than-significant impact on VMT. Evidence supports a presumption of less than significant impact for a 100 percent affordable residential development (or the residential component of a mixed-use development) in infill locations. Lead agencies may develop their own presumption of less than significant impact for residential projects (or residential portions of mixed use projects) containing a particular amount of affordable housing, based on local circumstances and evidence. Furthermore, a project which includes any affordable residential units may factor the effect of the affordability on VMT into the assessment of VMT generated by those units.

The proposed Alberta Ranch Subdivision is not designated an affordable housing development, and based on OPR guidance, its VMT impact cannot be presumed to be less than significant based on this screen line criteria.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) has identified *Low VMT generating locations* within this region, including Yuba County. The Alberta Ranch Subdivision location within SACOG region was determined, and the per capita VMT characteristics of the existing residences in this area of Yuba County was identified, as noted in Table 2. As shown, the Yuba County average per capita VMT rate for residences is 24.9 vehicles miles per day. The location primarily containing the Alberta Ranch Subdivision has a rate of 15.45. The OPR recommended goal for unincorporated Yuba County would be a 15% reduction, or 21.18. Thus, the project is located in a defined Low VMT generating region that meets the goal, and the project's impact can be presumed to be less than significant under this screen line criteria.

TABLE 2 PER CAPITA VMT CHARACTERISTICS				
SACOG Regional Average	Yuba County Average	15% reduction from Yuba County Average	Alberta Ranch Subdivision Area	Reduction Greater than
20.82	24.92	21.18	15.45	yes
https://sacog.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Compare/index.html?appid=ec67f920461b461f8e32c6a5c3dd85cf				

Proximity to High Quality Transit, which requires service on 15 minute headways. This criteria is not applicable.

Conclusion

The Alberta Ranch Subdivision is located within an area of Yuba County where residences generate per capita regional VMT at a rate that is less than 85% of the current countywide average. Thus development of the project will help Yuba County achieve the overall state goal for a 15% reduction in total regional VMT, and the project's impact is not significant.

Therefore, the additional 57 parcels will cause a *less than significant* transportation impact.

c) Alberta Avenue is an existing roads that will provide access to the project site. Moreover, the new streets within the subdivision are laid out in a grid type pattern with all intersections at 90-degree angles to one another and are shown with at least a 200-foot separation from one another, meeting Yuba County's road standards. The new Zoller Way road will be stubbed out on the west end for future extension into an adjacent subdivision at a later date. Hazards due to a design feature of the project would not be substantially increased as a result of this project and there would be *no impact*.

d) Emergency access to the project site would be via Alberta Avenue, Raymond Drive, and Dellavon Drive. In addition all of the streets within the subdivision will comply with all county street width standards. There are no cui-de-sacs that exceed the length requirement as set by the County. There are no features of the proposed subdivision that would result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the project will have *no impact*.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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:

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) Please refer to Chapter V, Cultural Resources, for a summary of the study and findings made in the Cultural Resource Inventory Survey that was prepared by Sean Michael Jensen, M.A. from Genesis.

The study included a search of State data bases, including all records and documents available at the North Central Information Center, and intensive pedestrian survey, have resulted in identifying no tribal cultural resources (TCRs) and sites within the project property. Therefore, no additional treatment or mitigated action is recommended for the site and would create a *less than significant impact*.

b) Yuba County Planning Department requested AB-52 consultation with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), due to their request for consultation on all discretionary projects within Yuba County. The UAIC was established in 1917 when the United States acquired land in trust for the Auburn Band near the City of Auburn and formally established the reservation, known as the Auburn Rancheria. In 1953, the United States Congress enacted the Rancheria Acts, authorizing the termination of federal trust responsibilities to a number of California Indian tribes including the Auburn Band. With the exception of a 2.8-parcel containing a tribal church and a park, the government sold the land comprising the Auburn Rancheria. The United States terminated federal recognition of the Auburn Band in 1967. Finally, in 1970, President Nixon declared the policy of termination a failure. In 1976, both the United States Senate and House of Representatives expressly repudiated this policy in favor of a new federal policy entitled Indian Self-Determination. In 1991, surviving members of the Auburn Band reorganized their tribal government as the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) and requested the United States to formally restore their federal recognition. In 1994, Congress passed the Auburn Indian Restoration Act, which restored the Tribe’s federal recognition. The Act provided that the Tribe may acquire land in Placer County to establish a new reservation.

The UAIC responded to the Early Consultation request on October 6, 2021. Anna Starkey, with the UAIC, commenting that “based on the information we’ve received and our own desktop review of the project area, the previously provided (and attached) unanticipated discoveries mitigation measure should suffice.” The mitigation measure discussed was requested by the UAIC on October 6, 2021 to address inadvertent discoveries of potential TCRs, archaeological, or cultural resources during a project’s ground disturbing activities. Therefore, in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of tribal cultural resources in the project area the impact upon tribal cultural resources would be *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

Mitigation Measure 18.1 Unanticipated/Inadvertent Discoveries Of TCRs

If any suspected TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. A Tribal Representative from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074). The Tribal Representative will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

When avoidance is infeasible, preservation in place is the preferred option for mitigation of TCRs under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort shall be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign, if feasible. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by UAIC or by the California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. Treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a TCR may include Tribal Monitoring, culturally appropriate recovery of cultural objects, and reburial of cultural objects or cultural soil.

Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of the CEQA, including AB52, have been satisfied.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) The project will receive water and wastewater service by the Linda County Water District (LCWD). The district has indicated that adequate water capacity and wastewater treatment capacity exists to serve the proposed project. All required infrastructure expansions will be located in the existing right-of-way and will therefore create a *less than significant impact*.

b) The construction of 57 homes will involve the use of the existing water supplies, however no significant impacts related to the adequacy of the water supply for the project were identified during the course of the project review. Since no major concerns have been expressed, any impact related to water supply is expected to be *less than significant*.

c) LCWD will provide wastewater treatment. The project has been conditioned to ensure that the utility district will receive adequate funding from the project to provide for any needed future expansion of the wastewater treatment facilities. For this reason, there will be a *less than significant impact*.

d) & e) LCWD will continue to provide service to the 57 lots. Recyclable solid waste collected by LCWD is taken to a materials recovery facility on State Route 20, outside of the City of Marysville, and all other waste is taken to a landfill on Ostrom Road. The Ostrom Road landfill has a capacity of 41,822,300 cubic yards, and has adequate capacity to serve the project site. The

project will have a minimal effect on these facilities and the impact would be *less than significant*.

XX. WILDFIRE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including down slope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION/MITIGATION:

a) Access to the project site will not be impacted by construction activities. Therefore, project related impacts to the adopted emergency response plan and emergency evacuation plan would be *less than significant*.

b), c) & d) The project is not located within a State Responsibility Area established by CalFire. All homes will be required to meet current Building Code requirements for sprinkler systems and other design features to reduce fire risk. Therefore, impacts by wildfire will be *less than significant*.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) As discussed in the Biological Resources section, the proposed development will have a ***less than significant impact with mitigation*** for a Heritage Blue Oak. The site is not located in a sensitive or critical habitat area, is void of any water sources and would not conflict with any local policies, ordinances or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans.

As discussed in the Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources section, construction could potentially impact cultural resources. Proposed mitigation measures in **MM5.1, MM5.2, and MM18.1**, would reduce the impact to ***less than significant with mitigation***.

b) The project site was already identified through the General Plan and Zoning Designation for residential development. Therefore, the project is considered to have a ***less than significant impact***, or cause cumulatively considerable effects.

c) The project is a 57-lot subdivision that is not expected to have any substantial adverse effect on humans. The project has the potential to create air quality impacts, primarily from the generation of Pm 10. These effects are subject to standard mitigation measures as set forth by the

Feather River Air Quality Management District. Due to the nature and size of the project, no substantial adverse effects on humans are expected as result of the project. Therefore, the project is considered to have *a less than significant impact with mitigation*.

REFERENCES

1. Yuba County 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, AECOM.
2. Yuba County 2030 General Plan, AECOM.
3. Yuba County Development Code 2015.
4. Yuba County Important Farmland Map 2012. California Department of Conservation.
5. Cultural Resource Study, Genesis Society, August 2021.
6. Vehicle Miles Traveled (Vmt) Impact Analysis, KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., August 2021

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 1.1 Exterior Lighting		
All exterior lighting shall be directed downwards and away from adjacent properties and rights of way. Lighting shall be shielded such that the element is not directly visible, and lighting shall not spill across property lines.		
Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to approval of Site Improvement and/or Master Plans.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Planning and Public Works Department	
Performance Criteria Building Permit Review	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 3.1 FRAQMD		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement FRAQMD Fugitive Dust Plan • Shall adhere to District Rule 3.16, which states that the developer or contractor is required to control dust emissions from earth moving activities, handling, or storage activity from leaving the project site. • Implement FRAQMD standard construction phase mitigation measures. (https://www.fraqmd.org/ceqa-planning) 		
Timing/Implementation <i>Upon start of construction activities.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Public Works Department	
Performance Criteria Permit verification , or clearance documents, from FRAQMD	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 4.1 Oak Tree Protection During Construction

All native oak trees that are 6 inches dbh or larger on the project site and all off-site native oak trees that are 6 inches dbh or larger which may be impacted by utility installation and/or improvements associated with this project, shall be preserved and protected as follows:

1. A circle with a radius measurement from the trunk of the tree to the tip of its longest limb shall constitute the dripline protection area of each tree. Limbs must not be cut back in order to change the dripline. The area beneath the dripline is a critical portion of the root zone and defines the minimum protected area of each tree. Removing limbs that make up the dripline does not change the protected area.
2. Any protected trees on the site that require pruning shall be pruned by a certified arborist prior to the start of construction work. All pruning shall be in accordance with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 pruning standards and the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) "Tree Pruning Guidelines."
3. Prior to initiating construction, temporary protective fencing shall be installed at least one foot outside the driplines of the protected trees within 100-feet of construction related activities, in order to avoid damage to the tree canopies and root systems. This measure shall be followed except for allowed construction beneath the tree on Lot 18. During construction, orange construction fencing shall be placed a maximum of 1 foot off the limit of the work area which is the proposed curb or building foundation along the perimeter of the lot.
4. No signs, ropes, cables (except those which may be installed by a certified arborist to provide limb support) or any other items shall be attached to the protected trees. Small metallic numbering tags for the purpose of preparing tree reports and inventories shall be allowed.
5. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile home/office, supplies, materials or facilities shall be used, driven, parked, stockpiled or located within the driplines of protected trees.
6. No grading (grade cuts or fills) shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees except as allowed on the approved site plan.
7. Drainage patterns on the site shall not be modified so that water collects or stands within, or is diverted across, the dripline of any protected tree.
8. No trenching shall be allowed within the driplines of protected trees. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the dripline of a protected tree, the utility line shall be bored and jacked under the supervision of a certified arborist.
9. The construction of impervious surfaces within the driplines of protected trees shall be stringently minimized.
10. No sprinkler or irrigation system shall be installed in such a manner that sprays water or requires trenching within the driplines of protected trees. An above ground drip irrigation system is recommended or a similar irrigation system approved by the County's Parks & Landscape Coordinator
11. All portions of the proposed iron fence that will encroach into the dripline protection area of any protected tree shall be constructed with posts spaced in a manner as to maximize the separation between the tree trunks and the posts in order to reduce impacts to the trees.
12. Trunk protection measures, per Yuba County standards, shall be used for all protected trees where development/ construction activity, including the installation of the iron fence, occurs within 10 feet of a tree.
13. Landscaping beneath oak trees may include non-plant materials such as bark mulch/wood chips. The only plant species which shall be planted within the driplines of oak trees are those which are tolerant of the natural semi-arid environs of the trees. A list of such drought-tolerant plant species is available at the Office of Planning and Environmental Review. Limited drip irrigation approximately twice per summer is recommended for the understory plants.

<p>Timing/Implementation <i>Upon start and during construction activities.</i></p>	<p>Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County's Parks & Landscape Coordinator</p>	
<p>Performance Criteria N/A</p>	<p>Verification Cost N/A</p>	
		<p>Date Complete (If applicable)</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 4.2 Oak Tree Compensation

In the event the Heritage Blue Oak (*Quercus Douglasii*) on Lot 18 is removed, the County shall be compensated for by the planting of native oak trees (blue oak/*Quercus douglasii*) equivalent to the dbh inches lost, based on the ratios listed below, at locations that are authorized by the Parks & Landscape Coordinator. Up to a total of 50% of native oak tree loss shall be compensated.

Equivalent compensation based on the following ratio is required:

- One 15-gallon tree = 1 inch dbh
- One 24-inch box tree = 2 inches dbh

Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or building permits, a Replacement Oak Tree Planting Plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist or licensed landscape architect and shall be submitted to the Parks & Landscape Coordinator for approval. The Replacement Oak Tree Planting Plan(s) shall include the following minimum elements:

1. Species, size and locations of all replacement plantings;
2. Method of irrigation;
3. A Tree Planting Detail;
4. Planting, irrigation, and maintenance schedules;
5. Identification of the maintenance entity and a written agreement with that entity to provide care and irrigation of the trees for a 3-year establishment period, and to replace any of the replacement oak trees which do not survive during that period.

No replacement tree shall be planted within 15 feet of the driplines of existing oak trees or landmark size trees that are retained on-site, or within 15 feet of a building foundation or swimming pool excavation. The minimum spacing for replacement oak trees shall be 20 feet on-center. Examples of acceptable planting locations are publicly owned lands, common areas, and landscaped frontages (with adequate spacing). Generally unacceptable locations are utility easements (PUE, sewer, storm drains), under overhead utility lines, private yards of single family lots (including front yards), and roadway medians. If oak tree replacement plantings are demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Parks & Landscape Coordinator to be infeasible for any or all trees removed, then compensation shall be through payment into the contribution to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund. Payment shall be made at a rate of \$325.00 per dbh inch removed but not otherwise compensated, or at the prevailing rate at the time payment into the fund is made.

<p>Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or building permits</i></p>	<p>Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County's Parks & Landscape Coordinator</p>	
<p>Performance Criteria N/A</p>	<p>Verification Cost N/A</p>	
		<p>Date Complete (If applicable)</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 5.1 Inadvertent Discovery Of Human Remains		
<p>Consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery of human remains: In the event that human remains are inadvertently encountered during trenching or other ground- disturbing activity or at any time subsequently, State law shall be followed, which includes but is not limited to immediately contacting the County Coroner's office upon any discovery of human remains.</p>		
Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to the start of, and during, construction activities.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Planning Department	
Performance Criteria N/A	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 5.2 Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Material		
<p>Consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery of cultural material: The present evaluation and recommendations are based on the findings of an inventory- level surface survey only. There is always the possibility that important unidentified cultural materials could be encountered on or below the surface during the course of future development activities. This possibility is particularly relevant considering the constraints generally to archaeological field survey, and particularly where past ground disturbance activities (e.g., road grading, livestock grazing, etc.) have partially obscured historic ground surface visibility, as in the present case. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of previously unidentified cultural material, archaeological consultation should be sought immediately.</p>		
Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to the start of, and during, construction activities.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Planning Department	
Performance Criteria N/A	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 10.1 National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Permit		
<p>Prior to the County's approval of a grading plan or site improvement plans, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board a National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Permit for the disturbance of over one acre. Further, approval of a General Construction Storm Water Permit (Order No. 99-08-DWQ) is required along with a Small Construction Storm Water Permit. The permitting process also requires that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) be prepared prior to construction activities. The SWPPP is used to identify potential construction pollutants that may be generated at the site including sediment, earthen material, chemicals, and building materials. The SWPPP also describes best management practices that will be employed to eliminate or reduce such pollutants from entering surface waters.</p>		
Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to the approval of a grading plan or site improvement plans.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Public Works Department	
Performance Criteria N/A	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 10.2 Drainage Plan		
<p>Prior to recordation of a Final Map, a plan for a permanent solution for drainage shall be submitted to and approved by Yuba County and the Public Works Division. The drainage and improvement plans shall provide details relative to drainage, piping, and swales. Further, the Drainage Plan shall specify how drainage waters shall be detained onsite and/or conveyed to the nearest natural or publicly maintained drainage channel or facility and shall provide that there shall be no increase in the peak flow runoff above existing conditions.</p>		
Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to Recordation of Final Map.</i>	Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Public Works Department	
Performance Criteria N/A	Verification Cost N/A	
		Date Complete (If applicable)

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
TSTM 2021-0008 (ALBERTA RANCH)**

MM 18.1 Inadvertent Discoveries Of TCRs

If any suspected TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. A Tribal Representative from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074). The Tribal Representative will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.

Preservation in place is the preferred alternative under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort must be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The Tribe does not consider curation of TCR's to be appropriate or respectful and request that materials not be permanently curated, unless approved by the Tribe.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. Treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a Tribal Cultural Resource may include Tribal Monitoring, culturally appropriate recovery of cultural objects, and reburial of cultural objects or cultural soil.

Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of the CEQA, including AB 52, has been satisfied.

<p>Timing/Implementation <i>Prior to the start of, and during, construction activities.</i></p>	<p>Enforcement/Monitoring Yuba County Planning Department</p>	
<p>Performance Criteria N/A</p>	<p>Verification Cost N/A</p>	
		<p>Date Complete (If applicable)</p>