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SECTION ONE

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Lead Agency:**
City of Porterville

**Consulting Firm (if applicable):**
Quad Knopf, Inc.

**City of Porterville**
Quad Knopf, Inc.

**Street Address**
5110 W. Cypress Avenue

**City/State/Zip**
Visalia, CA 93277

**Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP**
Community Development Director

**Stephen J. Peck, AICP**
Vice President, Planning Services

---

The City of Porterville will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the Negative Declaration prepared by our agency when considering permits or other approvals for the project.

The project description, location and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study (☒ is ☐ is not) attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

**Opportunity for Comments:** This Notice of Intent and Initial Study will be circulated for a period of 30 days starting on August 19, 2005 and ending on September 19, 2005.

The Porterville City Council will consider this matter at a public meeting on October 4, 2005 in the council chambers at City Hall.

Please send your response to Bradley D. Dunlap, Community Development Director at the address shown above. We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.

**Project Title:** Burns Property Subdivision

**Project Location:**
City of Porterville Tulare County

**Project Description:** (brief)

The City of Porterville is evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the subdivision of a 44± acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Olive Avenue and Mathew Street. The project would be developed in two phases. Phase 1 would include 71 single family residential lots and remainder parcels as well as needed road improvements. Phase 2 would include 10 single family lots, 9 multi-family lots, and remainder and road improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO

INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION
SECTION TWO – INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This document is an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of a subdivision, located at the southwest corner of Olive Avenue and Mathew Street in Porterville, Tulare County, California (Figure 2-1).

Pursuant to Section 15003 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Porterville Community Development Department has prepared this Initial Study to determine whether the project will have a significant effect on the environment. The Initial Study Checklist, in Section Three, found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. Based on this Initial Study, it has been determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be approved.

Project Description

The City of Porterville is evaluating the potential environmental impacts of approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map on a 65± acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Olive Avenue and Mathew Street (Figure 2-2). The project would be developed in two phases as follows:

Phase 1 (Generally south of the Clare Avenue alignment):

- Approximately seventy-one (71) lots in the R-1 (One Family Residential) Zone.
- A 23.97-acre Remainder Parcel in the R-1 (One Family Residential) Zone along the north side of the Tule River. A 16,000± square foot temporary ponding basin will be constructed within this parcel on the west side of Mathew Street, south of the Monte Court alignment. No other development is proposed for this parcel.
- Orange Avenue will be constructed to collector standards (60’ right-of-way) from the Westerly property line to Mathew Street. The west side of Mathew Street will be constructed to collector standards (60’ right-of-way) where such improvements are needed along the entire frontage of the subject site. Interior streets will be constructed and improved to local street standards (50’ and 60’ Rights-of-Way) as necessary to serve the proposed development.

Phase 2 (Generally north of the Clare Avenue alignment):

- Approximately ten (10) lots in the R-1 (One Family Residential) Zone.
- Nine (9) lots in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone, with an average lot area of approximately 18,000 square feet. Note that the R-3 Zone permits one unit for every 1,500 square feet of lot area. Municipal requirements for parking, on site open space, setbacks, and fire lanes typically reduce the development potential by approximately
20%. Using that assumption, the nine multiple family parcels may accommodate up to 90 residential units.

- Two "Remainder" parcels, in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone of 1.17± acres and 11.06± acres respectively. At 1,500 square feet per unit (reduced by 20% to meet municipal development standards) these parcels are developable with 27 units and 257 units respectively.

- Lombardi Street will be extended north to Olive Avenue to local street standards (60’ right-of-way).

The City of Porterville General Plan designates the northerly 17.4± acres of the subject site as High Density Residential. Approximately 2.4 acres at the southwest corner of the subject site is within the floodway of the Tule River and is designated as Recreation and Open Space and the channel of the Tule River as it crosses this panel makes up approximately 2 acres. The remaining 43.2± acres of the subject site is designated as Low Density Residential (Figure 2-3).

All City services such as water and wastewater will be extended to the project area upon development. Existing water and sewer lines are available in Mathew Street. Storm drainage will be provided through surface flows and piping as appropriate to a proposed temporary drainage basin on the west side of Mathew Street, south of the Monte Court Alignment. Access will be along Mathew Street, a designated collector, and the proposed extension of Lombardi Street to Olive Avenue, a designated major arterial. Alternative access will be provided along Orange Avenue, a designated collector, to Westwood Street, a designated arterial. The Circulation Element of the General Plan also calls for the construction of a future collector between Mathew Street and Newcomb Street but that is not a part of the proposed development.
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LAND USE PLAN
SECTION THREE

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
SECTION THREE – ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AESTHETICS Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or night time views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The project will transform approximately 44 acres of fallow agricultural land to residential uses. Residential development in the mix of urban and residential areas will not change the overall setting.

b) **Less than Significant Impact** – The native vegetation on Remainder Parcel No. 2 will be retained, limiting the potential impact. One mature oak tree is proposed for removal. The City of Porterville has not adopted a tree preservation ordinance. The site is not located near a state scenic highway. Removal of cropland and development of the subdivision is not expected to significantly alter views in the area.

c) **No Impact** – The proposed residential development is compatible with the existing land uses to the north, east and south.

d) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** – New sources of light and glare will result from subsequent street lighting, and residential dwellings to be installed/developed.

Mitigation Measure:

1. The installation of low profile, exterior lighting will be directed away from adjacent properties, as required by the City Zoning Ordinance, and will reduce the impact of outside lighting. Minimal glare is anticipated from street light and on-site lighting facilities accruing from the site’s eventual development. This will serve to reduce potential hazards for autos, bicyclists, and pedestrians, as well as provide a secure environment for the occupants.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** - 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? □ □ ☒ □

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? □ □ ☒ □

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use? □ □ ☒ □

**Response:**

a), b), c) Less Than Significant Impact – The site is currently fallow and is disked annually with alfalfa planted on the northern portion of the property; however, the site is not under Williamson Act contracts. The soil type is Tagus loam which is rated prime for agriculture. The parcel is not considered prime agricultural land due to the relatively small size of the area to be converted, and the presence of existing urban development to the north, east and west.
### Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☑

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ☑

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is no-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ☑

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☑

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ☑

#### Response:

a), b), c), and d): Less Than Significant with Mitigation – The project will facilitate the construction of 81 single family residences and a maximum of 374 apartment units in conformance with the General Plans. Such development has the potential to impact air quality through short term construction activities, primarily through the generation of dust ($PM_{10}$). In addition, residential development is accompanied by additional traffic generation, which is a primary source of smog precursors such as Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx).

The anticipated development of the subject site was analyzed in accordance with the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI).

Following the steps outlined in the GAMAQI, mixed residential developments that exceed 1,453 trips per day are analyzed using the Cursory Analysis Level (CAL) which requires the following steps:

- Conduct URBEMIS model run.
- Screen project for CO impact.
- Perform screening analysis of potential toxics, hazardous materials, and odor impacts.
- If demolition or renovation of existing buildings is proposed, contact the District for asbestos requirements.
- Identify mitigation measures.

Because the above process indicated that the project will not have a potentially significant impact on air quality, a Full Analysis Level (FAL) Air Quality Study was not performed.
The project was analyzed using URBEMIS, a modeling program developed by the California Air Resources Board for this purpose. Based on the expected development, a projected project completion date of 2008 (based on the historical absorption rate of multiple family residential units in Porterville) and the travel characteristics of Porterville, the model yielded the following predictive results:

- ROG 34.04 tons/yr
- NOx 6.15 tons/yr
- CO 105.84 tons/yr
- SO$_2$ 0.19 tons/yr
- PM$_{10}$ 13.17 tons/yr

The thresholds of significance set by the SJVAPCD for ROG and NOx are 10 tons/year for each constituent. Mitigation measures will be required in order to avoid a finding of a potentially significant effect with regard to ROG.

The default values used by the URBEMIS 2000 model assume that 35% of new residential units (including apartments) will be equipped with wood stoves and that 10% of the units will be equipped with wood burning fire-places. Changes in the marketplace and evolving regulation of the SJVAPCD have made such features less common. The model was run a second time assuming that none of the homes or apartments will be equipped with wood stoves or wood burning fireplaces. The results were as follows:

- ROG 8.26 tons/yr
- NOx 5.15 tons/yr
- CO 43.68 tons/yr
- SO$_2$ 0.03 tons/yr
- PM$_{10}$ 3.63 tons/yr

This indicates that the impact will be less than significant, upon adoption of a mitigation measure prohibiting the installation of wood stoves and wood burning fireplaces in new construction. The GAMAQI suggests that a formal CO study is only necessary where an intersection in the project vicinity will be reduced to Level of Service E or F. The traffic analysis (see Section XV) for this project does not indicate that such a result is likely.

There is no adopted numerical threshold of significance for PM$_{10}$. As the project does not require unusual grading practices and does not violate the thresholds of significance for other vehicle related emissions, the project may be determined to have a less than significant effect from operations. Construction related impacts to PM$_{10}$ are controlled through the enforcement of SJVAPCD Regulation VIII which establishes a number of mandatory and optional construction practices. Compliance with Regulation VIII is sufficient to reduce the potential impact of development of the subject site to less than significant levels.

The cumulative air quality effects of development in conformance with the General Plan were addressed in the General Plan DIR.
Mitigation Measures:

1. The Tentative Subdivision Map shall include a condition of approval prohibiting the installation of wood stoves and wood burning fireplaces for all future residential development on the subject site.

2. All development on the subject site shall be conducted in compliance with the standard and optional sections of SJVUAPCD Regulation VIII with regard to the control of fugitive dust and PM$_{10}$ generation.

e): The proposed project will not create objectionable odors, nor are such odors present in areas proposed for development.
### Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 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?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

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?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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?

- | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

### Response:

a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation – A biological report was prepared for this project and a similar subdivision on an adjacent property (see Appendix A).

The Tule River runs through the southwestern portion of the subject site. A considerable area to the north of the Tule River remains in native riparian vegetation, though the most distant portion of the riparian area has been disked for weed control approximately 800 feet, around large trees and shrubs.

The biological report identified eight potential biological resources on the subject sites:

1. Wetlands and other Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. are present along the channel of the Tule River within Remainder Parcel No. 2. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development.
2. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development, and will continue to serve as a wildlife migration corridor.

3. During the field survey, biologists identified the presence of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB), listed as a Federally Threatened species. Determination of the presence of VELB was made on the basis of a large number of elderberry bushes, many of which have exit holes indicative of the presence of VELB. In addition to the elderberry bushes identified in the Biological Report, a single elderberry bush was located in preparation of this document along the westerly property line of the subject site, approximately 200 feet south of Olive Avenue. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has published standards indicating that there is no impact to the valley elderberry longhorn beetle if each shrub providing potential habitat is protected from development by a 100 foot buffer around the drip line of the plant. All but two of the elderberry shrubs on the subject site are located on Remainder Parcel No. 2 in areas that allow for the 100 foot buffer. A single elderberry shrub on the Remainder Parcel No. 2 is approximately 70 feet south of the proposed location of Orange Avenue, but is otherwise protected from development. One elderberry shrub is located on an adjacent parcel very near to the proposed alignment of Lombardi Street, approximately 200 feet south of Olive Avenue. This shrub will be relocated to the Open Space south of the project as a component of construction of the project, in conformance with USFWS Guidelines. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development.

4. Habitat for resident and migratory birds, and nesting sites for raptors, are present on the subject site, primarily within the riparian vegetation on Remainder Parcel No. 2. Raptor nests were identified in two trees on Remainder Parcel No. 2. Both of these trees, as well as an additional sycamore and an oak tree are in close proximity to proposed development. One oak tree, located north of Remainder Parcel No. 2, on lots 32 and 33 is proposed for removal. While no nests were identified in this tree, there is the potential that nests will be constructed prior to the project. Preconstruction surveys will be carried out prior to construction and potential nesting sites will be replaced with additional plantings.

5. The subject site contains habitats with the moderate potential for the occurrence of Swainson's hawk, a species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and listed as a Federal Species of Concern and a California State Threatened species. Such habitat is primarily located on Remainder Parcel No. 2. Although no sightings occurred, several of the larger trees on the subject site are potential nesting sites for Swainson's hawk. The single oak to be removed is one of the trees that could provide a nesting site for this species. Preconstruction surveys will be carried out and potential nesting sites will be replaced with additional plantings. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development.

6. The subject site includes habitat with the low potential for the occurrence of San Joaquin kit fox (SJKF), a listed Federal Endangered Species and California State Threatened Species. The portions of the site which form potential habitat or foraging grounds for the SJKF are substantially altered by cultivation, ATV use, and other activities. Actual presence of SJKF on the subject site is unlikely.

7. The subject site contains habitat with the low potential for the occurrence of the western spadefoot toad, listed as a Federal Species of Concern and a California Species of concern. The only area with the potential for habitat for this species is adjacent to the Tule River, on Remaider Parcel 2. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development.

8. The subject site contains habitat with the low potential for the occurrence of molestan blister beetle, listed as a Federal Species of Concern. Although the area is in the historic range of the
molestan blister beetle, that species has not been reported in the area for many years.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Except as noted on the Tentative Subdivision Map, all on-site trees, with a diameter at breast height (dbh) greater than six (6) inches shall be retained. The oak tree on Lot 32 shall not be removed during the raptor nesting season (February 1 through September 15). The oak tree shall be replaced with a minimum of three oak trees (at least 15 gallon in size) for each 6 inches of diameter at breast height (DBH). Replacement trees shall be located on Remainder Parcel No. 2.

2. Prior to the removal of the oak tree on Lot 32 and prior to the start of construction of each phase, a preconstruction survey of the site including a suitable buffer shall be conducted by a qualified biologist/ornithologist. If nesting raptors are found in close proximity to the construction zone, such that nest failure could result from the disturbance of construction, then construction shall be postponed in that location until the breeding season has concluded. If construction cannot be delayed the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service shall be consulted for guidance on how to proceed.

3. Prior to construction activity within 100 feet of any elderberry shrub, the developer shall secure a written opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that such activity is not likely to affect the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The developer shall ensure compliance with all conditions of approval included in such a letter.

4. Prior to the removal of any elderberry bush with one or more stems greater than one inch in diameter at ground level, the developer shall secure a Section 10(a) Incidental Take permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The developer shall ensure compliance with all conditions of approval, and mitigation measures identified in such permit.

5. Prior to commencement of subsequent phases of the project, a pre-construction survey of the phase shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of species of concern. If species of concern are found, appropriate consultation and mitigation shall be conducted with the state or federal agency.

e), f) No Impact – Neither the City nor the County has adopted local conservation policies or ordinances or a habitat conservation plan.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? □ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? □ ☒ ☐ ☐

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? □ ☒ ☐ ☐

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? □ ☒ ☐ ☐

**Response:**

a) **No Impact** – There are no known historical resources on the site.

b), c), d) **Less Than Significant Impact** – No archeological paleontological resources are known to exist on the subject site. Many years of cultivation would have removed any surface evidence of such resources. There is a low potential that excavation will uncover previously unknown artifacts.

**Mitigation Measure:**

1. If artifacts or remains are encountered, all construction within 50 feet of the find shall be halted and a qualified archeologist consulted to determine the disposition of the find.
VI. GEOLOGY/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.
   □ □ ☒ ☒
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   □ □ ☒ ☒
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
   □ □ ☒ ☒
   iv) Landslides
   □ □ ☒ ☒

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
   □ □ ☒ ☒

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction of collapse?
   □ □ ☒ ☒

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?
   □ □ ☒ ☒

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?
   □ □ ☒ ☒

Response:

a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant – According to the City of Porterville General Plan, no active faults underlay the project site. There are several faults known to exist within the County which are located on the edges of the San Joaquin Valley. No faults are currently known to exist within the valley portion of the County. Any impact of ground shaking will be reduced to a less than significant level by building designs that comply with Title 24 Building Standards. There is also a requirement for a grading plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to mitigate soil erosion impacts.

The project site is not located in an area subject to liquefaction, subsidence, landslide or substantial soil erosion conditions (City of Porterville General Plan). According to the City’s General Plan EIR, the soils on the site can generally be described as loam soils which have low potential for shrink-swell problems.
e) **No Impact** – The proposed project will be on the City’s sewer system and will not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VII. HAZARDS/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?

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?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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?

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?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Response:

a), b), c), d) No Impact – Development and operation of a residential subdivision will not result in the use or disposal of hazardous materials.

e) No Impact – The subject site is within the Horizontal Zone of the Porterville Municipal Airport. The only restriction to development within the horizontal zone is a maximum building height of 150 feet. No development to that height is proposed.
f) **No Impact** – The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. (Tulare County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan, 1992).

g) **No Impact** – The proposed project will improve emergency access to nearby uses by providing an alternative route parallel to Mathew Street and along Orange Avenue. Therefore no impact has been identified.

h) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The seventeen (17) lots along the south side of Orange Avenue will be adjacent to Remainder Parcel No. 2 which will not be developed. There is a modest risk that grass and brush fires would spread to the houses along Orange Avenue. The design of the subdivision provides emergency access to Remainder Parcel No. 2 from two locations along Orange Avenue and along Mathew Street. The Fire Department oversees a weed abatement program that identify and correct potential grass fire hazards. Inspections will continue on Remainder Parcel No. 2, and the property owner will be responsible for continuing to maintain the property to limit fire risk.
**Issues:**

**VIII. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**

a), b) Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed residential uses will be on the City’s water and sewer systems. The City’s wastewater treatment plant has a rated capacity of 8-mgd and is currently...
operating at 4-mgd. It is also not presently subject to special restriction by the Regional Board. The subject site is within the sewer and water Master Plans which identify infrastructure necessary to serve the site.

c), d), e) Less Than Significant Impact – The subject site is within the boundary of the Storm Water Master plan which requires that the site be adequately drained to surface streets, and underground piping as appropriate. Drainage will initially be directed to a temporary drainage basin to be constructed on Remainder Parcel No. 2. When Master Plan storm drainage facilities are in place, runoff will be directed to those facilities. The Master Plan indicates that drainage on the subject site will flow to a drainage basin south and east of the terminus of Mathew Street. No storm water discharges will be directed to the Tule River, which crosses the southerly portion of the subject site.

g) h) Less than Significant Impact – Approximately five (5) acres of the subject site is within Flood Zone "A", the 100-year flood hazard zone (FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel 0650660845B). The entire area within Flood Zone "A" is located on Remainder Parcel No. 2. Remainder Parcel No. 2 is not proposed for development. The remainder of the site is primarily within Flood Zone "B", the 500-year flood hazard zone. No flood hazard mitigation measures are required within Flood Zone "B".

i) Less Than Significant Impact – According to Tulare County’s Geographic Information Systems data, the project area is within the 24 hour inundation area of the Success dam in the event of its failure. The safety element designates appropriate evacuation routes. Because of the time for evacuation and the location of the project area, the impact is less than significant.

j) No Impact – The project is not located near a body of water which could generate seiche or tsunami effects. The site is level and will not engender mudflow events.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IX. LAND USE/PLANNING – Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?  
   - No Impact – The proposal is an infill development connecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.

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?  
   - No Impact – The proposal is an infill development connecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  
   - Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project area is planned and zoned for residential development.

Response:

b) No Impact – The Proposal is an infill development connecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.

c) Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project area is planned and zoned for residential development.

d) No Impact – No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan has been adopted with regard to the subject site.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X. 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?  
   - No Impact – There are no known mineral resources on the proposed project area; therefore no impact has been identified.

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?
   - No Impact – There are no known mineral resources on the proposed project area; therefore no impact has been identified.
XI. NOISE – would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?  

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?  

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  

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?  

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?  

Response:

a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact – During construction activities there will be a short-term increase in noise associated with construction equipment that may exceed the City’s noise level standards. As these activities will be restricted to daytime hours and be of short-term in nature, the impact will be less than significant.

e) Less Than Significant Impact – The subject site lies within the horizontal zone of the Porterville Municipal Airport. The subject site is not within the 60dB Noise Contour. No development restrictions apply within the Horizontal Zone and no significant noise impacts will occur.

f) No Impact – There are no private airstrips within two miles of the project site. (Tulare County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan, 1992).
Issues:

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Response:

a), b), c) Less Than Significant Impact – The addition of the project will result in a projected increase of between 1,365 and 1,593 persons to the City of Porterville (assuming between 3.0 and 3.5 persons per dwelling). However, the project will be in multiple phases and this growth will occur over several years. This development is planned for the area and the project is consistent with the Porterville General Plan.
XIII. 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 impact, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact**

*Fire Protection* – The City of Porterville will provide fire protection services to the project site upon adequate facilities are in place to provide fire service.

*Police Protection* – The City of Porterville will also provide police protection services to the project site upon development. Adequate facilities are in place to provide police service. The impact will be less than significant.

*Schools* – The potentially affected school districts are the Porterville Unified School District and Burton School District. Both districts can mitigate increased student enrollment impacts by the collection of school impact fees. A new school, the Summit Charter Academy, is under construction on the subject site. This impact is less than significant.

*Parks* – Residential development increases the demand for recreational facilities. Parks impact fees will be collected upon developments to offset the cost of acquisition and development of facilities.

*Other Public Facilities* – Other public facilities are discussed in Sections VIII Hydrology/ Water Quality, XIV Recreation, XV Transportation/Traffic, and XVI Utilities/Service Systems.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XIV. 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?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**Response:**

a), b) Less Than Significant Impact – The project will have the potential to increase demand on recreational facilities in other areas of the City in proportion to on-site population. For many recreational activities provided in public parks, fees are charged for participation. The impact of the project to recreational facilities is considered to be less than significant.
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:**

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? □ □ ☒ □

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? □ □ ☒ □

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? □ □ □ ☒

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? □ □ ☒ □

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? □ □ ☒ □

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? □ □ □ ☒

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? □ □ □ ☒

**Response:**

a), b), e) Less Than Significant Impact – As noted in the project description, the project is expected to lead to the development of 81 single family residences and a maximum of 374 multiple family residential units. Single family residential development generates approximately 10.54 Average Daily Trips (ADT) per unit and low-rise multiple family residential development generates approximately 6.16 ADT per unit (URBEMIS Model). Based on these rates, the project will generate approximately 3,158 ADT.

Primary access to the subject site will be from Olive Avenue, a designated major arterial. Olive Avenue trips will be distributed along Mathew Street, a designated collector, Lombardi Street, a local street, and directly to the subject site along the frontage of Remainder Parcel No. 1. Secondary access will be from Westwood Street, a designated arterial, to Orange Avenue, a designated collector. The most recent traffic counts indicate that Olive Avenue is operating at 10,263 trips per day. As a four lane divided major arterial, Olive Avenue has capacity to accommodate 30,000 trips per day.

Mathew Street will be developed to its full collector width upon development of the adjacent school, yielding a capacity of 12,500 trips per day. In addition, the Burton School District and the City of Porterville are cooperating to fund a traffic signal at the intersection of Mathew Street and Olive Avenue. Although there are no current traffic counts for Mathew Street, an analysis of potential usage...
has been prepared. Mathew Street currently serves as a collector street for approximately 230 residential units. An additional 60 units to the west may be served upon construction of Orange Avenue as a component of the project. Together, these existing units generate approximately 2,775 ADT, with an additional 510 ADT expected to be generated by the adjacent school. Even if all of the project trips were to be added to Mathew Street, the maximum demand would be approximately 6,525 ADT, or 52% of maximum capacity (Level of Service A). Orange Avenue, west of the subject site is currently operating as a local street, with substantial additional capacity. Westwood Street, south of Olive Avenue also has substantial unused capacity as it primarily serves two moderately sized subdivisions and provides one of several alternative routes to SH 190, approximately one mile south of Olive Avenue.

The proposed development was anticipated in the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan, and sufficient infrastructure has been programmed in the Circulation Element to accommodate the incremental effects of the proposed development. Traffic impact fees will be collected upon development to fund the project’s proportionate share of Circulation System improvements.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Upon development of the subject site, all on-site and adjacent streets shall be improved to their designated widths as required by the Circulation Element, the Subdivision Ordinance and the City of Porterville Improvement Standards.

c) No Impact – The project will not have any affect on air traffic patterns.

d) Less Than Significant Impact – The design of the proposed subdivision meets the standards and guidelines set forth by the City of Porterville.

f) No Impact – Adequate parking will be provided in compliance with the City’s ordinance and building code regulations that govern development of single-family residential and multiple-family lots.

g) No Impact – The proposed project will not conflict with any existing alternate transportation programs.
XVI. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

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?

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?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Response:

a), b), c), d), e) Less Than Significant Impact – With regards to wastewater, the project will be served by the City of Porterville. Flows generated by the residential development can be accommodated by the Porterville Wastewater treatment plant, and the project will not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The impact is less than significant. New stormwater drainage facilities will be installed as needed to serve the project area. A temporary stormwater basin will be constructed to serve the project until master plan facilities are available.

f) Less Than Significant Impact – The City of Porterville disposes of its solid waste at the Teapot Dome Disposal Site, southwest of the City. The landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs for at least the next 15 years.

g) No Impact – Refuse removed from the project area will conform to County regulations.
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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)?

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

Response:

a) Less than Significant Impact – The subject site contains considerable ecological resources along the Tule River and extending throughout Remainder Area No. 2. That portion of the subject site provides a valuable riparian and upland habitat and a wildlife movement corridor, available to a wide variety of animal species. The environmentally sensitive portion of the subject site is not proposed for development.

b) Less Than Significant Impact – Development of the subject is anticipated in the Land Use Element, Circulation Element and in the Water, Sewer, Storm Water Master Plans. Appropriate infrastructure has been programmed into each of these documents to accommodate the incremental effects of the proposed development.

c) Less Than Significant Impact – Development of the subject site will be required to comply with the Subdivision Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance and Development Standards of the City of Porterville which are designed to ensure compatible development and adequate protection to neighboring residents and uses.
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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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 “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An 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, but because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (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.

Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP  
City of Porterville  

Date
Appendix A

URBEMIS Models
### Summary Report
(Tons/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Type</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Source Emission Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational (Vehicle) Emission Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of Area and Operational Emission Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>107.70</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>105.84</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Stoves</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplaces</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Prdcts</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS (tpy, unmitigated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family housing</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments low rise</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EMISSIONS (tons/yr)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not include correction for passby trips. Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips.

### OPERATIONAL (Vehicle) EMISSION ESTIMATES

**Analysis Year:** 2008 **Temperature (°F):** 85 **Season:** Annual


### Summary of Land Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family housing</td>
<td>10.54 trips / dwelling units</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>853.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments low rise</td>
<td>6.18 trips / dwelling units</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>2,303.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Assumptions:

#### Fleet Mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Percent Type</th>
<th>Non-Catalyst</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Auto</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck &lt; 3,750 lbs</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck 3,751-5,750</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Truck 5,751-8,500</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lite-Heavy 8,501-10,000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81.80</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lite-Heavy 10,001-14,000</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med-Heavy 14,001-33,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Heavy 33,001-60,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>88.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Haul &gt; 60,000 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bus</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Home</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-Work</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Shop</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Other</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work Customer</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Trip Length (miles)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Trip Length (miles)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Speed (mph)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Trips - Residential</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes made to the default values for Land Use Trip Percentages

Changes made to the default values for Area

The area source mitigation measure option switch changed from off to on.

Changes made to the default values for Operations

The operational emission year changed from 2004 to 2008.
The home based work selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based work urban trip length changed from 10.8 to 5.4.
The home based shopping selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based shopping urban trip length changed from 7.3 to 3.7.
The home based other selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based other urban trip length changed from 7.5 to 3.8.
The commercial based commute selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based commute urban trip length changed from 9.5 to 4.8.
The commercial based non-work selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based non-work urban trip length changed from 7.35 to 3.7.
The commercial based customer selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based customer urban trip length changed from 7.35 to 3.7.
The travel mode environment settings changed from both to: residential.
The default/nodefault travel setting changed from nodefault to: nodefault.
Side Walks/Paths: No Sidewalks
changed to: Side Walks/Paths: Complete Coverage
Street Trees Provide Shade: No Coverage
changed to: Street Trees Provide Shade: Some Coverage
Pedestrian Circulation Access: No Destinations
changed to: Pedestrian Circulation Access: Some Destinations
Visually Interesting Uses: No Uses Within Walking Distance
changed to: Visually Interesting Uses: Moderate Number and Variety
Street System Enhances Safety: No Streets
changed to: Street System Enhances Safety: Some Streets
Pedestrian Safety from Crime: No Degree of Safety
changed to: Pedestrian Safety from Crime: Moderate Degree of Safety
Visually Interesting Walking Routes: No Visual Interest
changed to: Visually Interesting Walking Routes: Moderate Level
Transit Service: Dial-A-Ride or No Transit Service
changed to: Transit Service: 15-30 Minute Bus within 1/4 Mile
Safe School Routes: No Schools
changed to: Safe School Routes: One School
Uses w/in Cycling Distance: No Uses w/in Cycling Distance
changed to: Uses w/in Cycling Distance: Moderate Number and Variety
Mitigation measure Provide Sidewalks and/or Pedestrian Paths: 1
has been changed from off to on.
Mitigation measure Provide Street Lighting: 0.5
has been changed from off to on.
### SUMMARY REPORT
(Tons/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Source Emission Estimates</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational (Vehicle) Emission Estimates</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Area and Operational Emission Estimates</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, unmitigated)</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (tpy, mitigated)</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>PM10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Stoves</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplaces</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Prdcts</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS (tpy, unmitigated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family housing</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments low rise</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EMISSIONS (tons/yr)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not include correction for passby trips.

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips.

**OPERATIONAL (Vehicle) EMISSION ESTIMATES**

Analysis Year: 2008  Temperature (F): 85  Season: Annual


Summary of Land Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family housing</td>
<td>10.54 trips / dwelling units</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>853.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments low rise</td>
<td>6.16 trips / dwelling units</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>2,303.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle Assumptions:

Fleet Mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Percent Type</th>
<th>Non-Catalyst</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Auto</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck &lt; 3,750 lbs</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck 3,751-5,750</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Truck 5,751-8,500</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lite-Heavy 8,501-10,000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81.80</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lite-Heavy 10,001-14,000</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med-Heavy 14,001-33,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Heavy 33,001-60,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>88.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Haul &gt; 60,000 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bus</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Home</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>93.30</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home-Work</td>
<td>Home-Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Trip Length (miles)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Trip Length (miles)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Speeds (mph)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Trips - Residential</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes made to the default values for Land Use Trip Percentages

Changes made to the default values for Area

The area source mitigation measure option switch changed from off to on.
The percentage of wood stoves changed from 35 to 0.
The fireplace percentage of residential units changed from 10 to 0.

Changes made to the default values for Operations

The operational emission year changed from 2004 to 2008.
The home based work selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based work urban trip length changed from 10.8 to 5.4.
The home based shopping selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based shopping urban trip length changed from 7.3 to 3.7.
The home based other selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The home based other urban trip length changed from 7.5 to 3.8.
The commercial based commute selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based commute urban trip length changed from 9.5 to 4.8.
The commercial based non-work selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based non-work urban trip length changed from 7.35 to 3.7.
The commercial based customer selection item changed from 8 to 7.
The commercial based customer urban trip length changed from 7.35 to 3.7.
The travel mode environment settings changed from both to: residential.
The default/nodefault travel setting changed from nodefault to: nodefault

Side Walks/Paths: No Sidewalks
    changed to: Side Walks/Paths: Complete Coverage
Street Trees Provide Shade: No Coverage
    changed to: Street Trees Provide Shade: Some Coverage
Pedestrian Circulation Access: No Destinations
    changed to: Pedestrian Circulation Access: Some Destinations
Visually Interesting Uses: No Uses Within Walking Distance
    changed to: Visually Interesting Uses: Moderate Number and Variety
Street System Enhances Safety: No Streets
    changed to: Street System Enhances Safety: Some Streets
Pedestrian Safety from Crime: No Degree of Safety
    changed to: Pedestrian Safety from Crime: Moderate Degree of Safety
Visually Interesting Walking Routes: No Visual Interest
    changed to: Visually Interesting Walking Routes: Moderate Level
Transit Service: Dial-A-Ride or No Transit Service
    changed to: Transit Service: 15-30 Minute Bus within 1/4 Mile
Safe School Routes: No Schools
    changed to: Safe School Routes: One School
Uses w/in Cycling Distance: No Uses w/in Cycling Distance
    changed to: Uses w/in Cycling Distance: Moderate Number and Variety
Mitigation measure Provide Sidewalks and/or Pedestrian Paths: 1
    has been changed from off to on.
Mitigation measure Provide Street Lighting: 0.5
    has been changed from off to on.
Appendix B

Biological Survey