CITY OF COLFAX

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

FEBRUARY 28, 2013

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21092 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15072 that the City of Colfax has prepared and proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration in connection with the project described in this notice.

PROJECT TITLE: #TPM-VAR-01-11/Colfax Motor Lodge

PROJECT LOCATION: 520 S. Auburn St., City of Colfax, Placer County, California. Assessor's Parcel No. 100-230-035-000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: #TPM-VAR-01-11/Colfax Motor Lodge. The proposed project is a minor land division for a developed commercial site. There are four existing buildings on the site including a motel, restaurant and two office buildings. The site comprises 1.44 acres. The proposed subdivision will place these existing individual businesses on separate parcels. Each parcel has existing sewer, water and electric (both underground and overhead). The proposed parcel areas are as follows:

Parcel 1 (restaurant with drive-thru): 13,560+/- SF

Parcel 2 (office): 16,257+/- SF

Parcel 3 (office and motel): 32,822+/- SF

No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. No change in the existing number of employees, deliveries, clients, visitors, customers or traffic trips are anticipated as a result of this subdivision. The proposed project seeks a variance from the setback requirements for the existing buildings on Parcels 2 and 3. The proposed project also seeks a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection (the City's Municipal Code requires a separate independent building sewer line for every building).

A copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available for review at the City of Colfax Planning Department located at 33 S. Main Street, Colfax, CA 95713 during normal public business hours. It is also accessible to the public by visiting www.ci.colfax.ca.us under the page "Reports & Documents."

Written Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration must be addressed to the City of Colfax Planning Department, P.O. Box 702, Colfax, CA 95713. The 30-day public review period ends **April 1, 2013**. All comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on **April 1, 2013**.

The Public Hearing on this project is anticipated to be held on April 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall, located at 33 S. Main Street, Colfax, CA.

Contact: City of Colfax Planning Department (530) 346-2313

CITY OF COLFAX

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Colfax has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the City finds that the proposed project, with mitigation, will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Colfax
33 S. Main Street
Colfax, CA 95713
Contact: Planning Department (530) 346-2313

PROJECT APPLICANT: Christine Johnson
Clear Path Land Evolvement, Inc.
500 Auburn Folsom Road, Suite 100
Auburn, CA 95603
Telephone: (530) 887-11410

PROPERTY OWNER: Room Four LLC
c/o Steve Williams
8010 Mt. Vernon Road
Auburn, CA 95603
Telephone: (530) 823-8769

PROJECT LOCATION: 520 S. Auburn St., City of Colfax, Placer County, California. Assessor's Parcel No. 100-230-035-000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: #TPM-VAR-01-11/Colfax Motor Lodge. The proposed project is a minor land division for a developed commercial site. There are four existing buildings on the site including a motel, restaurant and two office buildings. The site comprises 1.44 acres. The proposed subdivision will place these existing individual businesses on separate parcels. Each parcel has existing sewer, water and electric (both underground and overhead). The proposed parcel areas are as follows:

Parcel 1 (restaurant with drive-thru): 13,560+/- SF

Parcel 2 (office): 16,257+/- SF

Parcel 3 (office and motel): 32,822+/- SF

No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. No change in the existing number of employees, deliveries, clients, visitors, customers or traffic trips are anticipated as a result of this subdivision. The proposed project seeks a variance from the setback requirements for the existing buildings on Parcels 2 and 3. The proposed project also seeks a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection (the City's Municipal Code requires a separate independent building sewer line for every building).

REVIEW PERIOD: **February 28, 2013 to April 1, 2013**

CITY OF COLFAX
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST (INITIAL STUDY) FORM

1. **File No:** #TPM/VAR-01-11/Colfax Motor Lodge

2. **Lead Agency name and address:** City of Colfax, Planning Development, 33 South Main Street, Colfax, CA 95713

3. **Agent:**
Christine Johnson
Clear Path Land Evolvement, Inc.
500 Auburn Folsom Road, Suite 100
Auburn, CA 95603
Telephone: (530) 887-1141

4. **Applicant:**
Christine Johnson
Clear Path Land Evolvement, Inc.
500 Auburn Folsom Road, Suite 100
Auburn, CA 95603
Telephone: (530) 887-1141

5. **Property Owner:**
Room Four LLC
c/o Steve Williams
8010 Mt. Vernon Road
Auburn, CA 95603
Telephone: (530) 823-8769

6. **Project location:** 520 S. Auburn St., City of Colfax, Placer County, California. Assessor's Parcel No. 100-230-035-000

7. **General Plan Designation:** Colfax General Plan - Commercial

8. **Zoning:** Highway Commercial

9. **Description of project:** The proposed project is a minor land division for a developed commercial site. There are four existing buildings on the site including a motel, restaurant and two office buildings. The site comprises 1.44 acres. The proposed subdivision will place these existing individual businesses on separate parcels. Each parcel has existing sewer, water and electric (both underground and overhead). The proposed parcel areas are as follows:

   Parcel 1 (restaurant with drive-thru): 13,560+/- SF

   Parcel 2 (office): 16,257+/- SF

   Parcel 3 (office and motel): 32,822+/- SF

   No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. No change in the existing number of employees, deliveries, clients, visitors, customers or traffic trips are anticipated as a result of this subdivision. The proposed project seeks a variance from the setback requirements for the existing buildings on Parcels 2 and 3. The proposed project also seeks a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection (the City's Municipal Code requires a separate independent building sewer line for every building).

10. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The subject parcel is bordered by the I-80 Freeway to the East and North and South Auburn Street to the West.

REFERENCES: The following references were used in preparing this report. The reference material is available for review upon request from the Colfax Planning Department at 33 South Main Street, Colfax, CA (530-346-2313).

1 Project Plans
2. Project Site Photos
3. Colfax General Plan 2020
3. Colfax Zoning Ordinance, Title 17 and amendments thereto
4. Federal Emergency Management Agency Map No. 06061C0125F
5. California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map for Placer County, 2008

6. Official Maps, California Department of Conservation Geological Survey, December 2010 (Earthquake Fault Zones)
7. National Register of Historic Places/State Historic Preservation Office
8. DTSC, 2011, List of Hazardous Material Clean-up Sites
9. California Air Resources Board website resources
10. Placer County Air Pollution Control District website resources
11. USGS, Mineral Resources Spatial Data, December 2011

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:

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ 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:

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

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on the attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect (s) 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 the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: February 22, 2013

Printed Name: Brigit S. Barnes, City Attorney for Land Use For City of Colfax

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 IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant 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

Impact Discussion:

a) The project site is not located within a scenic vista.

b) The project site is not located within a state scenic highway.

c) The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, the project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) No new lighting is proposed with this project.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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:

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 use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?				X

Impact Discussion:

a) The project site is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland). [California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map for Placer County, 2008] Therefore, the project will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.

b) The project site and surrounding properties are not zoned agriculture, nor is the property is under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with agricultural-zoned property or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) The project site is not zoned for forest production or adjacent to land designated to support forestry operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any existing zoning for forestry use.

d) No forest land occurs on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impacts associated with the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would result from project implementation.

e) The project site is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland). [California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map for Placer County, 2008] Therefore, this project will not cause any changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant 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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The proposed project does seek a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection. If the variance is not approved, and a separate sewer line is required as a condition of approval, temporary construction-related emissions may occur while installing the sewer line. However, this potential impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant 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 Wildlife Service?				X
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

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant 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 geological feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The project site is not located in the vicinity of the 3 locations in Colfax which are identified and listed on the National Register of Historic Places: the Colfax Freight Depot (7 Main St.), the Colfax Passenger Depot (Main St. and Railroad Ave.) and Stevens Trail (Secret Ravine ridge area). (Note: These locations are not listed on the California State Register of Historic Places.) As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant 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 area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
				X
				X
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv. Landslides?				
b) 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
c) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The proposed project does seek a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection. If the variance is not approved, and a separate sewer line is required as a condition of approval, temporary construction-related emissions may occur while installing the sewer line. However, this potential impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

VIII. 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 Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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
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 wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
IX.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
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 salutation 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 storm water 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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
X. 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

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. 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?				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

Impact Discussion: Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The project is not located in an area determined to have significant mineral resources. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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 ground borne vibration or ground borne 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 project 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

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The proposed project does seek a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection. If the variance is not approved, and a separate sewer line is required as a condition of approval, temporary construction-related noise may occur while installing the sewer line. However, this potential impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. 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

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the Project:				
a) 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 following public services:				
i. Fire Protection?				X
ii. Police Protection?				X
iii. Schools?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other Facilities?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) 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 that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	**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 that 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?				
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

Impact Discussion a): The proposed project seeks a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection. The City's Municipal Code requires a separate independent building sewer line for every building, in furtherance of compliance with regional state water board requirements imposed on the City. If the variance is approved, and a separate sewer line is not installed for Parcel 1, the project's impact could be considered potentially significant as it relates to this question. However, incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM-XVII-1 through MM-XVII-4 (below) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact Discussion b) through g): The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. The proposed project seeks a variance from the requirement that Parcel 1 have its own separate sewer connection. If the variance is not approved, the installation of a separate sewer line may be required as a condition of approval, which could result in temporary construction-related emissions during installation of the sewer line. Due to the temporary nature of the emissions and the minimal impacts associated with installing a small sewer line, this impact is considered less-than-significant. With respect to capacity, Parcel 1 is already receiving sewer service via a shared sewer line with Parcel 2. Based on the foregoing, any potential impacts are considered less-than-significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*

Mitigation Measures:

MM-XVII-1. Enter into a shared Private Sewer Easement and Maintenance Agreement and record it against the property.
MM-XVII-2. Test, inspect and repair (if required) the existing building sewer laterals that will be shared
MM-XVII-3. Provide a clean-out at the junction of the shared sewer lateral.
MM-XVII-4. Provide a clean-out at the property line of parcel 1 with parcel 2, and at the property line of parcel 2 at the public right of way.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
XVIII. 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 the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?				X
c) 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
d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is a minor land division for an already-developed commercial site. No new buildings or improvements are proposed as a part of this application. As such, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

#TPM-VAR-01-11/COLFAX MOTOR LODGE

MITIGATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	MONITORING/REPORTING ACTION & SCHEDULE
Utilities and Service Systems MM-XVII-1 Enter into a shared Private Sewer Easement and Maintenance Agreement and record it against the property.	1. City includes this mitigation in the Conditions of Approval for the Project	1. City Engineer and Planning Department	1. Review and approve proposed Agreement prior to recording final map.
Utilities and Service Systems MM-XVII-2 Test, inspect and repair (if required) the existing building sewer laterals that will be shared.	1. City includes this mitigation in the Conditions of Approval for the Project	1. City Engineer and Public Works Department	1. Review and approve test results, inspection reports and repairs prior to recording final map.
Utilities and Service Systems MM-XVII-3 Provide a clean-out at the junction of the shared sewer lateral.	1. City includes this mitigation in the Conditions of Approval for the Project	1. City Engineer and Public Works Department	1. Review and approve of installation prior to recording final map.
Utilities and Service Systems MM-XVII-4 Provide a clean-out at the property line of parcel 1 with parcel 2, and at the property line of parcel 2 at the public right of way.	1. City includes this mitigation in the Conditions of Approval for the Project	1. City Engineer and Public Works Department	1. Review and approve of installation prior to recording final map.