



County of Calaveras

Department of Planning

Peter N. Maurer – Interim Planning director

Phone (209) 754-6394 Fax (209) 754-6540

www.planning.calaverasgov.us

Initial Study / Negative Declaration

Review Period: October 23, 2024 through November 25, 2024

Initial Study

ENVIRONMENTAL

CHECKLIST

For: Allen Sender

Zoning Amendment 2023-028

Assessor's Parcel No. 036-005-009 and 036-006-027

1. Project Title: Zoning Amendment 2023-028 for Allen Sender
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Calaveras County Planning Department
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Katherine Stefani, Planner II
kstefani@calaverascounty.gov
(209)754-6394
4. Project Location: 8183 & 8151 Garabaldi Street
Mountain Ranch, CA 95246
APNs 036-005-009 & 036-006-027
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Allen Sender
8111 Garabaldi Street
Mountain Ranch, CA 95246
6. General Plan Designation: Historic Center (HC)
7. Zoning: Single-Family Residential (R1) and Local Commercial (C1)
8. Project Description:

The application proposes to amend the zoning of a 0.15-acre parcel (APN 036-005-009) from R1 (Single-Family Residential) to C1 (Local Commercial) to accommodate a proposed 4,500 square foot expansion of the retail grocery and hardware store on the adjacent C1 zoned parcel, APN 036-006-027.

The subject parcel is located at 8183 Garabaldi Street, Mountain Ranch, CA. APN 036-005-009 is located in a portion of Block 1 of the El Dorado Townsite.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Location	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Land Use
North	Historic Center	Local Commercial	Sender's Market
South	Historic Center, Rural Residential	Single-Family Residential, Rural Residential	Single-family residences, vacant land
East	Historic Center, Working Lands	Local Commercial, Rural Residential, Single-Family Residential	Cemetery, vacant land
West	Historic Center, Public/Institutional	Local Commercial, Single-Family Residential, Public Service	Commercial uses, single-family residences, Mountain

			Ranch Community Park
--	--	--	----------------------

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: NONE

11. Have California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1?

YES or NO

If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? YES or NO

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

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

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

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



Katherine Stefani
Project Planner

10/16/2024

Date

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 a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Environmental Impact Analysis:

The project consists of a Zoning Amendment (ZA) to amend the zoning of APN 036-005-009 in Mountain Ranch from Single-Family Residential (R1) to Local Commercial (C1). The rezoning will facilitate a lot line adjustment to allow a proposed 4,500 square-foot expansion of the existing business on the adjacent C1 parcel, APN 036-006-027, which is a retail grocery and hardware store. Approximately 1,500 square feet of the expansion will be increased shopping area, and the remainder will be warehousing for grocery backstock and cold storage. The expansion as planned requires a zero-foot setback between the parcels, which the existing R1 zoning does not allow. Per the Calaveras County Code, the C1 zone is designed to provide areas for a mix of residential and commercial uses intended to serve the residents of and visitors to the community and the surrounding area. The subject property, located in a mixed commercial and residential area, is currently developed with a barn built in the early 1900s that has been used for personal storage for many years. This report analyzes impacts to the subject parcel and the proposed addition on the adjacent parcel.

The subject parcel, APN 036-005-009, is located at 8183 Garabaldi Street in Mountain Ranch and the adjacent parcel, where the commercial addition is proposed, is located at 8151 Garabaldi Street (APN 036-006-027). The parcels are a portion of Block 1 of the El Dorado Townsite. Figures 1 and 2 show the location of the parcels in the Mountain Ranch area of Calaveras County. Figure 3 shows the approximate planned location of the proposed addition. The parcels are not within a public service area for water or wastewater. The subject parcel does not have a well or septic system, but the adjacent parcel is developed with both. The project site is not located within any known earthquake fault zone. Impacts from liquefaction and erosion of the site are less than significant due to parcel features, the scale of potential development, and application of existing local and state regulations. There is a pond and unnamed creek on the adjacent parcel, APN 036-006-027, but the creek is diverted through a culvert and the proposed addition on the adjacent parcel is not located near either of these features. Although the parcel is located within a delineated natural diversity database area for Parry's horkelia (a flower), the project was not found to have a significant impact on the species.



Figure 1 - Location Map



Figure 2 - Aerial Photo (Parcel boundary lines shown in green are approximate)



Figure 3 – Proposed area for addition on southside of Sender’s Market, the grocery and hardware store

I. AESTHETICS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Except as provided in Public Resources Code §21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact** – A scenic vista is an area that is designated, signed, and accessible to the public for the express purposes of viewing and sightseeing. The Conservation and Open Space element of the Calaveras County General Plan considers scenic vistas to include forests, rolling hills, ranches, agricultural land, historic landscapes, oak woodlands, rock formations, and other unique topographical features, river corridors, lakes, and streams.¹ None of these features are present on the subject parcel or in the surrounding area. Additionally, there are no designated scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, rezoning APN 036-005-009 and the addition to the existing commercial structure on APN 036-006-027 will not result in a significant impact.
- b) **No Impact** –The subject parcel is over 12 miles from the closest designated scenic highway (Highway 4 in Arnold).² Therefore, rezoning this parcel will not result in any damage or impact to scenic resources.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The existing visual quality of the project site and surrounding area is characteristic of a rural mixed commercial and residential area. There are mostly one story commercial and residential buildings surrounded by trees including pines and oaks in the vicinity of the project site. A zoning amendment (ZA) to C1 would allow for a maximum building height of 45 feet which is 10 feet taller than the current building height limit of 35 feet; however, no further development is proposed on the parcel to be rezoned. The rezone is to facilitate an addition on an adjacent C1 parcel, the addition to be located on the southern side of the existing store on that parcel and east of (behind) the barn, which has a peaked roof,

and a 45-foot height limit. There are no prominent views visible from the parcel or the surrounding area that would be impacted by the proposed addition. Therefore, any visual impact from the proposed addition would be limited and the proposed ZA would not result in development that would substantially degrade public views of the site and its surroundings.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage. The applicant is proposing to construct an addition to the existing commercial structure on the adjacent parcel, which will be subject to the regulations of the Calaveras County Zoning Code including Section 17.16.100 – Lighting and Illumination.³ This section has requirements for maximum light levels at property lines, shielding of all outdoor light fixtures, glare prevention, and timing controls. With the adherence to outdoor lighting regulations at the time of development, the proposed project would not create new sources of substantial lighting or glare that would generate a significant impact. Therefore, the rezoning of this parcel will not result in a significant impact due to new light sources.

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.

Would the project:

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

Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact** – The California Department of Conservation’s Important Farmland Finder map has designated both APN 036-005-009 (proposed to be rezoned) and APN 036-006-027 (proposed to construct an addition to existing commercial structure) as “Urban and Built-Up Land.”⁴ Therefore, there will be no conversion of prime, unique, or important farmland to a non-agricultural use because of this project, and thus no impact due to the proposed rezone.
- b) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is not restricted by a Williamson Act contract and is not zoned for agricultural use. The current zoning is Single-Family Residential (R1) and the existing use on the parcel is a barn used for personal storage, not an agricultural use. The adjacent parcel, where the addition is proposed, is zoned C1 and used commercially. Therefore, a rezone of the subject parcel to C1 will not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.
- c) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is not restricted by a Timberland Production contract and is not zoned for forest land or timber production. The existing zoning is Single-family Residential (R1) and the existing use on the parcel is a barn used for personal storage. The adjacent parcel, where the addition is proposed, is zoned C1 and used commercially. Therefore, a rezone of the subject parcel to C1 will not rezone forest land or timberland.
- d) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is surrounded by commercial and residential development in the unincorporated community of Mountain Ranch. The site has already been developed with a barn and there is no forest land immediately surrounding the project site. Therefore, a rezone to C1 will not result in the lost or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- e) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is already developed and is surrounded by commercial and residential development. The structure on site is used for personal storage, and the purpose of the ZA is to allow the construction of an addition to an existing commercial structure on a cleared, graveled area on the adjacent parcel. The closest farmland is Farmland of Local Importance located northwest, across Mountain Ranch Road, but rezoning the subject parcel to C1 and a commercial addition on the adjacent parcel would not significantly impact the surrounding parcels.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires projects to be consistent with the local management plan and the State Implementation Plan (SIP). A consistency determination plays an essential role in local agency project review by linking local planning and unique individual projects to the County General Plan and the SIP in the following ways: (1) it fulfills the CEQA goal of fully informing local agency decision makers of the environmental costs of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed; and (2) it provides the local agency with ongoing information assuring local decision-makers that they are making real contributions to clean air goals contained in the SIP. Projects that are consistent with the local General Plan are therefore considered consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The proposed ZA is to allow a commercial addition to the existing business on the adjacent parcel. No significant air quality impacts have been identified for either construction or operation of the project. As such, the project is consistent with the goals of County General Plan, the SIP, and does not present a significant air quality impact.

The proposed project is in Calaveras County, which is part of the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). Air quality within the County is under the jurisdiction of the Calaveras County Air Pollution Control District (CCAPCD). Although the County has experienced relatively good air quality, it has been classified as a non-attainment area for the State and Federal ozone standards (1-hour and 8-hour) and particulate matter standards (PM2.5 and PM10).⁵ The primary source of ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NOx) is mobile sources, including cars, trucks, buses, construction equipment, and agricultural equipment. Common sources of particulate matter pollution in the County include residential, development, and land management related activities such as woodstoves, windblown dust and/or diesel from

construction activities, and forestry management burning. The County General Plan states that pollutant exceedance is due mainly to emissions produced elsewhere in the state, particularly the Valley and Bay Area, and transported into the county by prevailing winds.⁶

The ZA would allow the construction of an addition to the south side of the existing commercial structure located on APN 036-006-027, adjacent to the parcel proposed to be rezoned. Construction of the addition would produce typical air pollutants, but the operation of the addition won't release a significant amount of pollutants, and would be subject to all applicable state, regional, and local regulations related to construction and building emissions. Additionally, the addition to the business will help allow Sender's Market to continue to serve as a general store in the Mountain Ranch Community. Should the business be unable to provide the goods and services it currently does or close, residents would have to travel several miles to purchase the same essential goods and services, increasing emissions. Therefore, the ZA of the subject property will result in a less than significant increase in air pollutants.

c-d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project is in the center of the Mountain Ranch community which has sensitive receptors including commercial businesses, residences, and a community park. Construction of the addition would create temporary emissions of dust and exhaust from construction equipment. However, these activities are temporary and are required by CCAPCD to have best management practices in place to minimize dust and construction emissions. The project will not result in a significant amount of pollutants that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. The proposal is to allow the expansion of the existing commercial structure to improve services already provided. The applicant has not proposed new uses that would introduce new emissions. Furthermore, the addition is not expected to significantly increase the customers that already patron the business due to its location and services provided. Exhaust from vehicles associated with the commercial businesses is typical in a residential neighborhood near a commercial area. The primary source of odor emissions would be from the exhaust of vehicles traveling to and from the existing business, the number of which are not expected to increase due to the addition. These sources of odor would dissipate over time. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, regulations, or by the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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 checked="" 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

a-c) Less Than Significant Impact – The subject parcel is within California Natural Diversity Database designated area for Parry’s horkelia (a flowering plant) and half a mile from the designated area for Graham’s Cave amphipod (a subterranean crustacean). However, the designated area for the Parry species is 2 miles in diameter and encompasses the entirety of the Mountain Ranch community area, and records indicate that these species have not been observed in the area for decades. The subject parcel is very small, currently developed with a barn that takes up much of the lot, and no work or further development is proposed on this parcel. Much of the adjacent parcel on which the addition is proposed has been paved to accommodate the existing structures and parking lot. The area where the addition is proposed is graveled and currently being used for outdoor storage. There is a designated pond on the eastern side of the parcel and an unnamed creek that runs east to west from the pond. However, the pond is at a higher elevation than the rest of the parcel and the creek is channeled through a culvert which deposits on the west side of Garabaldi Street. Additionally, the proposed addition will be located in the southwest corner, approximately 800 feet from the pond. The addition on the adjacent parcel is not expected to result in a significant impact to any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, protected wetlands, or riparian habitat.

d) Less Than Significant Impact – The subject parcel is developed with Sender’s Market, associated outbuildings, and paved. There are no other known or potential migratory corridor on or near the parcel. The pond on the east end of the parcel feeds into an unnamed creek that is directed under the parcel via a culvert that runs the length of the parcel and deposits on the west side of Garabaldi Street. The proposed addition is on the southeast side of the parcel, and if the creek is a migratory corridor, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any wildlife species. Therefore, the proposed ZA would have a less than

significant impact on any migratory corridors or interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species.

e-f) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed ZA will not conflict with any local policies, ordinances or plans protecting biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-c) **Less Than Significant Impact** – There are no known historic or archaeological resources pursuant to § 15064.5 located on the subject parcel or in the surrounding area. The subject parcel is developed with a barn built in the early 1900s, which is considered a historical building; however, it is not listed on any local, state or federal register and is not considered a historical resource pursuant to CEQA guidelines by the County. Furthermore, the barn is not proposed to be altered or demolished as part of this project. If alterations or demolition are proposed for the building in the future, it will be subject to a historic review process, including the County’s historic resource ordinance, at that time. Sender’s Market, located on the adjacent parcel, was originally constructed in the 1950s and has had several commercial additions through the years. None of the structures on this adjacent parcel are listed on any local, state or federal register and are not considered historical resources pursuant to CEQA guidelines by the County. If any remains or artifacts are found during construction of the proposed addition on the adjacent parcel, construction will be halted pursuant to state law. Therefore, a less than significant impact is found.

VI. ENERGY

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

energy resources, during project construction or operation?

- b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

DISCUSSION

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The California Energy Code (also titled The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings) was created by the California Building Standards Commission in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The code's purpose is to advance the state's energy policy, develop renewable energy sources and prepare for energy emergencies. These standards are updated periodically by the California Energy Commission. The code includes energy conservation standards applicable to most buildings throughout California.

The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn and the project does not propose to alter this structure in any way. The purpose of the project is to allow an addition on the adjacent parcel, and the applicant has indicated he intends to install solar panels. Construction of the addition would consume energy in the form of machinery run by petroleum-based fuels but there are no site or project characteristics suggesting that construction of the addition would be less energy efficient than other typical small commercial construction projects. Construction would be temporary and fuel consumption would end when construction is complete. Calaveras County has not adopted a local renewable energy or energy efficient plan, but all new construction must comply with adopted State and local regulations, and the addition would not be more energy intensive than similar developments. No uses are proposed that would result in the continuous consumption of a significant amount of energy. The energy usage resulting from the commercial addition, when compared to the existing baseline of the current development on the site and in the surrounding area, is expected to be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect 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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Calaveras County is within the Sierra Block, an area of historically low seismic activity. Although ground shaking from earthquakes with epicenters located elsewhere have been felt, no major earthquakes have been recorded within the County. According to the California Department of Conservation, the subject parcel is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone.⁷ The closest known Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are the West Tahoe-Dollar Point Fault Zone and the Carson Range Fault System along the eastern margin of the Sierra Nevada.⁸ These faults are located east of the County and the risk of surface rupture is not considered significant enough to restrict development in the County. The areas of landslide concern are those that include high elevations with steep ravines and gulches associated with river and stream channels. Located at an elevation of approximately 2,150 feet, the subject parcel is relatively flat and the adjacent parcel is flat where developed and slopes upward in the southeast corner. An unnamed creek runs through the adjacent parcel from a pond to the west side of Garabaldi Street but is diverted under the pavement via a culvert. There is a flood zone on the adjacent parcel where the culvert begins, but the proposed development is approximately 600 feet from the flood zone. Calaveras County is not considered to be at risk for liquefaction hazards as no portion of the County is in a Seismic Hazard Zone and liquefaction generally occurs in conjunction with seismically induced ground shaking.⁹ Sites in Calaveras County with liquefaction potential would be those alluvial deposits having groundwater and sand or silt layers of uniform grain sizes within about 30 feet of the surface. Such conditions are not found on the subject parcel.

b-c) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Soils at the project site are mapped as Nesdgulch-Wallyhill complex, 3-30% slope.¹⁰ This soil is typically a gravelly loam. Loam does have erosion

potential, but the property in general is not characteristic of land with a high hazard for erosion. Some erosion or loss of topsoil may occur due to the construction of the proposed addition, but existing codes and Best Management Practices (BMPs) that regulate erosion control will be implemented as part of the grading and building permit processes to mitigate. Additionally, soil conditions associated with liquefaction aren't found on the subject site. If erosion of soils were to occur, the risk of loss, injury or death is low. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The soil of the subject parcel is categorized as loamy, and largely gravelly.¹¹ The soil is categorized as being well draining and is not considered an expansive soil. The subject parcel is developed with a barn with no construction on that parcel. An addition, which will require a building permit, is proposed to the existing commercial business on the adjacent parcel. A soils report will be required prior to construction as part of the permitting process, which would address whether the proposed development could be accommodated on-site due to soil conditions. Additionally, compliance with the California Building Code, related laws, and the implementation of BMPs for erosion control, would be required during construction. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcel is not served by public water or public sewer, and at 0.15 acres is not large enough to support a well or septic system. The adjacent parcel has a well and septic system installed and the addition would not create the need for improvements or expansion of the existing infrastructure. Should an expansion of the existing infrastructure occur, development will be required to meet the County standards for on-site wells and wastewater systems from the Environmental Management Agency. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact to soils incapable of adequately supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems.
- f) **No Impact** – There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features on or near the subject parcel, and therefore there is no impact.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

DISCUSSION

- a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The project proposes to rezone the subject parcel to facilitate a 4,500-square-foot addition to the commercial structure on the adjacent parcel. An incremental increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be generated through construction due to construction operations and auto emissions. Building standards in Title

24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Building Standards Code) dictate high-efficiency materials and construction for residential and non-residential buildings. Emissions from any new construction are therefore already reviewed under the standards contained in Title 24.

Auto emissions are the primary source of GHG emissions in Calaveras County; however, the County has not yet adopted a Climate Action Plan or program to reduce GHGs so the proposed project would not conflict with any such plan or program. As mentioned in Section III, the proposed addition will help Sender's Market continue operations as a general store selling essential goods and services, allowing residences to continue to shop locally rather than drive out of the area, which would potentially increasing emissions. Additionally, the addition to the business is not expected to induce demand from people in the region who do not already patronize the business. Therefore, the project is assumed to have a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>

- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

DISCUSSION

- a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. The subject property has been developed with a barn, currently used for personal storage, since the early 1900s and the adjacent parcel has been developed with Sender’s Market since the 1950s, a commercial structure which has been expanded periodically through the years. The expansion does not involve the transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposal is to expand this existing business by increasing the shopping area approximately 1,500 square feet and add approximately 3,000 square feet of warehousing for grocery backstock and cold storage. Routine construction processes and materials will be used during construction of the proposed addition, but these uses would be temporary and must comply with state, regional, and local regulations for the transportation, use, and disposal of any hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.
- c) **No Impact** – Neither the subject or adjacent parcels are located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d) **No Impact** – Neither the subject or adjacent parcels are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.^{12 13 14}
- e) **No Impact** – Neither the subject or adjacent parcels are located in an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Calaveras County has a Hazard Mitigation Plan, but this project will not impair the plan or its implementation and mitigation goals. The proposed project would not impede traffic or alter any roads. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.
- g) **Less Than Significant Impact** – According to The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) maps, this area of the county has a high to very high fire risk.¹⁵ However, the project was routed to all applicable fire protection districts and agencies and no comments were received. The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage and the adjacent property has an existing commercial structure which is being proposed to be expanded as part of this project. The expansion will house additional shopping space and warehousing for grocery backstock and cold storage. The new construction would be subject to all applicable state, regional, and local fire and safety regulations. The potential to increase the risk for death and injury due to a wildfire is less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) result in 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 off-site;	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed ZA will not violate any water quality standards, wastewater discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The subject parcel is developed with a barn used for personal storage and no alterations or demolition are proposed to that building. The purpose of the ZA is to allow an addition to the grocery and hardware store on the adjacent parcel. Development and operation of the addition would be subject to all applicable state, regional, and local regulations regarding stormwater runoff and retention, waste discharge, and water quality, including the

County Grading and Drainage Ordinance and the County Stormwater Quality Ordinance. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact to surface and groundwater quality.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – An addition is proposed to the adjacent parcel; however, it will be an addition to the existing grocery and hardware store shopping area and warehousing for grocery backstock and cold storage. If the addition does result in an increase in demand from the well, it will not be significant enough to create a substantial impact. Additionally, the parcels are located in an area with moderate to high groundwater potential. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact** – An addition is proposed on the adjacent parcel in an area that is currently graveled and used for outdoor storage. The proposed development will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) during all construction related activities, such as grading and excavating, and will be enforced by the Public Works and the Building Departments during the permitting process and actual construction. Therefore, any impact to the drainage would be less than significant.
- d) **No Impact** – The parcels are not in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.^{16 17}
- e) **No Impact** – There is no water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan for the area of the County in which the parcels are located.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **No Impact** – Both the subject and adjacent parcels are within the Mountain Ranch Community Area and the project site doesn't connect surrounding land uses nor is it used for access to the surrounding community. The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage and the adjacent parcel, where the commercial addition is proposed, is developed with commercial structures. Approval of the ZA would allow the construction of an addition to the south side of the existing store, but development is not proposed on the subject parcel and would not result in the physical division of an established community. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The project proposes to rezone the subject parcel to allow an addition to a commercial structure on the adjacent parcel. Both parcels are designated in the General Plan as having a Historic Center (HC) land use, which identifies land suitable for

residential and visitor-serving uses that preserve and protect the historic core of existing communities. The Local Commercial (C1) zone is compatible with the HC designation, and the addition to the existing commercial structure and use is permitted by the C1 zoning of the adjacent parcel. Additionally, the project is consistent with Calaveras County General Plan Policy LU-5 which encourages a strong and diversified economic base through the creation, retention, expansion, and attraction of business, agriculture, and industry. Similarly, Land Use Goal 1.2 supports growth in and around existing communities while protecting and enhancing community and neighborhood character. Following the approval of the zoning amendment, the project would have less than significant impacts related to any plan, policy, or regulation to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-b) **No Impact** – The subject parcel is not located within the County’s Mineral Resource overlay zone, which permits mining operations, and there are no known mineral resources on the subject parcel.¹⁸ The parcel is in the Historic Center land use designation, which does not allow for mining operations, and is not located within or near an active mining operation. The project would not result in the loss or availability of any known mineral resources of value to the region or result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. NOISE

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project result in:				
a) 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 ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

DISCUSSION

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise and vibration. In general, these uses include residences, schools, hospital facilities, houses of worship, and open space/recreation areas where quiet environments are necessary for the enjoyment, public health, and safety of the community. There are sensitive receptors in the area of the subject parcel including the Mountain Ranch Community Park to the west and residences in the general area. However, the project will not have a significant noise impact on these receptors.

The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage and the purpose of the zoning amendment is to facilitate an addition to Sender’s Market, an existing commercial retail business, on the adjacent parcel. Construction of the addition would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in the area; however, construction would be subject to Chapter 9.02 of the Calaveras County Code of Ordinances.¹⁹ Chapter 9.02.060.D requires that all construction in and around residential areas be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM and noise levels associated with the construction of the addition would be temporary. The business and its operations will also continue to be subject to Calaveras County Code Chapter 9.02 – Noise Control which limits exterior noise levels to 70 decibels between 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM and 60 decibels between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM for commercial land uses. The addition to the existing commercial business would expand the interior area and does not propose the expansion of any outdoor uses. The potential increase to noise due to the expansion of the existing business would be less than significant. Therefore, any noise generated from the project would have a less than significant impact.

c) **No Impact** – The parcel is not located within the vicinity of any known private airstrip or an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there is no impact.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

DISCUSSION

a-b) **No Impact** – Neither the subject parcel or the adjacent parcel is developed with housing and no new housing is proposed as part of the project. Thus, the project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area or displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project proposes to rezone the subject R1 parcel to C1 to allow a 4,500 square foot addition to an existing commercial retail structure on an adjacent site. The ZA will not increase the allowed density of either parcel. Therefore, there will be no impact.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject property is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage. The structure and use are not proposed to change. The adjacent property is developed with Sender’s Market, a grocery and hardware store, and the applicant wishes to amend the zoning to allow for an addition to the existing grocery and hardware store. The addition to the existing commercial structure is not expected to cause an increase of customers from outside the area who would use existing public services and facilities. The project would not result in an increase in population or of new patrons to the business that would impact schools or parks. Access to the adjacent parcel is directly from Garabaldi Street via two existing encroachments, neither of which will be affected by the proposed addition. The application was routed to local service providers and no comments were received. Commercial additions are subject to both school and fire district fees through the Building Department’s building permit process. Therefore, the proposed addition is not significant enough to substantially impact public services or require the expansion of facilities.

XVI. RECREATION

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Approval of the ZA would allow an addition to the existing business on the adjacent parcel but would not increase the allowed density on the parcel proposed to be rezoned or the adjacent parcel. The project does not propose the development of any housing, and the addition to the existing commercial structure is not expected to cause an increase of customers from outside the area who would use existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to increase the use of any existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity and would result in a less than significant impact to existing parks and recreations facilities.
- b) **No Impact** - The proposed project does not include plans for additional recreational facilities, nor would it require expansion of existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse physical effects on the environment from construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The subject parcel is currently developed with a barn used for personal storage and the adjacent parcel, where the addition is proposed, is developed with commercial structures. The construction of the addition will be required to meet standards such as those for onsite circulation, parking, emergency access, and other related County ordinances at the time of building permit submittal. The project will not conflict with any plans, ordinances, or policies regarding transportation.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The parcel is currently zoned Single-Family Residential (R1) and is developed with a barn used for personal storage. The retail use on the adjacent parcel is a local grocery and hardware store and an addition is needed to improve existing services. Both the location and the fact that no new uses are proposed factor into the expectation that the project is not expected to increase VMTs. This is a local-serving business that does not typically draw clients from the greater regional area. Additionally, if the business were to close, current customers would have to travel longer distances to find the same essential goods and services, increasing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). Therefore, the project can be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

- c-d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The parcel is accessed from Garabaldi Street, a paved, county-maintained road. No new roads or road improvements are proposed as part of this project. The proposed project will continue to use the existing encroachment, which does not have any hazardous design features, to access the parcel. The project application was routed to the Calaveras County Public Works Department, Central Fire District, and CalFire, and no comments were received. The proposed construction will be required to meet state, regional, and local standards for parking, on-site circulation, and emergency access. The addition will facilitate the expansion of the current uses onsite. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant 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:

- 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

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant

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

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

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.

DISCUSSION

a-b) **No Impact** – As discussed in Section V. Cultural Resources, there are no known cultural or archaeological resources on the subject parcel. Both the subject and adjacent parcels have already been disturbed to construct a barn used for personal storage and commercial structures, respectively. The project proposes an addition to the southside of Sender’s Market, an area which is used for access and outdoor storage. If during development any remains or artifacts are found construction will be halted.

As part of the processing of the project application, County staff initiated consultation with tribes that have requested formal notification of proposed projects within their geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation pursuant to AB 52 Notification Request, Public Resources Code Section 20080.3(b) and SB 18, Government Code Section 65352.3. The Calaveras Band of Miwuk Indians, the California Valley Miwok Tribe, and the lone Band of Miwok Indians have been notified of this project. No responses were received from the tribes.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater 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?

DISCUSSION

a-e) **Less Than Significant Impact** –The subject property is currently developed with a barn that is used for personal storage. This use doesn't have any infrastructure for water or sewer and there is no proposed change to the electrical demand. The adjacent parcel, where Sender's is located, has a well and septic system and is connected to electrical services. The applicant has indicated that he wants to install solar panels on the addition. The applicant has also indicated that he wishes to update the existing bathrooms; however, no significant changes to the water or septic demands are proposed because the proposed expansion is not likely to expand the facility's existing customer base or the way they use the grocery and hardware store. The proposed addition will be reviewed by the Environmental Management Agency for compliance with wells and septic systems. Therefore, the proposed 4,500 addition would not significantly increase demand for water, wastewater, electrical, solid waste, or other referenced services.

XX. WILDFIRE

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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"/>
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"/>
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"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope 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"/>

DISCUSSION

a-d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The Calaveras County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines the functions, responsibilities, and regional risk assessments of Calaveras County for large scale emergencies such as wildland fires, hazardous materials incidents, flooding, and dam failure. The EOP addresses the planned response to extraordinary emergency situations and establishes a flexible, all hazards, emergency management organization required to facilitate the response to, and provide for short term recovery activities related to any significant emergency or disaster affecting Calaveras County.²⁰

The project does not propose activities that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The subject parcel is developed with a barn used for personal storage and the adjacent property is developed with commercial structures. A 4,500-square foot addition is proposed to the south side of the existing grocery and hardware store. The project would not require the installation or maintenance of new infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Approximately 1,500 square feet of the addition will be increased shopping area, and the remainder will be warehousing for grocery backstock and cold storage. Construction would be subject to all state, regional, and local regulations regarding fire safety.

The subject parcel is not in a flood zone, nor does the site have a significant risk of erosion or runoff. The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. The proposed project does not require the installation of any new roads, nor does it alter any existing roads or impede traffic. The proposed addition to the existing commercial structure will not negatively alter any risk that may or may not currently exist on the subject parcel. The project was routed to Central Calaveras Fire Protection District that serves the region and no comments were received.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

DISCUSSION

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Approval of the proposed ZA will not significantly impact the surrounding environment. The analysis of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicates that the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce habitat or population of wildlife species, substantially restrict the range of special status species, or eliminate important cultural or archaeological resources. The subject parcel is developed with a barn that covers most of the lot and no alterations or demolition is proposed for the building. A large portion of the adjacent parcel has already been disturbed and is developed with commercial structures. The area where the addition is proposed is graveled and used for outdoor storage. As discussed in the biological resources section of this document, any potential impacts to special status species will be less than significant and despite a wetland and flood zone being on the adjacent parcel, they are not within the vicinity of the proposed development and will not be impacted. The parcel is in a developed area which includes both residential and commercial development in the immediate vicinity. The ZA is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the environment.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – Approval of the proposed ZA would not create a cumulative impact to any of the items discussed in this Initial Study. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code and the ZA will not result in considerable cumulative impacts to the environment. The proposed addition is allowed by right in the C1 zoning of the adjacent parcel and no significant impacts were found on that parcel. No significant impacts were found for the subject parcel and development is proposed as part of the project, but the rezoning of a 0.15-acre parcel from R1 to C1 does not increase the development potential in such a manner that will create cumulatively considerable impacts. Any impacts to the area will be minor and will not be significant enough to create a cumulative impact when considered in relation to the impacts of other past, present, or probable future projects.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The analysis of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicates that the project is not expected to have substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Best management practices and compliance with standard regulations will reduce any environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

REFERENCES

1. Calaveras County General Plan, adopted November 12, 2019.
2. California Department of Transportation. California State Scenic Highway System Map. <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.
3. Calaveras County Zoning Code, adopted July 16, 2024.
4. California Department of Conservation. California Important Farmland Finder Web Map. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
5. Calaveras County General Plan, adopted November 12, 2019.
6. Calaveras County General Plan, adopted November 12, 2019.
7. California State Geoportal. CGS Seismic Hazards Program: Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones Web Map. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/maps/ee92a5f9f4ee4ec5aa731d3245ed9f53/explore?location=37.120942%2C-119.787889%2C7.00>.
8. California Department of Conservation. CGS Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/>.
9. Calaveras County General Plan, adopted November 12, 2019.
10. United State Department of Agriculture. Natural Resources Conservation Service. <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.
11. United State Department of Agriculture. Natural Resources Conservation Service. <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.
12. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,FUDS&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29.
13. California Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/search?PAGE=62&CMD=search&business_name=&main_street_number=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&branch=&status=&site_type=LUFT&cleanup_type=&npl=&reporttype=&reporttitle=PROJECT+SEARCH+RESULTS&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&permitted=&corrective_action=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&qwbasin=&display_results=&pub=&watershed=&ORDERBY=county&excludenc=False&next=Next+50.

14. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Search for Superfund Sites Where You Live. <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>.
15. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) Viewer. <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/>
16. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search by Address. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=73%20mitchler%20avenue%2C%20murphys#searchresultsanchor>.
17. California Department of Conservation. California Tsunami Maps and Data. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>.
18. United States Geological Survey. Mineral Resources Online Spatial Data. <https://mrdata.usgs.gov/general/map-us.html>.
19. Calaveras County Municipal Code. Chapter 9.02. https://library.municode.com/ca/calaveras_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CD_ORD_TIT9PUPEMOWE_CH9.02NOCO.
20. Calaveras County General Plan, adopted November 12, 2019.