

CITY OF COLFAX

NOTICE OF INTENT (REVISED) TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

JUNE 15, 2012

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 Negative Declaration in connection with the project described in this notice.

PROJECT TITLE: Administrative Zoning Code Revisions (#PL-02-12)

PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide ordinance amendment, Colfax, Placer County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: #PL-02-12/Administrative Zoning Code Revisions. The project proposes to amend the Colfax Zoning Code (Colfax Municipal Code Title 17). The purpose of the zoning code revisions is to (1) streamline the City's planning permit process by providing administrative-level approvals where feasible; (2) update the zoning code, including correcting inconsistencies, removing duplicative text and updating staff and agency references; and (3) re-organize the structure of the code to make it more understandable to both staff and the public. The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

A copy of the draft 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 Negative Declaration must be addressed to the City of Colfax Planning Department, P.O. Box 702, Colfax, CA 95713. The public review period begins **June 21, 2012**. All comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on **July 24, 2012**.

The Public Hearings on this project are anticipated to be held on July 25, 2012 and August 8, 2012 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 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 will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this 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: City of Colfax
33 S. Main Street
Colfax, CA 95713

Contact: Planning Department (530) 346-2313

PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide ordinance amendment, Colfax, Placer County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: #PL-02-12/Administrative Zoning Code Revisions. The project proposes to amend the Colfax Zoning Code (Colfax Municipal Code Title 17). The purpose of the zoning code revisions is to (1) streamline the City's planning permit process by providing administrative-level approvals where feasible; (2) update the zoning code, including correcting inconsistencies, removing duplicative text and updating staff and agency references; and (3) re-organize the structure of the code to make it more understandable to both staff and the public. The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

REVIEW PERIOD: June 21, 2012 to July 24, 2012

CITY OF COLFAX ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST (INITIAL STUDY) FORM

1. **File No:** #PL-02-12/Administrative Zoning Code Revisions
2. **Lead Agency name and address:** City of Colfax, Planning Department, 33 South Main Street, Colfax, CA 95713
3. **Property Owner:** City of Colfax
4. **Project Applicant:** City of Colfax, Planning Department, 33 South Main Street, Colfax, CA 95713
5. **Project location:** Citywide ordinance amendment, Colfax, Placer County, California
6. **Description of project:** The project proposes to amend the Colfax Zoning Code (Colfax Municipal Code Title 17). The purpose of the zoning code revisions is to (1) streamline the City’s planning permit process by providing administrative-level approvals where feasible; (2) update the zoning code, including correcting inconsistencies, removing duplicative text and updating staff and agency references; and (3) re-organize the structure of the code to make it more understandable to both staff and the public. The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

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.
2. 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. DTSC Hazardous Site List
12. 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:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <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"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> 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: June 15, 2012

Printed Name: Brigit S. Barnes, Land Use Attorney for the 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 significant.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project proposes to amend the Colfax Zoning Code (Colfax Municipal Code Title 17). The purpose of the zoning code revisions is to (1) streamline the City’s planning permit process by providing administrative-level approvals where feasible; (2) update the zoning code, including correcting inconsistencies, removing duplicative text and updating staff and agency references; and (3) re-organize the structure of the code to make it more understandable to both staff and the public. The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

The newly-revised zoning code is comprised of five (5) articles:

- Article I - General Provisions
- Article II - Administration
- Article III - Use and Zone District Regulations
- Article IV - General Development Regulations
- Article V - Special Area and Specific Use Regulations

The Table of Contents is attached hereto for reference purposes.

ARTICLE I – GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article I is an introduction to the zoning code and the districts established under the code. It includes definitions of key words and phrases used throughout the code. Proposed changes include adding new definitions, correcting outdated definitions, providing illustrations for ease of reference, and updating staff and agency references.

ARTICLE II – ADMINISTRATION

Article II contains the procedures for processing a permit, types of permits, types of public hearing and public notice, approval authority, the appeal process, permit revocation and enforcement and development agreements. The information has been organized into charts, where feasible for ease of reference. Proposed changes include establishing a new permit process and approval authority structure, a summary of which is set forth below. This Article contains most of the significant revisions to the code. The goal was to streamline and decrease the costs associated with the City’s permit process by providing administrative-level approvals wherever possible.

PERMIT TYPE & APPROVAL AUTHORITY

- Administrative (Use) Permit (AP) = The Planning Director is the approval authority for an Administrative Use Permit for uses that are listed as permitted uses and are in substantial compliance with the applicable development standards.
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) = The Planning Commission is the approval authority for projects involving uses that require a conditional use permit or for any permitted uses where a public hearing was requested after notice of intent to approve was served on property owners within a 400’ radius.
- Design Review Permit (DRP) = There are a series of exemptions for various design review projects. If a project is not exempt, the approval authority is the Planning Director, who also has the discretion to elevate a project to the Planning Commission if it is not in substantial compliance with applicable, adopted design guidelines and prior conditions of approval, or if the planning director determines that, because of location, size or design that the public hearing should not be waived. The Planning Commission is the approval authority for projects that have been elevated by the Planning Director, and for projects that involve Planning Commission review of an associated permit, rezone, general plan amendment or significant building (defined as those registered with the Federal or California Historic Registries). Note: Single-family and two-family residences are not subject to design review.
- Sign Permit (SP) = The Planning Director is the approval authority for sign permits unless it is associated with another permit that is required to go before the Planning Commission for review/approval.
- Extension (EXT) = The Planning Director is the approval authority for extensions unless he/she determines that a public hearing is required, in which case the Planning Commission would be the approval authority.
- Modification (MOD) = The Planning Director is the approval authority for modifications unless he/she determines that a public hearing is required, in which case the Planning Commission would be the

approval authority.

- Variance (VAR), Administrative = The Planning Director is the approval authority for variances that do not exceed 35% of the development standard.
- Variance (VAR) = The Planning Commission is the approval authority for variances that are 35% or greater than the development standard.

PUBLIC HEARING TYPES

- A = Hearing waived; notice of intent to approve mailed to applicant and 400’ radius property owners
- B = Full public hearing and notice per Government Code
- C = Hearing waived – notice of intent to approve posted on project site by property owner
- D = No hearing or notice required

REQUIRED HEARINGS, AUTHORIZED APPROVING AUTHORITY AND PUBLIC NOTICE		
	APPROVING AUTHORITY	
	PLANNING DIRECTOR	PLANNING COMMISSION
TYPE OF PERMIT OR VARIANCE		
Administrative Permit	D	-
Conditional Use Permit	-	B
Development Agreement	-	B*
Design Review Permit	-	B
Design Review Permit, Administrative	A/C/D	-
Design Review Permit for Residential Subdivision	-	B
Extension	D	-
Modification	A	-
Planned Development Permit	-	B
Variance	-	B
Variance, Administrative	D	
Sign Permit	-	B
Sign Permit, Administrative	D	-

*The planning commission makes a recommendation to the City Council

APPEAL AUTHORITY

- A decision of the Planning Director is appealed to the City Manager.
- A decision of the City Manager is appealed to the Planning Commission.
- A decision of the Planning Commission is appealed to the City Council.

ARTICLE III – USE AND ZONE DISTRICT REGULATIONS

Article III sets forth a comprehensive list of uses that are allowed within each zoning district. Proposed changes include providing more examples of the types of uses contemplated by each zoning district and providing a clear definition for each use. Information has been organized into charts for ease of reference. This Article also provides development standards specific to each zoning district, such as height restrictions and setback requirements.

ARTICLE IV – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Article IV contains general development regulations that apply to most projects (such as parking requirements, design guidelines and tree preservation guidelines, etc.), most of which were already part of the zoning code and have been inconsequentially revised. Proposed changes include organizing the parking requirements into a chart for ease of reference.

ARTICLE V – SPECIAL AREA AND SPECIFIC USE REGULATIONS

In Article V, use-specific regulations have been established, which are in addition to the general development standards (such as parking requirements and design guidelines) contained in Article IV. Examples of a specific use include such things as Home Occupations and Nightclubs. Most of these use-specific regulations are newly-added to the zoning code.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

The City has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. Where the Initial Study concludes there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration is required. If revisions in the project plans or proposals are made or agreed to by the applicant before the CEQA analysis is released for public review that would avoid or mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts, then a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration is still required (§15070). If the Initial Study concludes that there is substantial evidence that a project could have a significant effect on the environment, and mitigation are either unavailable or have not been agreed to by the applicant, then an EIR is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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
<p>Impact Discussion:</p> <p>The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.</p> <p>As such, the project will not adversely affect aesthetics.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>				
<p>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:</p>				
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:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

There are no areas in the City that are mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland). [California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map for Placer County, 2008].

As such, the project will not adversely affect any agriculture and forest resources.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Setting</p> <p>The City of Colfax is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. The MCAB is designated as nonattainment for federal and state ozone (O₃) standards, and nonattainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).</p> <p>The air quality management agencies of direct importance in Placer County are the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the California Air Resources Board (ARB), and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for which the ARB and the PCAPCD have primary implementation responsibility. The ARB and the PCAPCD are also responsible for ensuring that the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) are met. PCAPCD manages air quality in the Placer County portion of the MCAB; it has jurisdiction over air quality issues in the county and administers air quality regulations developed at the federal, state, and local levels. It is also responsible for implementing strategies for air quality improvement and recommending mitigation measures for new growth and development. State and federal standards for a variety of pollutants are summarized in Appendix AIR-I.</p> <p>Area Pollutants</p> <p>State and federal criteria pollutant emission standards have been established for six pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, particulate matter (particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter [PM₁₀] and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM_{2.5}]), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. The pollutants of greatest concern in the MCAB are ozone, particulate matter, and CO. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) also affect climate change and human health, respectively, but no state or federal ambient air quality standards exist for these pollutants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ozone: Ozone is a respiratory irritant and an oxidant that can cause substantial damage to vegetation and other materials. Ozone is not emitted directly into the air, but is formed by a photochemical reaction in the atmosphere. Ozone precursors, called reactive organic gases (ROG), and oxides of nitrogen (NOX) react in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight to form ozone. Ozone is primarily a summer air pollution problem, and high ozone levels often occur downwind of the emission source. Ozone conditions in Placer County result from a combination of locally generated emissions and transported emissions. • Inhalable Particulate Matter: The federal and state ambient air quality standard for particulate matter applies to two classes of particulates: PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Health concerns associated with suspended particulate matter focus on those particles small enough to reach the lungs when inhaled. Particulates also reduce visibility and corrode materials. Sources of PM₁₀ in the MCAB are both rural and urban, and include agricultural burning, discing of agricultural fields, industrial emissions, dust suspended by vehicle traffic, and secondary aerosols formed by reactions in the atmosphere. • Carbon Monoxide: Carbon monoxide is a public health concern because it combines readily with hemoglobin and reduces the amount of oxygen transported in the bloodstream. Motor vehicles are the dominant source of CO emissions in most areas. High CO levels develop primarily during winter, when periods of light winds combine with the formation of ground-level temperature inversions (typically from the evening through early morning). These conditions result in reduced dispersion of vehicle emissions. Motor vehicles also exhibit increased CO emission rates at low air temperatures. • Carbon Dioxide: Carbon dioxide is an anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) and accounts for more than 75% of all anthropogenic GHG emissions. Its long atmospheric lifetime (on the order of decades to centuries) ensures that atmospheric concentrations of CO₂ will remain elevated for decades. Increasing CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere are primarily a result of emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, gas flaring, cement production, and land use changes. • Mobile Source Air Toxics/Toxic Air Contaminants: Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are pollutants that may result in an increase in mortality or serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. ARB identified particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC, which is estimated to be responsible for about 70% of the total ambient air toxics risk (California Air Resources Board 2002). 				

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

Monitoring Data

Ozone concentrations are measured at a local monitoring station in the project area. The monitoring station for Colfax is located at 33 South Main Street. A review of the Colfax monitoring station for the last 3 years that complete data is available (2008-2010) shows that the monitoring station has experienced 7 violations of the state 1- hour ozone standard, 22 violations of the federal 8-hour ozone standard and 52 violations of the state 8-hour ozone standard during the 3-year monitoring period.

Attainment Status

If monitored pollutant concentrations meet state or federal standards over a designated period of time, the area is classified as being in attainment for that pollutant. If monitored pollutant concentrations violate the standards, the area is considered a nonattainment area for that pollutant. If data are insufficient to determine whether a pollutant is violating the standard, the area is designated as unclassified. The USEPA has classified Placer County as a nonattainment area for the 8 hour ozone standard (USEPA February 2011). For the CO standard, the USEPA has classified the county as an attainment/unclassified area (USEPA February 2011). The USEPA has classified Placer County as an unclassified/attainment area for the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} standards (USEPA February 2011). The ARB has classified Placer County as a nonattainment area for ozone and PM₁₀ standards (ARB February 2011). For the CO and PM_{2.5} standards, the ARB has classified the county as unclassified (ARB February 2011). The PCAPCD has an adopted emission thresholds of 82 pounds per day for ROG, NOx, and PM₁₀.

PCAPCD Adopted Rules

The PCAPCD has adopted a number of District Rules that apply to the construction phase of the proposed project. The project's Conditions of Approval will include a condition requiring compliance with PCAPCD's rules.

Impact Discussion:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect air quality.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect any biological resources.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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 project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect any cultural resources, including 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.)

Based on the foregoing, 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
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:				
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
ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv.	Landslides?				X
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
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
<p>Impact Discussion:</p> <p>The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.</p> <p>The most recent listing of Earthquake Fault Zones under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act does not include either the City of Colfax or Placer County. [Official Maps, California Department of Conservation Geological Survey, December 2010] The project does not include the use of a septic system.</p> <p>As such, the project will not adversely affect any geology and soils.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>					
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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

Impact Discussion:

I. Global Climate Change: Climate change is a shift in the “average weather” that a given region experiences. This is measured by changes in temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Global climate is the change in the climate of the earth as a whole. It can occur naturally, as in the case of an ice age, or occur as a result of anthropogenic activities. The extent to which anthropogenic activities influence climate change has been the subject of extensive scientific inquiry in the past several decades. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), recognized as the leading research body on the subject, issued its Fourth Assessment Report in February 2007, which asserted that there is “very high confidence” (by IPCC definition 9 in 10 chance of being correct) that human activities have resulted in a net warming of the planet since 1750.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires local agencies to engage in forecasting “to the extent that an activity could reasonably be expected under the circumstances”. The agency cannot be expected to predict the future course of governmental regulation or exactly what information scientific advances may ultimately reveal (CEQA Guidelines Section 15144, *Office Associate v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376).

II Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Recent concerns over global warming have created a greater interest in greenhouse gases (GHG) and their contribution to global climate change (GCC). However, at this time there are no generally accepted thresholds of significance for determining the impact of GHG emissions from an individual project on GCC. Thus, the City may develop policies and guidance to ascertain and mitigate, to the extent feasible, the effect of GHG, for CEQA purposes, without the normal degree of accepted guidance by case law. The City of Colfax currently has not developed nor established a policy for this.

The potential effect of greenhouse gas emissions on global climate change is an emerging issue that warrants discussion under CEQA. Unlike the pollutants discussed in Section III of this report (Air Quality) that may have regional and local effects, greenhouse gases have the potential to cause global changes in the environment. In addition, greenhouse gas emissions do not directly produce a localized impact, but may cause an indirect impact if the local climate is adversely changed by its cumulative contribution to a change in the global climate. Individual development projects contribute relatively small amounts of greenhouse gases that when added to other greenhouse gas producing activities around the world would cumulatively result in an increase in these emissions that have led many to conclude is changing the global climate. However, no threshold has been established for what would constitute a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gases for individual development projects that might be considered significant. The State of California has taken several actions that help to address potential global climate change impacts.

In 2006, the State of California adopted Assembly Bill 32 which requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulations and market mechanisms that will ultimately reduce California’s greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2020. Mandatory caps will begin in 2012 for significant sources and ratchet down to meet the 2020 goals.

III Project Analysis: The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely impact global climate change.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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
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 wild-lands?				X

Impact Discussion:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

There are no active sites in the City of Colfax that are included on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List [DTSC, 2011]. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within the vicinity of a private airstrip or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

As such, the project will not adversely affect any hazards or hazardous materials.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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
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
<p>Impact Discussion:</p> <p>The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.</p> <p>The City of Colfax is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area [FEMA FIRM, Map Number 06061C0125F], near a dam or levee, or ocean, coast or seiche hazard area.</p> <p>As such, the project will not adversely affect any hydrology or water quality.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.</p>				

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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 project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

The City of Colfax does not have an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that would be affected by the project.

As such, the project will not adversely affect any land use and planning.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Impact Discussion:</p> <p>The City has three known mineral deposit sites: (1) the “Colfax Claim” site (primary commodity: Gold); (2) the “Colfax Mine” site (primary commodity: Clay); and (3) the “Colfax Shale Quarry” site (primary commodity: Crushed/Broken Stone). [USGS, Mineral Resources Spatial Data, December 2011]</p> <p>The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.</p> <p>As such, the project will not adversely affect any mineral resources.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>				
<p>XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

Impact Discussion:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, nor within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

As such, the project will not adversely affect noise.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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 project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect population and housing.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
ii. Police Protection?				X
iii. Schools?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other Facilities?				X

Impact Discussion:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project would not increase the demand for public services.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

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 project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect recreation.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 result 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) 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
<p>Impact Discussion:</p> <p>The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.</p> <p>As such, the project will not adversely affect transportation and traffic.</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>				
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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?				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

Impact Discussion:

The project involves making administrative changes to the zoning code and does not involve changing the zoning on any parcels in the City. Where revisions were made regarding allowed land uses and any development standards applicable thereto, the revisions did not allow for a use or standard greater in intensity than that contemplated under the original zoning designation. Any future projects processed pursuant to the provisions of the zoning code would be required to undergo applicable project-level environmental review.

As such, the project will not adversely affect utilities and service systems.

Based on the foregoing, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

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 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

Impact Discussion (XVIII-a): As described throughout the preceding checklist sections, the proposed project will not 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. Any potential impacts to important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory are considered less-than-significant.

Impact Discussion (XVIII-b and -c): As described throughout the preceding checklist sections, the proposed project will not result in cumulatively considerable impacts or environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly. There is no impact.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are necessary.

Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards ¹		Federal Standards ²		
		Concentration ³	Method ⁴	Primary ^{3,5}	Secondary ^{3,6}	Method ⁷
Ozone (O ₃)	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Photometry	—	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		0.075 ppm (147 µg/m ³)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	24 Hour	50 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³		—		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	24 Hour	No Separate State Standard		35 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	15.0 µg/m ³		
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10mg/m ³)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	None	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)		35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)		
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m ³)		—		
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m ³)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	53 ppb (100 µg/m ³) (see footnote 8)	Same as Primary Standard	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m ³)		100 ppb (188 µg/m ³) (see footnote 8)	None	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	—	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³) (see footnote 9)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence; Spectrophotometry (Pararosaniline Method) ⁹
	3 Hour	—		—		
	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)		75 ppb (196 µg/m ³) (see footnote 9)		
Lead ¹⁰	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	Atomic Absorption	—	Same as Primary Standard	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Calendar Quarter	—		1.5 µg/m ³		
	Rolling 3-Month Average ¹¹	—		0.15 µg/m ³		
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 Hour	Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer — visibility of ten miles or more (0.07 — 30 miles or more for Lake Tahoe) due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70 percent. Method: Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape.		No		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m ³	Ion Chromatography	Federal Standards		
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride ¹⁰	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)	Gas Chromatography			

See footnotes on next page ...

For more information please call ARB-PIO at (916) 322-2990

California Air Resources Board (09/08/10)

1. California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, suspended particulate matter—PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.
2. National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest eight hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM₁₀, the 24 hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m³ is equal to or less than one. For PM_{2.5}, the 24 hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact U.S. EPA for further clarification and current federal policies.
3. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
4. Any equivalent procedure which can be shown to the satisfaction of the ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.
5. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.
6. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
7. Reference method as described by the EPA. An “equivalent method” of measurement may be used but must have a “consistent relationship to the reference method” and must be approved by the EPA.
8. To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 0.100 ppm (effective January 22, 2010). Note that the EPA standards are in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national standards to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standards of 53 ppb and 100 ppb are identical to 0.053 ppm and 0.100 ppm, respectively.
9. On June 2, 2010, the U.S. EPA established a new 1-hour SO₂ standard, effective August 23, 2010, which is based on the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations. EPA also proposed a new automated Federal Reference Method (FRM) using ultraviolet technology, but will retain the older pararosaniline methods until the new FRM have adequately permeated State monitoring networks. The EPA also revoked both the existing 24-hour SO₂ standard of 0.14 ppm and the annual primary SO₂ standard of 0.030 ppm, effective August 23, 2010. The secondary SO₂ standard was not revised at that time; however, the secondary standard is undergoing a separate review by EPA. Note that the new standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the new primary national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.
10. The ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.
11. National lead standard, rolling 3-month average: final rule signed October 15, 2008.