
APPENDIX B

Yuba County 2030 General Plan Final EIR
Executive Summary

This page intentionally
left blank.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary provides an overview of the EIR for the 2030 Yuba County General Plan (the project). The 2030 General Plan is summarized here (with more detail in Chapter 3, “Project Description”), along with alternatives to the project, which are described in detail in Chapter 5, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project.” Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter, summarizes the environmental impacts identified for the project in each of the environmental issue sections of this draft environmental impact report (DEIR). These impacts are described in detail throughout Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis.” The summary table at the end of this chapter outlines environmental impacts, the significance without mitigation, proposed mitigation measure(s), and the significance of the impact with implementation of identified mitigation measures.

2.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The “project site,” as defined by CEQA, consists of the unincorporated areas of Yuba County. The 2030 General Plan proposes an update of the County’s existing 1996 General Plan. The updated General Plan has been significantly revised and reorganized. The overarching purpose of the updated plan is to provide policy guidelines for future development and conservation in and adapt to issues that have emerged since the creation of the previously written elements. The General Plan provides the framework for decisions guiding where and how development should occur and the priorities given to the County’s natural resources in order to achieve the highest quality of life possible for its residents. The General Plan is comprehensive in scope, addressing land use, transportation, housing, conservation of resources, economic development, public facilities and infrastructure, public safety, and open space, among many other subjects.

Although the General Plan is a policy document that does not directly propose construction projects, assumptions must be made for the purposes of analysis. It is estimated that the updated General Plan could accommodate the construction of between 32,000 and 42,000 housing units and 80,000 to 100,000 additional people living in unincorporated areas of Yuba County at full buildout. Between 47,000 and 67,000 jobs could be located in the County at full buildout of the 2030 General Plan. The presentation of broad ranges for buildout of the General Plan is appropriate for a long-range planning document. The actual population and number of jobs added between present and buildout will depend on changes in the local economy, demographic trends, and other factors, many of which are beyond the direct control of the County. Please refer to the 2030 General Plan for more detail regarding buildout assumptions.

2.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Project alternatives are intended to reduce or eliminate the potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project, while attempting to meet the project objectives. An EIR is required to contain a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]).

The following sections summarize the alternatives to the 2030 General Plan that are addressed in this DEIR. Chapter 5, “Alternatives to the Proposed Project” provides a more detailed description of these alternatives, as well as any alternatives that were originally considered, but then rejected.

2.3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT (1996 GENERAL PLAN).

This alternative assumes that the 2030 General Plan would not be implemented and instead the County would build out as provided in the 1996 General Plan.

2.3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: GROWTH SCENARIO 1.

This alternative would have a smaller, more compact overall development footprint compared to the 2030 General Plan. This alternative describes land use change that would be anticipated for unincorporated areas if the county grew at a rate similar to high growth rates experienced in places such as Placer County during the 1990s and between 2000 and 2009. Development under this alternative would occur in areas with access to existing water, wastewater, transportation, and drainage facilities. This alternative would place a higher proportion of housing within close proximity to destination land uses, such as retail, services, and jobs. With the more compact footprint and a greater focus on infill development and redevelopment, public transit, bicycling, and walking will be viable for a greater proportion of residents for meeting daily travel needs.

2.3.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: BLUEPRINT PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board of Directors adopted the Blueprint Preferred Scenario in December 2004. The Blueprint represents an approach to land use and transportation investments that promotes more compact, mixed-use development, access to transit, improves air quality, and preserves open space, as an alternative to low-density and dispersed development patterns. SACOG used the Blueprint Preferred Scenario to guide preparation of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which identifies priority regional transportation investments. This alternative is guided by the level and mix of development in unincorporated Yuba County included in the Blueprint Preferred Scenario. Relative to the project, this alternative includes a reduced amount of population and employment growth. The land use mix with this alternative is similar to the 2030 General Plan. This alternative reduces the overall footprint of development compared to the 2030 General Plan.

2.3.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: GROWTH SCENARIO 2.

Like Alternatives 2 and 3, this alternative would have a smaller, more compact overall development footprint compared to the 2030 General Plan. This alternative describes land use change that would be anticipated for unincorporated areas if the county grew at a high rate between present and 2030, including buildout of some areas along the Highway 65 corridor between Ostrom Road and South Beale Road.

2.3.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative among the alternatives considered be selected and the reasons for such selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts.

For the purposes of this EIR, Alternative 3 is environmentally superior. Alternative 3 would reduce environmental impacts, compared to the 2030 General Plan, for each of the environmental topic areas analyzed. Alternatives 2 and 4 would also reduce impacts in the same number of topic areas as Alternative 3. In addition to the impacts that would be reduced without changing the impact conclusion, Alternative 3 would also result in one impact area becoming less than significant (Land Use, Population, and Housing).

2.4 SUMMARY OF KNOWN CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

The CEQA Guidelines require that the summary of an EIR include a synopsis of known issues of controversy that have been raised by agencies and the public (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123). A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was delivered to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse on June 17, 2010, anticipating a NOP review period starting June 18, 2010. The County held a scoping meeting on July 7, 2010, to receive comments on the NOP. The County has also conducted public outreach in various formats and settings to

support the 2030 General Plan and has received substantial email and website input from citizens and agencies. Although social and economic issues were raised during this outreach, many environmental issues were also raised. The following is a summary of the issues raised during this scoping process:

- ▶ flood hazards;
- ▶ hazardous materials;
- ▶ access management for state highway system;
- ▶ alternatives to the state highway system for local trips;
- ▶ impacts to state highway system intersections, ramps, ramp intersections, mainline segments;
- ▶ land use strategies to reduce travel demand;
- ▶ wildfire risk in foothill areas;
- ▶ soil stability and erosion;
- ▶ water quality;
- ▶ transportation safety related to conflicts between travel modes;
- ▶ safety at at-grade railroad crossings;
- ▶ loss of agricultural and forest lands;
- ▶ air quality, including airborne toxics, and greenhouse gas emissions;
- ▶ availability of public transportation;
- ▶ water supply;
- ▶ waste disposal;
- ▶ drainage, including impacts to OPUD facilities;
- ▶ direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources, including rare species;
- ▶ evacuation in the case of wildfire;
- ▶ effects of extending utilities to the Magnolia Ranch Specific Plan Area;
- ▶ energy conservation measures;
- ▶ deer herds;
- ▶ orderly provision of urban services in the unincorporated areas;
- ▶ analysis of environmental impacts associated with providing public services;
- ▶ traffic impacts to Marysville;

- ▶ impacts to the Highway 70 bridge;
- ▶ impacts to the Spenceville Recreation and Wildlife Preserve;
- ▶ visual impacts of foothills development;
- ▶ encroachment on existing mining operations;
- ▶ incorporating low impact development and smart growth concepts in order to mitigate impacts related to urbanization;
- ▶ provision of fire, emergency medical, and other public safety services;
- ▶ traffic impacts within Wheatland Fire Authority’s service area that could impact emergency response;
- ▶ fire flow;
- ▶ impacts related to increased vehicle miles traveled;
- ▶ land use planning and population and housing impacts;
- ▶ traffic impacts to major roads in and around the City of Wheatland;
- ▶ groundwater supplies;
- ▶ impacts of future wastewater treatment needs;
- ▶ solid waste and landfill capacity;
- ▶ alternative that focuses on areas with existing municipal services;
- ▶ impacts to mineral resources, especially aggregate operations; and
- ▶ impacts to species using rice lands.

A copy of the NOP and a complete listing of the letters received during the comment periods are provided in Appendix A.

2.5 SUMMARY TABLE

Information in Table 2-1, “Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures,” has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4, “Environmental Analysis,” of this document. The summary table is arranged in four columns: environmental impacts; level of significance without mitigation; recommended mitigation measures; and level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures.

A series of mitigation measures are noted when more than one mitigation measure is required to reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level.

2.6 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The following provides a summary of the project’s cumulative environmental impacts. A detailed discussion of the project cumulative impacts is provided in Section 6.2, “Cumulative Impacts,” of this EIR.

2.6.1 AESTHETICS

Development in Sutter County, Butte County, Nevada County, and Yuba County and cities in the region would cause substantial changes to the exiting visual character. Important visual resources present in Yuba County (agricultural lands, views of the Sutter Buttes and the Sierra Nevada, waterways, etc.) would be affected by land use change under the cumulative scenario by related projects and plans. As development occurs in the unincorporated County and surrounding areas, substantial changes in visual conditions would continue as open viewsheds are replaced by urban development. Increased urban development would also lead to increased nighttime light and glare in the region and more limited views of the night sky and sky glow effects, and would disrupt the rural nature of the area. The effect of these changes, when considering the related projects, on aesthetic resources from past and planned future projects is a cumulatively **significant** impact.

Despite the range of policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan that would reduce or avoid adverse aesthetics impacts throughout Yuba County, urban development of agricultural lands and open space would occur. Growth and development in adjacent counties (Sutter County, Butte County, Nevada County and Placer County) would involve similar conversion of former agricultural lands, open space, and elements of the rural landscape. Given the large scale of this development and the rural nature of the regional setting, the impacts on visual resources from implementing projects accommodated under the 2030 General Plan is **cumulatively considerable**.

2.6.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

Conversion of Important Farmland in the Sacramento Valley is a **significant** cumulative impact resulting from urbanization. The cumulative loss of forestland through development in the region is considered a **significant** cumulative impact, also. The loss of Important Farmland is a cumulatively considerable impact when considered in connection with the **significant** cumulative losses that would occur through implementation of the proposed project, past farmland conversions, and planned future development.

The forest land areas that could potentially be affected by implementation of the General Plan are within the existing (1996) Rural Community Boundary Areas. The conversion of forestland in Yuba County combined with timberland conversion in adjacent counties as a result of rural community development and rural subdivisions is a **significant** cumulative impact. The 2030 General Plan, while maintaining existing (1996) rural community boundaries, would make a **considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact.

2.6.3 AIR QUALITY

Air quality in the region does not meet State of California standards. Construction and operation of projects accommodated under regional plans could have a long-term impact on a region's emission profile and ability to attain and maintain NAAQS and CAAQS. The cumulative effects from short- and long-term criteria pollutants generated from the proposed 2030 General Plan, combined with related projects, creates a **significant** cumulative impact.

Construction-related and operational criteria air pollutant emissions associated with General Plan buildout would exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to air pollutants in the region.

Toxic air contaminants are considered in land use planning in association with sensitive land uses. Projects and plans throughout the region would contribute roadway and railway traffic that could occur near sensitive receptors, resulting in a **significant** cumulative impact. The County considers the contribution of the 2030 General Plan to be **cumulatively considerable**.

2.6.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Past development in Yuba County, ranging from conversion of land to agricultural production to recent expansion of urban development, has resulted in a substantial loss of native habitat to other uses. This is a **significant cumulative impact**. Implementing the 2030 General Plan could result in further loss of special status species and their habitat. Continued development of natural resources areas will result in the incremental decline in the amount of habitat remaining to support special-status species and sensitive natural communities. The 2030 General Plan would contribute to an ongoing decline of special status species and habitats. The 2030 General Plan policies and actions require avoidance of impacts to special-status species and their habitats. The Natural Resources Element also designates various types of open space, including open space required to protect critical habitat and other important biological resources. Therefore, the 2030 General Plan's contribution to a significant cumulative impact would be reduced by implementing the General Plan policies and actions. However, it may not be feasible to completely avoid direct and indirect impacts, while still allowing full build out of the designated land uses and therefore the 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

In Yuba County, most established riparian vegetation occurs along the largest rivers; the Feather River, Yuba River, and Bear River, and south Honcut Creek. Important riparian corridors also occur along Dry Creek and other tributaries to Honcut Creek and the Yuba River. Riparian vegetation is present in the surrounding region along the Sacramento River and in the Sutter Bypass. Agricultural, residential, and industrial water use and land development have resulted in a **significant cumulative** reduction in the extent of riparian habitats in the county and surrounding region. The 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

The alteration of the hydrologic condition supporting long-term soil saturation and conversion to other uses, primarily agriculture, has resulted in a **significant cumulative impact** to freshwater emergent wetlands in Yuba County and the surrounding region. Implementing the 2030 General Plan could result in the loss of freshwater emergent wetland and vernal pool complex with vernal pools and swales. Implementing the General Plan policies and actions listed above, along with the additional mitigation measures, is expected to reduce significant impacts on wetland and other waters of the United States requiring delineation and avoidance of these habitats to the maximum extent feasible, establishment of wetland habitat buffers, and by providing compensation for unavoidable impacts in a manner that would ensure no net loss of overall wetland habitat in the County. Complete avoidance would not be possible while still allowing full build out of the designated land uses. Therefore, the 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

2.6.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources in the region generally consist of prehistoric sites, historic sites, historic structures, and isolated artifacts. During the 19th and 20th centuries, localized urbanization and intensive agricultural use in the region caused the destruction or disturbance of numerous prehistoric sites, while many structures now considered to be historic were erected. Development of projects and plans assumed in the cumulative scenario has the potential to result in the discovery of undocumented subsurface cultural resources or unmarked historic-era or prehistoric Native American burials. Cumulative gains in population, households, and jobs would require a commensurate increase in infrastructure, capital facilities, services, housing, and commercial uses in Yuba County, its incorporated cities, and areas adjacent counties. The impact on archaeological deposits, human remains, and paleontological resources would be substantial given the past extent of urban development, and anticipated gains in population, jobs, and housing. There is a **significant** cumulative impact to cultural resources. Full buildout of the 2030 General Plan would involve substantial development and earth disturbance and the impact is **cumulatively considerable**.

2.6.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The cumulative loss of access to mineral resources is a **significant** cumulative impact resulting from encroachment by development into areas with mineral resources. Implementation of the proposed policies and actions of the 2030 General Plan and implementation of existing regulations for SMARA Mineral Resource Zones, would reduce the impacts of buildout of the 2030 General Plan on mineral resources. Nonetheless, it is possible that development of the County's Rural Community Boundary Areas could preclude extraction of important County mineral resources along the Yuba River. One of the key objectives of the 2030 General Plan is to proactively guide development of rural areas of the County, including those that could be within areas of important mineral resources. The County has included all feasible mitigation as a part of the 2030 General Plan. The 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact. All feasible mitigation is included as policies and actions of the 2030 General Plan.

The fact that vertebrate fossils have been recovered throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in these sediments suggests that there is a potential for uncovering additional similar fossil remains during construction-related earthmoving activities. Development under the cumulative scenario could adversely affect these resources, resulting in a **significant** cumulative impact. Implementation of the policies and actions of the 2030 General Plan would reduce the impacts of buildout of the 2030 General Plan on paleontological resources. However, the 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

2.6.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have the potential to adversely affect the environment because such emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to global climate change. Global climate change has the potential to result in sea level rise (resulting in flooding of low-lying areas), to affect rainfall and snowfall (leading to changes in water supply), to affect temperatures and habitats (affecting biological resources), and to result in many other adverse effects. Global GHG emissions represent a **significant** cumulative impact.

Because the 2030 General Plan would generate higher GHG emissions per service population than is needed at the state level to achieve the AB 32 target, and since a substantial quantity of GHG emissions would be generated through buildout of the General Plan, this impact is considered a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.

In addition to GHG emissions from implementation of the 2030 General Plan, another cumulative impact of climate change includes increased global average temperatures (global warming) through the intensification of the greenhouse effect, and associated changes in local climatic conditions. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. Policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan would reduce the extent and severity of climate change-associated impacts by proactively planning for changes in climate and conditions, and providing methods for adapting to these changes. For the purposes of this EIR, the impact is considered **cumulatively considerable**.

2.6.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The 2030 General Plan would potentially combine with development in the region to create **significant** cumulative hydrologic and water resource impacts. However, the General Plan's Public Health & Safety Element policies are designed to reduce the rate of runoff, filter out pollutants, and/or facilitate groundwater infiltration. Implementation of existing regulations and laws, along with the policies and actions of the 2030 General Plan would reduce the 2030 General Plan's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact to water quality. The 2030 General Plan would have a **less than cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to water quality impacts assuming application of existing regulations and policies and actions of the 2030 General Plan.

Development and land use change in Yuba County and in the surrounding region could result in additional impervious surfaces, and the diversion of groundwater to surface water through subsurface drainage features or localized dewatering measures. As a result, levels of groundwater recharge in the underlying groundwater basin would decline. Reductions in groundwater recharge in a given area could affect groundwater levels and the yield of hydrologically connected wells. This is considered a **significant cumulative impact**. 2030 General Plan policies would be implemented in coordination with the Yuba County Groundwater Management Plan on a regional level to ensure conjunctive use, perennial yield, and avoidance of groundwater overdraft within the County and in surrounding areas that are hydrologically connected to it. The impact is **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Much of the floodplain area of Yuba County and adjacent Sutter County is protected by levees along the Feather River, Yuba River, Bear River, and Honcut Creek. Riverine flooding can overwhelm the integrity of the local or regional levee system. This is a potentially **significant** cumulative impact. Adoption and implementation of the proposed policies in the 2030 General Plan, as well as existing state and local regulations, would reduce the risk for people and structures involving flooding that could result from failure of a levee. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan policies and actions, the 2030 General Plan would have a **less than cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

2.6.9 LAND USE, HOUSING, AND POPULATION

General plans in the region, along with specific plans that are outside the development assumptions from local general plans, would potentially accommodate substantially greater population and employment growth compared to regional forecasts and planning efforts. Population and employment growth beyond those included in local and regional land use and transportation plans could induce population growth, which could have a **significant** cumulative impact.

The County has designed the 2030 General Plan to balance land uses in order to avoid growth inducement elsewhere. However, the 2030 General Plan could accommodate a substantially greater population and employment growth than is included in existing forecasts and plans. The 2030 General Plan would have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

Regional growth could displace existing housing and population, requiring the construction of housing elsewhere, representing a **significant** cumulative impact. The 2030 General Plan does not propose to remove existing housing or displace existing population or housing units. However, it is possible that some housing could be removed during buildout. The 2030 General Plan could have a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

2.6.10 NOISE

Traffic noise levels will increase along major regional roadway corridors as a result of the additional traffic generated by buildout of the 2030 General Plan, coupled with regional growth. This represents a **significant** cumulative impact. The primary factor for a cumulative noise impact analysis is the consideration of future traffic volumes. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan, along with regional growth and traffic conditions, would cause changes in traffic noise levels over existing traffic noise levels. The 2030 General Plan would make a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

2.6.11 PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Development and operation of new parks that may be needed to serve additional population accommodated under the General Plan could result in adverse impacts on the physical environment. The 2030 General Plan establishes the overall parkland standard as “a diversity of park types at a ratio of at least 5 acres for every 1,000 residents.” Implementation of this standard will require land dedication and/or fees and planning for parkland of different

types that is integrated into new growth areas, as well as redevelopment areas. The County, however, is not the primary provider of developed park facilities or recreational programming for all unincorporated areas. Because the County cannot guarantee the full implementation of parkland and recreational policies and actions, and because it is possible that parkland and recreational facilities may not be provided at an adequate rate to avoid overuse of existing facilities, a **potentially significant** cumulative impact related to park facilities would occur. The 2030 General Plan would make a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

2.6.12 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Regional population and employment growth is anticipated to result in traffic volumes along regional roadways, such as SR 70, that could exceed acceptable levels of service. This represents a **significant** cumulative impact.

While the 2030 General Plan includes various policies to reduce traffic demand and mitigation for roadway segments and intersections, traffic is anticipated to exceed level of service standards at certain roadway segments and intersections. The 2030 General Plan would make a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics			
4.1-1: Adverse Impacts on Scenic Vistas. Yuba County contains varying topography and land cover that provides many different types of views and scenic vistas. Prominent aesthetic resources visible within Yuba County include the Sutter Buttes, Sierra Nevada foothills and mountains, the valley floor, expansive agricultural lands, rivers and river valleys, and lakes and reservoirs. Future development anticipated under the General Plan could potentially block or result in changes to certain scenic views. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.1-2: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. There are no officially-designated State Scenic Highways in Yuba County, although SR 49 is an eligible highway. There would be no impact.	NI	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	NI
4.1-3: Degradation of Visual Character. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would substantially alter the visual character of the unincorporated communities in Yuba County through conversion of agricultural and other open space lands to developed urban uses. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.1-4: Increase in Nighttime Lighting and Daytime Glare. Development projects would require nighttime lighting and could include construction of buildings with reflective surfaces that inadvertently cast light and glare toward motorists the County’s highways and roadways. Development under the 2030 General Plan would increase the amount of daytime and nighttime light and glare and would introduce a new source of nighttime lighting in an existing rural area. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
4.2-1: Loss of Important Farmland and Conversion of Agricultural Land to Non-Agricultural Uses. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan could result in the conversion of as many as 5,682 acres of Important Farmland and 44,901 acres of grazing land to nonagricultural uses. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.2-2: Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forest Land to Non-Forest Use. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not result in large-scale conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses, but some timberland areas in Rural Community Boundary Areas could be affected by implementation of the 2030 General Plan. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1: Generation of Long-Term Operational, Regional Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and Consistency with Air Quality Planning Efforts. Future development in Yuba County would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) and ozone precursors, both of which affect regional air quality. The 2030 General Plan would accommodate additional population and employment development, which would lead to operational (mobile-source and area-source) emissions that are not accounted for in the current applicable air quality plan and would exceed FRAQMD thresholds. This impact is considered significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.3-2: Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors. Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and precursors resulting from construction activities accommodated under the 2030 General Plan would exceed FRAQMD's significance thresholds of 25 lb/day for ROG and NO _x and 80 lb/day for PM ₁₀ . Policies in the 2030 General Plan would support compliance with FRAQMD-recommended standard construction mitigation practices. This would appreciably reduce construction-generated air pollutant emissions from buildout of the	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>2030 General Plan. However, due to the large amount of total development proposed over the buildout period, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors is considered substantial, and could violate an ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or predicted air quality violation, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this impact is considered significant.</p>			
<p>4.3-3: Generation of Long-Term, Operational, Local Mobile-Source Emissions of CO. Local mobile-source emissions of CO would not be expected to substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that would exceed the 1-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.3-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would reduce the potential for exposure of sensitive land uses to substantial concentrations of TACs. This impact is considered significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
<p>4.3-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Odors. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of objectionable odors. As a result, this impact is considered significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
<p>4.4 Biological Resources</p>			
<p>4.4-1: Impacts to Special Status Wildlife and Fish Species. 37 special-status wildlife and fish species are known to occur within areas that could be affected by implementation of the 2030 General Plan. Special-status species could occur in suitable habitats throughout areas that could be affected by implementation of the 2030 General Plan. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in loss or degradation of existing populations or of suitable habitat for these species. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4-2: Impacts to Special-Status Plants. Adopting and implementing the 2030 General Plan would accommodate development in areas of the County that support habitat for special-status plant species, which could result in loss of special-status plants either through direct removal or through habitat degradation, if they are present. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.4-3: Loss and Degradation of Sensitive Habitats. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate development in areas that support oak woodland and riparian habitats. Development in these areas would result in direct impacts on these sensitive habitats through vegetation removal. Loss and degradation of these habitat types could also result from indirect effects, such as altered hydrology, introduction of invasive species, and habitat fragmentation. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>4.4-3a: Oak Woodland Habitats. The following measures shall be implemented until the County has adopted an oak woodland preservation and mitigation ordinance. The County oak woodland preservation and mitigation plan may incorporate many of the measures listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ During evaluation of development proposals, require that impacts on oak woodlands such as direct conversions, habitat fragmentation and adverse effects from adjacent land uses be avoided to the greatest extent feasible through project design and modification. This shall be accomplished through mapping oak woodland resources on the project site and establishing buffers around existing stands to prevent adverse effects. ▶ Require implementation of BMPs while working near oak woodlands to avoid inadvertent damage to oak trees. BMPs should include establishment of buffers to prevent root and crown damage, soil compaction, introduction and spread of invasive species and other indirect effects. ▶ For those impacts on oak woodland that cannot be avoided, the County shall require the project applicant to minimize adverse affects. All impacts that cannot be avoided shall be mitigated to ensure that loss of oak woodland habitat in the county is reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Mitigation shall include the following steps: mapping of oak woodlands on the project site, quantification of oak woodland impacts resulting from project implementation, determination of appropriate mitigation measures (avoidance, minimization, compensation), development of an oak woodland mitigation plan, and implementation of the plan including monitoring and remedial measures. 	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Measures proposed in the oak woodland mitigation plan may include planting acorns and container stock from a local seed source; however planting may not account for more than 50% of the required mitigation and must occur on lands that are protected in perpetuity. Other measures to be included in the mitigation plan may include the enhancement of degraded stands of oak woodland, purchase of fee title of land and transfer to a public agency for management, and purchase of conservation easements. ▶ Oak woodland habitat placed under conservation easements should be at appropriate ratios to offset the loss of habitat functions and values of the oak woodland to be lost. Oak woodland habitat preserved this way should have similar tree sizes and densities, species composition, site condition, and landscape context to the oak woodland to be removed to serve the same function and have similar habitat value. The County may also consider the establishment of an oak woodland conservation fund which project applicants may contribute to for a percentage of their mitigation requirements, however a cap should be established for fund contributions, similar to the cap for replacement planting; fund moneys would be used solely for purchase of conservation easements or for public lands to protect oak woodland resources. ▶ Wherever possible, mitigation lands shall be contiguous with lands already protected and managed for the long term protection of oak woodland and the associated plant and wildlife species to maximize the likelihood of mitigation success. The oak woodland plan shall be developed by a qualified professional such as a professional biologist, arborist or registered forester using the best available science and shall clearly state all mitigation measures required. ▶ The plan shall designate responsible parties for funding, implementing mitigation, monitoring, reporting and annual review, and shall include remedial action measures if the initial plan fails or if success levels fall below the thresholds specified in the plan. The County shall require the mitigation plan and 	

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>proof of sufficient means to implement the plan prior to project approval and shall require annual reports for the implementation timeframe of the plan.</p> <p>4.4-3b: Riparian Habitats The following measures shall be implemented as necessary to avoid significant impacts to riparian habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If complete avoidance is not feasible, and projects require encroachment into the riparian habitat, project applicants shall be required to develop a riparian habitat mitigation plan resulting in a no- net- loss of riparian habitat functions and values. ▶ Mitigation may be accomplished through replacement, enhancement of degraded habitat, or off -site mitigation at an established mitigation bank. ▶ If a proposed project requires work on the bed and bank of a stream or other water body, the project applicant shall also obtain a streambed alteration agreement under Section 1600 et al. of the Fish and Game Code from DFG prior to project implementation, and shall implement all requirements of the agreement in the timeframes required therein. 	
<p>4.4-4: Interference with Movement or Migratory Patterns of Fish or Wildlife Species. Construction of infrastructure, roadways, or developments as part of the buildout of the 2030 General Plan could result in modifications to potential migratory routes or resting locations for fish or wildlife species. In addition, buildout of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate land use change that could alter migratory patterns for wildlife species. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
<p>4.4-5: Potential for Direct and Indirect Impacts on Federally Protected Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in direct impacts to federally protected wetlands and other waters of the United States, including vernal pools, freshwater emergent wetlands, and rivers, streams, and other water bodies. Impacts could occur</p>	PS	<p>4.4-5: Waters of the United States. The following measures shall be implemented, in addition to the 2030 General Plan policies and actions, to reduce significant impacts on wetlands and other waters of the United States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A permit from the USACE will be require for any activity resulting in impacts of “fill” of wetlands and other waters of the 	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
through habitat conversion, encroachment, routine maintenance, or other activities in the immediate vicinity of rivers and other water bodies and in habitat supporting wetlands. Indirect impacts could result from adjacent development that leads to habitat modifications such as changes in hydrology. This impact is considered potentially significant.		<p>United States. If the impact acreage is below one half acre, the project may qualify for a Nationwide Permit. If impacts exceed one half acre, a letter of permission or individual permit from the USACE will be required prior. Project applicants shall be required to obtain this permit prior to project initiation. A wetland mitigation plan that satisfies USACE requirements will be needed as part of the permit application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Projects applicants that obtain a Section 404 permit will also be required to obtain certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA. If the project involves work on the bed and bank of a river, stream or lake, a Streambed Alteration Agreement for CDFG pursuant to Section 1600 et al. of the Fish and Game Code will also be needed. Project applicants shall be required to obtain all needed permits prior to project implementation, to abide by the conditions of the permits, including all mitigation requirements, and to implement all requirements of the permits in the timeframes required therein. 	
4.4-6: Conflict with an Adopted HCP/NCCP or Local Policies Protecting Biological Resources. Yuba and Sutter Counties are currently in the process of developing a combined Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) / Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). This plan has yet to be adopted. During the planning horizon of the 2030 General Plan, if the NCCP/HCP is adopted, policies within the 2030 General Plan will ensure consistency with the NCCP/HCP. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.5 Cultural Resources			
4.5-1: Damage to Identified Historical Resources and Unique Archaeological Resources. The 2030 General Plan contains policies and a growth template that would allow construction and development, as depicted in the Land Use Diagram. Yuba County has a high density of identified cultural resources. Many of these resources, upon evaluation, are likely to qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Construction activity under the General Plan could affect one or more of these resources, resulting in significant impacts by either direct disturbance through excavation or by changes to the setting. These impacts are potentially significant.			
4.5-2: Damage of Previously Unidentified Cultural Resources. Buildout of the areas designated for development within the planning area identified 2030 General Plan has the potential to damage or disturb previously unidentified cultural resources. The density of known cultural resources within Yuba County is high; indicating that additional resources occur that have not been recorded and which could be damaged by construction prior to discovery. This impact is potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.5-3: Disturbance and Damage to Human Remains. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would allow construction in areas that could contain previously undiscovered buried human remains. Previously identified cultural resources within the County include prehistoric archaeological sites with human burials. In addition, historic archaeological deposits may include human remains and cemeteries. It is possible that ground-disturbing work that would be performed during buildout of the General Plan will encounter such remains, and potentially result in damage. This impact is potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.6 Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources			
4.6-1: Potential for Exposure to Seismic Ground Shaking. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would not result in development of areas prone to strong seismic ground shaking. Implementation of policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan and compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to exposure to seismic ground shaking. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.6-2: Potential for Seismic Ground Failure or Other Unstable Soil Conditions. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan could accommodate development of areas located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that could become unstable with moderate potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or landslides and subsidence.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Implementation of policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan and existing regulations would reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to exposure to seismic ground failure or other unstable soil conditions. This impact is considered less than significant.			
4.6-3: Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan could accommodate substantial construction and development, which could potentially cause soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Implementation of policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan and existing regulations would reduce potential soil erosion and topsoil loss. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.6-4: Construction in Areas with Expansive Soils. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas with expansive soils. General Plan policies and existing regulations will require measures to reduce impacts related to expansive soils. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.6-5: Construction in Areas with Soils with Poor Septic Suitability. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would result in construction of occupied structures in areas with soils poorly suited to septic systems. Should septic systems be used, implementation of policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan and existing regulations would require use of best practices for septic systems. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.6-6: Loss of Availability of Known Mineral Resources. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan could result in construction in areas near existing or potential future mineral resource development. While regionally significant mineral deposits located within Yuba County, including MRZ-2 zones located along the Yuba River between Marysville and Smartsville, will be preserved, it is possible that development under the 2030 General Plan would encroach on mining operations. However, narrative policy of the 2030 General Plan is structured to reduce impacts to areas with substantial mineral resources. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.6-7: Possible Damage to Unknown, Potentially Unique Paleontological Resources. Construction activities could disturb previously unknown paleontological resources in areas addressed by the 2030 General Plan. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.6-8: Potential damage from a seiche. The 2030 General Plan Land Use Diagram and Open Space Diagram indicate that new development would be limited around Collins Reservoir and substantial new development would not be consistent with the General Plan around New Bullards Bar Reservoir. However, it is possible that buildout of the 2030 General Plan could accommodate a very limited amount development in areas located at risk of damage from a seiche. Enclosed water bodies within the County are potential locations for a seiche to occur as a result of an earthquake and lake users, lake shorelines, and areas downstream of dams are at risk of potential damage from a seiche. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures.	LTS
4.7 Climate Change			
4.7-1: Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The 2030 General Plan would accommodate land use change that would increase GHG emissions. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan Update would result in substantially higher GHG emissions compared with existing levels. Climate change attributable to human-caused GHG emissions is a significant cumulative impact. 2030 General Plan GHG mass emissions could be cumulatively considerable when compared to existing mass emissions in. For this reason, this impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.7-2: Impacts of Climate Change on Yuba County. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects that could potentially impact Yuba County: alterations to agricultural production; changes to terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; increased energy demand; decreased water supply; increased risk of flooding; and increased frequency and intensity of wildfire. Substantial negative effects on residents, resources, structures, and the economy could result. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	The 2030 General Plan Update contains many goals, policies, and programs which have the potential to aid the County’s adaptation to climate change (reducing energy demand, reducing flood potential, decreasing wildfire risk, ensuring adequate water supply, increasing water conservation, preserving important habitat and open space areas). These policies and actions are shown in Table 4.7-4 and included throughout the 2030 General Plan.	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
<p>4.8-1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal and Possible Release of Hazardous Materials from Upset or Accident Conditions. Future population growth through buildout of the 2030 General Plan would result in an increase in the routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials, which could result in greater exposure of the public to such materials and exposure of increasing numbers of people through either routine use or accidental release. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies, in combination with existing federal and state regulations, would reduce the potential impacts related to the routine transportation of hazardous materials. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policy but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.8-2: Emission or Handling of Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could result in development of uses that would emit or handle hazardous waste in proximity to new or existing schools. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.8-3: Public Health Hazards from Project Development on a Known Hazardous Materials Site Compiled Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Several sites within the County are listed on the Cortese List as known hazardous materials sites. Implementation of the proposed project could expose construction workers to hazards and hazardous materials from these sites during construction activities, and hazardous materials on-site could create an environmental or health hazard if left in place. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.8-4: Safety Hazards Associated with Public and Private Airports. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could locate development within the vicinity of a public-use or private airstrip, potentially resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area. Policies and actions included in the 2030 General Plan, along with existing state local regulations associated with development in the vicinity of airports, would address these hazards. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.8-5: Interference with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan and Evacuation Plan. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would add additional traffic and residences requiring evacuation in case of an emergency. Implementation of 2030 General Plan policies would ensure conformance with local emergency-response programs and continued cooperation with emergency-response service providers. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.8-6: Exposure of People and Structures to Urban and Wildland Fires. Development of the 2030 General Plan could potentially increase risk to fire for both people and property. However, implementation of 2030 General Plan policies and actions, along with existing regulations would ensure that people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss of injury involving fires. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality</p>			
<p>4.9-1: Violation of Water Quality Standards. Development anticipated under the 2030 General Plan would result in additional discharges of pollutants to receiving water bodies from nonpoint sources. Such pollutants would result in adverse changes to the water quality of local water bodies. However, with adoption and implementation of the proposed policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan, combined with current land use, stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9-2: On-Site and Downstream Erosion and Sedimentation and Alteration of Drainage Patterns. Development and land use change consistent with the 2030 General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the total volume and peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff. This could alter local drainage patterns, increasing watershed flow rates above the natural background level (i.e., peak flow rates). Increased peak flow rates may exceed drainage system capacities, exacerbate erosion in overland flow and drainage swales and creeks, and result in downstream sedimentation. Sedimentation, in turn, could increase the rate of deposition in natural receiving waters and reduce conveyance capacities, resulting in an increased risk of flooding. Erosion of upstream areas and related downstream sedimentation typically leads to adverse changes to water quality and hydrology. However, with adoption and implementation of the proposed policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan, combined with current grading, erosion, and flood control regulations, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.9-3: Construction-Related Water Quality Impacts. Construction and grading activities during development consistent with the 2030 General Plan could result in excess runoff, soil erosion, and stormwater discharges of suspended solids and increased turbidity. Such activities could mobilize other pollutants from project construction sites as contaminated runoff to on-site and ultimately off-site drainage channels. Many construction-related wastes have the potential to degrade existing water quality. Project construction activities that are implemented without mitigation could violate water quality standards or cause direct harm to aquatic organisms. However, with implementation of existing regulations and water quality policies and actions contained in the 2030 General Plan, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9-4: Interference with Groundwater Recharge or Substantial Depletion of Groundwater Supplies. Development and land use change consistent with the 2030 General Plan could result in additional impervious surfaces and the diversion of groundwater to surface water. Resulting reductions in groundwater recharge in the groundwater basins underlying the Planning Area could affect groundwater levels and the yield of hydrologically connected wells. However, with implementation of the proposed policies and actions in the 2030 General Plan, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.9-5: Exposure of People or Structures to Flood Hazards. Development and land use changes consistent with the 2030 General Plan could result in the development of residential or commercial structures in floodplains, thereby exposing people and structures to flood hazards. However, implementation of the proposed policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan, combined with enforcement of existing flood control regulations would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.9-6: Potential for Failure of a Levee. Levees can fail because of earthquake-induced slumping, landslides, liquefaction, overtopping, and high volume flows. Levee failure results in exposure of people and structures to inundation, and death, injury, or loss of property could result. The Feather River Levee system protects the Sutter Basin area, which includes much of Western Yuba County. Extensive levee systems have been constructed along the Yuba, and Bear Rivers, and Western Pacific Interceptor Canal to provide flood protection. Implementation of the proposed policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan, combined with other relevant state and local regulations, would reduce the potential for effects on the area from levee failure. The impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.9-7: Potential for Failure of a Dam. The Yuba County Water Agency Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan has identified five dams in or outside the County where dam inundation has the potential to result in major loss of life and property in Yuba County in the unlikely event of dam failure, and three dams that would result in major damage on a smaller scale. Implementation of the proposed policies and programs in the 2030 General Plan, combined with other relevant state and local regulations, would minimize the potential for effects from dam failure. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.10 Land Use Planning, Population, and Housing</p>			
<p>4.10-1: Disrupt or Divide an Established Community. Compliance with goals and policies in the 2030 General Plan would ensure that development pursuant to the 2030 General Plan would not disrupt or divide established communities. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.10-2: Conflicts with Other Plans. The goals, policies, and actions proposed in the 2030 General Plan would not conflict with other land use plans, policies, or agency regulations with jurisdiction over projects that could be developed under the 2030 General Plan. The impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.10-3: Potential Conflict with Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There would be no impact.</p>	NI	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policy but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.10-4: Induce Population Growth. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan could induce population growth in unincorporated Yuba County. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policy but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10-5: Displacement of Existing Population and Housing. The 2030 General Plan provides overarching guidance for development and conservation. The 2030 General Plan does not propose to remove existing housing or displace existing population or housing units. However, it is possible that areas designated for development could involve removal of existing housing. The impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.11 Noise and Vibration			
4.11-1: Potential for Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction Noise. Short-term construction source noise levels could exceed the applicable County standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. In addition, if construction activities were to occur during more noise-sensitive hours, construction source noise levels could also result in annoyance and/or sleep disruption to occupants of existing and proposed noise-sensitive land uses and create a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. However, the 2030 General Plan would include policies to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed established standards. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policy but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.11-2: Exposure to or Generation of Noise Levels in Excess of Local Standards. Future development of new noise-sensitive land uses would occur under the 2030 General Plan within areas that either are currently affected by noise from both transportation and non-transportation noise sources, or will be in the future. Uses allowed under the General Plan could potentially expose existing or planned noise-sensitive uses to noise levels that exceed local standards. However, the 2030 General Plan would include policies and actions to reduce the potential for noise levels to exceed established standards. Nevertheless, even with the implementation of these General Plan policies and actions, this impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.11-3: Increases in Ambient Noise Levels. Under the 2030 General Plan, future development of new noise-generating land uses	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
could occur within areas containing noise-sensitive land uses. The impact is considered potentially significant.			
4.11-4: Increases in Vibration Levels. Construction of projects accommodated under the 2030 General Plan could cause a temporary, short-term disruptive vibration if construction activities were to occur near sensitive receptors. Under the 2030 General Plan, future development of new vibration-sensitive land uses could occur within vibration-generating areas (e.g., railroads). However, the 2030 General Plan would also include policies and actions to reduce the potential for vibration levels to exceed established standards. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.11-5: Noise Levels Near Airports. Future development of noise-sensitive land uses would occur under the 2030 General Plan within areas that are affected by noise from airport operations. However, the 2030 General Plan would also include policies and actions to reduce the potential for noise levels to exceed established standards at noise-sensitive receptors. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.12 Public Services and Facilities			
4.12-1: Demand for Additional Fire Protection and Emergency Services Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in an increase in population in Yuba County and increase the demand for fire protection services, which would result in the need for additional and/or expanded fire protection facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.12-2: Demand for Additional Law Enforcement Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate an increase in population and commerce in Yuba County, thereby increasing the demand for police protection and law enforcement services, which could result in the need for additional and/or expanded police protection facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12-3: Demand for Additional School Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate a population increase in the unincorporated areas of Yuba County, which also increase the number of school-aged children requiring educational services. The increased demand for services could result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. However, the environmental effects of such facilities expansion are analyzed throughout the environmental subsections of Section 4.0 of this EIR and there are no additional significant impacts beyond that which is already fully addressed. In addition, school impact fees will be required to address increased demand for educational services. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.12-4: Need for New or Expanded Parks and/or Recreation Facilities and Potential for Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Parks. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in an increase in population in Yuba County, which would result in an increase in demand for parks and recreation services and require the construction of additional and/or expanded parks and recreation facilities. The construction of facilities could potentially have adverse impacts on the physical environment. Increased population in the unincorporated County could result in heavier use of existing parks within and outside of the unincorporated County, which could lead to accelerated deterioration of such facilities. The General Plan provides the policy direction necessary to fund and construct parks and recreational facilities needed to respond to increased demand. However, this would depend on the cooperation of agencies outside the County’s direct control. Therefore, the impact is considered potentially significant.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
<p>4.12-5: Demand for Additional Library Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would generate new population in Yuba County, which would create an increase in demand for library services, which could potentially result in the need for new or expanded library facilities. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.13 Transportation and Traffic			
4.13-1: Increase in Traffic Levels. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in increases in traffic levels on roadways within Yuba County. This impact is considered significant.	S	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.13-2: Degradation of Roadway Levels of Service. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in roadways and intersections degrading below their current operations. Increased congestion is not in and of itself an adverse physical environmental impact under CEQA. Indirect impacts associated with increased traffic and congestion are analyzed in other sections of this EIR. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.13-3: Potential Traffic Impacts in Other Jurisdictions. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would contribute to roadways and intersections degrading below the applicable LOS standard of the incorporated Cities of Wheatland, Marysville, and Yuba City, and the adjacent Counties of Sutter, Placer, Butte, and Nevada. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.13-4: Traffic Impacts on Caltrans' Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in Caltrans' facilities degrading below the applicable LOS standard. This impact would be significant.	S	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.13-5: Increased Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT). Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in greater VMT compared to existing conditions. This impact is considered potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.13-6: Result in Change in Air Traffic Patterns. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in substantial safety risks. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.13-7: Introduce New Traffic Hazards. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not introduce new traffic hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. The General Plan, however, would add traffic across existing at-grade railroad crossings and to areas where the County anticipates ongoing movement of	PS	4.13-7: Railroad Crossings ▶ For developments that would add substantial traffic, defined as adding 5,000 or more daily trips, across existing at-grade railroad crossings, traffic analysis shall be submitted to the County for review. This analysis and report shall estimate daily	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
agricultural equipment. This impact would be potentially significant.		<p>and peak-hour traffic at the subject at-grade crossing, as well as accident data; estimates of train, vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel at the crossing; and a description of existing and planned and funded equipment at at-grade rail crossings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The County will review traffic data in communication with the California PUC to identify improvements needed to ensure the public safety. ▶ As appropriate and feasible, the County will condition approval of projects and plans that add substantial traffic across at-grade crossings to participate in the funding for improvements needed to ensure the public safety as determined by the County. Such improvements may include coordinated highway/rail traffic signals, enhanced rail crossing signage, warning equipment, and markings, and grade-separations. ▶ Depending on the outcome of these studies, the County may include improvements in future updates to its Capital Improvement Program. 	
4.13-8: Adverse Effects on Emergency Access. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not adversely affect access to emergency services. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
4.13-9: Conflicts with Policies Supporting Alternative Transportation. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.14 Utilities and Service Systems			
4.14-1: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in the development of new residential, commercial, industrial, and civic uses, which would increase local demand for wastewater treatment facilities. It is possible that land use change could exceed the capacity of wastewater treatment facilities. It is possible that, depending on the specific uses developed under the 2030 General	PS	<p>4.14-1: Wastewater Treatment Verification. The County shall implement the following measures to ensure the availability of adequate wastewater collection and removal systems for land development projects in the unincorporated county under the 2030 General Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before approval of any tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project, the County shall formally consult with the 	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Plan, wastewater treatment requirements may be exceeded. This impact is considered potentially significant.		<p>appropriate wastewater system provider that would serve the proposed subdivision to make a factual showing or impose conditions to ensure the availability of an adequate wastewater removal system for the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before recordation of any final subdivision map, or before County approval of any project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement for nonresidential land uses, the project applicant shall demonstrate, based on substantial evidence, the availability of a long-term, reliable wastewater collection and treatment system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of a written verification that existing treatment capacity is, or will be available and that needed physical improvements for treating wastewater from the project site will be in place before occupancy. 	
4.14-2: Construction of New or Expanded Water or Wastewater Facilities. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in the development of new residential, commercial, industrial, and civic uses, which would increase local demand for water conveyance and wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. In addition, implementation of the 2030 General Plan could accommodate development in areas that currently are not served by water systems or a wastewater treatment provider. Construction of new or expanded water and wastewater facilities could have adverse effects on the physical environment. This impact is potentially significant.	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU
4.14-3: New or Expanded Storm Water Drainage Facilities. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate an expansion of the urbanized landscape and construction of new impermeable surfaces that would generate additional stormwater runoff compared to baseline conditions. New land uses would be expected to include residential, commercial, industrial, and civic uses. Each of these land uses could involve addition of impermeable surfaces, with associated increases in stormwater runoff. The	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>construction of new facilities and conveyance infrastructure or the expansion of existing facilities and infrastructure to handle this runoff could generate significant environmental effects. This impact is considered potentially significant.</p>			
<p>4.14-4: Insufficient Water Supplies to Meet the Future Water Demand in Unincorporated Areas Served by the County. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would designate land uses that, if developed to full buildout, would increase water demand. Reductions in agricultural cultivation caused by conversion of agricultural land would decrease water consumption within Yuba County. Existing regulations require additional water conservation measures in new development and for large developments to demonstrate ongoing reliable water supply. Considering existing regulations that require conservation and demonstration of water supply and that the overall change in water demand compared to existing supply is not substantial, the impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.14-5: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Disposal and Compliance with Solid Waste Requirements. Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would accommodate an increase in population and commerce. This would result in an associated increase in solid waste streams of approximately 82,125 tons of solid waste per year, conservatively estimated. Because available capacity can meet this demand, no new facilities would need to be constructed to serve 2030 General Plan buildout. For these reasons this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS
<p>4.15 Energy</p>			
<p>4.15-1: Effects on Energy Consumption from Land Use Locations and Patterns. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would result in an increased demand for energy. New residential, commercial, industrial, and civic uses will increase local energy demands. However, the policies and actions of the General Plan that guide growth and development are designed to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact</p>	LTS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	LTS

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
would be less than significant.			
<p>4.15-2: Increased Energy Demand and Need for Additional Energy Infrastructure. Implementation of the 2030 General Plan would increase energy demand and would result in the need to extend services and infrastructure to new users in Yuba County. Policies of the 2030 General Plan, as well as existing regulations and project-level review would reduce energy demand. However, the future energy demand would require construction and operation of energy-related facilities that would have potentially significant impacts.</p>	PS	EIR references mitigating 2030 General Plan policies and actions but not technically EIR mitigation measures	SU

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less than Significant

S = Significant

PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable