

# **City of Sutter Creek**

## **Negative Declaration / Initial Study**

**For the proposed: Bryson Cottages General Plan  
Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map**

**Prepared by:  
City of Sutter Creek  
18 Main Street  
Sutter Creek, CA 95685**

**April 25, 2008**

**1. Purpose of Initial Study**

Sections 21157.1 and 21157.5 of the Public Resources Code allows for limited environmental review of subsequent projects covered by an EIR provided that certain findings are made. The City of Sutter Creek’s General Plan EIR allows such limited review for projects that are consistent with and are within the scope of the EIR. Because the environmental study for the Rezone, General Plan Amendment and Tentative Subdivision Map is tiered from the General Plan EIR, the environmental review of this initial study will therefore analyze whether there are any new or additional environmental impacts above and beyond those already identified.

**2. Project Information**

- a. Project title: Bryson Cottages General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map
- b. Assessor’s Parcel Number: 018-342-002 & 003
- c. Lead agency name and address: City of Sutter Creek, Sutter Creek, California 95685
- d. Contact person and phone number: Darcy Goulart (877) 691-2025
- e. Project sponsor’s name and address: City of Sutter Creek, Sutter Creek, California 95685

**3. Project Description**

Project Location - The project is located in an area within the incorporated boundaries of the City of Sutter Creek. The project is located on Bryson Drive south of Mesa De Oro Circle and west of Sutter Hill Road.

Scope of Project – The project includes a proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for the subject parcel. The General Plan Designation would be changed from RH and Commercial (C) to Residential Single Family (RSF) while the Zone Designation would be changed from R4 and C2 to R1(PD). The TSM proposed would create 12 residential lots. Future development of the property would be single family residences. The subject parcels were previously approved for a site plan review for 24 multifamily residences. A grading permit was issued by the City of Sutter Creek City Engineer under the previous approval. Approval of the requested entitlements would supersede the previous site plan approval.

**4. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The following factors are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and adapted to reflect the eighteen environmental subject areas analyzed within the Negative Declaration.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning

	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# Bryson Drive GPA, RZ and TSM Vicinity Map



# Bryson Cottages GPA, RZ & TSM Project Aerial



**A. Aesthetics –**

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

**Discussion:**

a) – d) Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project would not have a substantial effect on a scenic vista. The proposed project would allow for development of single family homes in the future. The project site is not located in the scenic corridor. The surrounding areas do not include any historical buildings within a state scenic highway, nor would damage occur to trees, rocks, or outcropping as a result of this proposal. The future development of single family residences would have very minimal change to the area and would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Any new light sources would be generated from the construction of single family residences which would be minimal in nature and would blend in with the existing residential character of the surrounding properties.

**B. Agricultural Resources –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural				X

use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Discussion:

a) – c) - No Impact - The project site is located within an area of the City that is predominantly residential land uses. Existing development within the immediate area of this 1.77 acres is urbanized and does not exhibit features suitable for agricultural use. The land is comprised of marginal soils and has been prior to the land transfer, was used as right-of-way land and not for agricultural purposes. The project site is not rated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance. The site is currently vacant and is not under a Williamson Act Contract.

**C. Air Quality -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion:

a) – e) Less than Significant Impact - In January of this year Assembly Bill (AB) 32 the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 went into effect. This bill charged the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulations on how the state would address global climate change (GCC) due to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. There are currently no thresholds or recommended methodologies for determining the significance of a project’s potential cumulative contribution to GCC in CEQA documents. However, an individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence GCC. Therefore, GCC are looked upon as being a cumulative impact to the environment rather than project specific.

Future development could contribute to the generation of GHG emissions from vehicle emissions, as part of short term construction of the project. However at this point in the analysis phase of the project there is no empirical evidence available at present to legitimately evaluate this issue in a CEQA document. Methodologies and baselines are currently being developed by CARB and should be available within the next few months. To address the issue, the Amador Air District currently adheres to the rules and regulations as specified by CARB. Mitigation measures to help reduce potential emissions from future development can be assessed at the site plan review stage by the Sutter Creek Development Review Committee.

As a result of the proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map, there is potential for the site to be developed as single family residences only. Short-term air pollution in the form of particulate matter (fugitive dust) may be caused by future construction activity including truck and equipment movement, grading, and earthwork. Adherence to Amador County APCD rules and regulations will control these effects. All air contaminants generated by activities on-site would be required to comply with the Rules and Regulations of the Amador Air District. Proposed development of the site that may generate odors would be required to mitigate odor problems as required by the Environmental Health Department at the time the development or improvements are proposed.

**D. Biological Resources -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and				X

Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X

Discussion:

a) – f) – No Impact – There are no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species of plants or animals within the project area, nor are there any known wetlands. The proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan since these plans do not exist.

**E. Cultural Resources -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion:

a) – d) Less than Significant Impact – The General Plan states that Sutter Creek is generally a moderately sensitive cultural resource zone, however historical growth and development within the City has virtually destroyed any prehistoric sites that may have existed. There are no existing structures on site, no new or additional significant environmental effects were identified in the project specific analysis, and no impacts are expected. California state law requires that if cultural resources are encountered work shall stop immediately and a professional archaeologist and/or the County coroner (if human remains are encountered) shall be contacted to coordinate an investigation of the discovery. If any remains are determined to be Native American guidelines for the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Since development of the site is not anticipated at this time, there would be no anticipated impact.

**F. Geology and Soils –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the Project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
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 evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong Seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems			X	

where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
---	--	--	--	--

Discussion:

a) (i-iv) – Less than Significant Impact - The Sutter Creek General Plan lists several significant local faults that have been identified in the planning area, however there are no State identified seismic hazard zones in or near the planning area. The maximum credible earthquake projected for the area is 6 to 6.5 on the Richter scale. Although an earthquake of that magnitude causes moderate to major damage, an epicenter greater than 3.0 Richter Magnitude has not existed within 24 a mile radius. The City addresses potential earthquake hazards through its Building Department which is responsible for enforcement of earthquake resistant construction standards as specified in the Uniform Building Code (UBC). Landslides are unlikely to occur on the project site. Landslides are most likely on slopes greater than 30% but may occur on relatively flat terrain when triggered by an earthquake. The soil characteristics and provisions in the UBC minimize concerns for landslide in the City.

b) – e) Less than Significant Impact - Some soil erosion is expected during the construction of a future development project, but loss of topsoil is not a significant issue. Existing Codes and Best Management Practices that regulate erosion control would be implemented during wet winter months and during future grading and development of the property in compliance with City of Sutter Creek improvement standards and regulations. The project site has already received a grading permit due to previous approvals on the site for 24 homes. Additionally, the risk of erosion is moderate due to the existing slope, but the General Plan states that most areas of the City contain relatively stable soils. Project specific grading issues and subsequent CEQA analysis would be reviewed through the City’s development review process as needed.

**G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to			X	

Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

Discussion:

a) – h) – Less than Significant Impact - The project is for the General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Subdivision Map of the subject parcels and would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or substances. The proposed project would not result in a significant risk of explosion or accidental release of hazardous substances, and it is therefore considered a less than significant impact. The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. The site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites and people would not be exposed to potential health hazards as a result of this project. The project is located within two miles of a public use airport but is not located within the direct flight path of arriving and departing flight. Compliance with FAA regulations and standards in regards to structures located within 20,000 feet of a public use airport will reduce this impact to less than significant. The project would not impair implementation of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. There are no wildlands located adjacent to the project site.

**H. Hydrology and Water Quality –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or			X	

interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Discussion:

a) – f) – Less than Significant Impact - The proposed General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map does not include a current development plan but would allow for single family residences in the future without the need for additional entitlements. The possibility of future residential development would not cause any additional foreseeable impacts to water quality standards and groundwater supplied. As previously mentioned, future development would be reviewed prior to grading of the site to ensure proper drainage. No water features other than natural drainage exist on-site so the project and future development would not alter the course of any stream or river and minimal erosion or siltation on or off-site is expected with the future development of the site. Additional sources of polluted runoff would not be generated by

project. Prior to development of the site, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary approvals from the City Engineer to ensure that the development does not have a significant effect on hydrology and water quality standards. Future development project would incorporate Best Management Practices with regards to water quality and runoff in compliance with the City of Sutter Creek (Roark Weber, City Engineer).

g) – j) – No Impact - The project does not involve placement of housing with the 100-year flood hazard and is not located on a parcel within the 100-year flood hazard. There are no large bodies water within the area that would pose a seiche or tsunami hazard or physical/geological features resulting in a mudflow hazard.

**I. Land Use and Planning -**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X	

Discussion:

a) – c) – Less than Significant Impact - The General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Subdivision Map would not physically divide an established community within the City of Sutter Creek. The proposal would change the land use of the subject parcel from multi family residential and commercial to single family residential and does not create any land use islands. The requested entitlements would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as there are no such plans in the immediate area.

**J. Mineral Resources –**

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
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?				X

Discussion:

a) – b) – No Impact –This project is for a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Subdivision Map for future development of single family homes , there would be no impact to any potential mineral resources. The 1.77 acres is surrounded by development and could be considered an infill development. Future development of this parcel would not cause any anticipated effects on Mineral Resources in Sutter Creek.

**K. Noise –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private				

airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion:

a) – f) – Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project would not generate noise levels above the established standards for the City. There is potential for vibration and increased noise levels in the area during construction of future residential development. Noise generated by construction equipment, including earthmovers, material handlers and electrical generators can reach high levels (79 to 90 decibels, A-scale measured at 50 feet). This is not expected to be significant and will be minimal and short term in nature.

The site is located within two (2) miles of a public use airport called Westover Field, however it is not inside the Overflight Zone (Zone 3), which is located southeast of the Highway 49-Highway 104 intersection. Fixed wing aircraft and helicopters utilize Westover Field. The prevailing approach and take-off patterns for both airplanes and helicopters (which are different), would not directly affect the project site (General Plan Land Use Map 3).

All potential noise, including that generated from future construction or developed use of the proposed residential property would be subject to the standards identified in the Sutter Creek General Plan Noise Element. This section includes time of day and decibel ranges appropriated for daytime and nighttime activities.

**L. Population and Housing –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

Discussion:

a) – c) – Less than Significant Impact - The project involves a General Plan Amendment. Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map of the subject parcel which would not have a significant change

in population growth in the City. The site is currently zoned and previously approved for multifamily development. The future new homes would be created create an insignificant change in population and is less than what the General Plan originally anticipated for the parcels. Displacement of existing housing or persons would not occur with this project or with future residential development. The current population of Sutter Creek is 2700 people. As previously mentioned the site would change from multifamily land use to single family uses and would decrease the population projections of what was previously approved for the site.. The project site would be developed to handle the required services and will not decrease services to other residents.

**M. Public Services –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a). Fire protection?			X	
b). Police protection?			X	
c). Schools?			X	
d). Parks?			X	
e). Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion:

a) – Less than Significant Impact - Fire Protection: The project site is currently within the Sutter Creek Fire Protection District (SCFPD), which has primary responsibility for fire prevention, inspection, and protection. The SCFPD would also provide emergency medical response to the subject parcel. SCFPD currently provides ‘first responder’ service to this area and therefore response times would not increase with the future residential development.

b) – Less than Significant Impact - Police Protection: Police protection will be the responsibility of the Sutter Creek Police Department. Providing this service to the project site area would not require an incremental increase in sworn officers, additional administrative personnel, and additional patrol vehicles. Response times throughout the City vary and average approximately eight (8) minutes (Rob Duke).

c) – e). – Less than Significant Impact – A General Plan Amendment, Rezone and creation of 12 single family lots would not generate a need for an additional school facility or impact the existing school capacity. Taking into consideration the small size of the property, the future single family residential would be impractical, and if developed, would not cause a significant increase in the population of Sutter Creek. This potential for a small increase in population would not cause a significant impact the existing parks located within the City, nor would it require the construction of new facilities.

**N. Recreation –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion:

a) – b) – No Impact - As addressed in the Population and Housing section, the project would not greatly increase the population of the area as it would approve 12 single family residential lots as compared to the previous approvals for the subject property which was 24 multifamily units. Thus, the project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks that would cause physical deterioration of these facilities or the construction of new facilities. The project does not include recreational facilities nor require the expansion of new facilities.

**O. Transportation/Traffic -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

Discussion:

a) – b) – Less than Significant Impact – The proposed project would modify the existing land uses from multifamily development to single family development. The development of single family uses on-site could decrease the number of vehicle trips over the existing multifamily designation. Access to the project site would be off of Bryson Drive via a 30 foot wide easement used as a private road and P.U.E. Based on the access and the decrease in land use intensity, the General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Tentative Subdivision Map would have a less than significant effect on traffic in the Sutter Creek area.

c) – No Impact - The proposed project would not have an affect on existing air traffic patterns. The project would be located near a public use airport, but is not located in the flight path of arriving and departing planes nor in any the airport safety zone.

d) – Less than Significant Impact – As addressed in the discussion of sections a) and b) access to the 12 single family residences would come off of Bryson Drive (a public street) onto a 30 foot private road. The design of this proposed access would not create visual hazards for drivers, create sharp or dangerous curves and intersections nor obstruct existing driveways to the site.

e) – g) – Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access for police or fire services (see discussion under Public Services). Parking for each single family residence would be provided on site for each parcel. The change of land use in itself would not require the need for any on site parking. There would not be any conflicts with

adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation such as bus turnouts or bicycle racks with this project.

**P. Utilities and Service Systems –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion:

a) – e) – Less than Significant Impact - Potable Water/Waste Water: While development of any property could have a potential to increase the demand of both potable water and waste water services, the existing utilities adjacent to the subject parcel are of sufficient size to support any foreseeable development. Potable water services would be provided by the Amador Water Agency and wastewater service would be provided by the City of Sutter Creek. Available treatment capacity at the Sutter Creek Sewage Treatment Plant is approximately 203,000 gallons per day. Available capacity in the Amador Regional Sanitation Authority (ARSA) disposal system is approximately 123,000 gallons per day.

Storm Water Drainage: Refer to the discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality (section H.).

f) – g) – Less than Significant Impact - Solid Waste disposal services for the project site would be provided by Amador Disposal, a division of Waste Management, Inc., under a franchise agreement with the City. The solid waste is sent to a transfer station outside the City limits and disposed of elsewhere. The County is currently undergoing a review process to determine the landfill operations at the Buena Vista site to ensure adequate capacity for future waste disposal. At this time significant environmental impacts are not anticipated with this project and future development projects could reduce waste by using recycling and source reduction measures on site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

**Discussion:**

a) – Less than Significant Impact - With implementation of basic regulatory requirements included in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, result in an adverse impact on fish, wildlife or plant species including special status species or prehistoric or historic cultural resources. Future development may temporarily impact the area by construction related air quality, noise and traffic impacts. By implementing basic regulatory requirements, and project conditions of approval, these impacts are effectively reduced to a less than significant or no impact level.

b) – Less than Significant Impact - The project is includes a General Plan Amendment, which

once approved, would be consistent with the City's General Plan and would not create any impacts that would be cumulatively considerable. All project impacts have been reduced by adherence to basic regulatory requirements or conditions of approval incorporated into the project.

c) – Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project would not have any direct or indirect adverse impacts on humans because construction effects would be temporary and have been reduced or eliminated by control measure incorporated into the project.