

3.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

The Lincoln East Specific Plan (LESP or proposed project) is an approximately 1,160-acre mixed-use development that includes residential, retail/office, public facilities, schools, parks, and new infrastructure and roadways. The proposed project would include 822 acres of residential uses of varying densities, 34 acres of commercial, 82 acres of parks and open space, 59 acres of public facilities, and 29 acres of quasi-public facilities.

The proposed project is located in unincorporated Sutter County within the Yuba City Sphere of Influence, immediately south and west of the existing city boundaries. The LESP is bounded by Franklin Road to the north, Bogue Road to the south, Sanborn Road and Harding Road to the east, and George Washington Boulevard to the west. Lands to the south and west of the LESP site are agricultural. Land to the east and north of the LESP site is within the City of Yuba City and is occupied by residential and industrial uses. Development is also planned for land west of the project site in Sutter County, according to the Sutter County General Plan and the Yuba County General Plan.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Effects Found to be Less Than Significant

As shown in Table 3-1, a number of project impacts identified in the Draft EIR were found to be less than significant, requiring no mitigation. These impacts can be found in Section 4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Section 4.2 Agricultural Resources, 4.3 Air Quality, 4.4 Biological Resources, 4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality, 4.8 Land Use, and 4.11 Public Services. In the course of drafting the EIR for this project, it was determined that numerous other identified impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of proposed mitigation measures described herein.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance (CEQA Guidelines section 15382). Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to some of these resources, which area analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.13 of this document and summarized in Table 3-1 (provided at the end of this Chapter).

This EIR discusses mitigation measures that could be implemented by the city and/or the project applicant to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less than significant. Such mitigation measures are noted in this document and are found in the following sections:

Section 4.2 Agricultural Resources, 4.3 Air Quality, 4.4 Biological Resources, 4.5 Cultural Resources, 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality, 4.9 Noise, and 4.12 Transportation and Circulation. However, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, some impacts could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The following are the significant and unavoidable impacts that were identified for both project-level and cumulative impacts:

Project-Specific Significant-and-Unavoidable Impacts

Project-specific significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project include:

- 4.1-1 The proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- 4.2-1 The proposed project could convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.
- 4.3-2 Construction activities would generate ROG and NO_x emissions from construction equipment that could exceed the air district thresholds.
- 4.3-3 Operational emissions associated with the proposed project could exceed the air district thresholds.
- 4.9-3 The proposed project could expose persons within the LESP to operational noise from motor vehicles and stationary sources that exceed adopted or applicable standards.
- 4.9-4 The proposed project could expose persons adjacent to the LESP area to operational noise from motor vehicles that exceed adopted or applicable standards.
- 4.10-1 The proposed project could directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.
- 4.12-1 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in the City of Yuba City.
- 4.12-2 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes on residential streets in the City of Yuba City.
- 4.12-3 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in Sutter County.
- 4.12-4 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections under Caltrans' jurisdiction.
- 4.12-5 The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs.

4.12-6 The proposed project could increase demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Cumulative Significant-and-Unavoidable Impacts

Cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project include:

- 4.1-3 The proposed project, in conjunction with development of other projects in Yuba City and within adjacent Sutter County, could substantially cumulatively degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area.
- 4.2-3 The proposed project, in combination with other projects in the City's SOI and Sutter County, could convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.
- 4.3-7 Construction of the proposed project, combined with other development in SVAB, could increase cumulative levels of ROG and NO_x.
- 4.3-8 Operational emissions from the proposed project, combined with other operational emissions from on-going development in the SVAB, could exceed air district thresholds.
- 4.9-6 Project traffic, in conjunction with traffic from planned future development in the City and the SOI, could generate substantial permanent noise increases on existing residential areas adjacent to major roadways.
- 4.10-2 The proposed project, in combination with future buildout of the City of Yuba City as well as the City's SOI, could directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.
- 4.12-7 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in the City of Yuba City.
- 4.12-8 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes on residential streets in the City of Yuba City.
- 4.12-9 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in Sutter County.
- 4.12-10 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections under Caltrans' jurisdiction.
- 4.12-11 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions.
- 4.12-12 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect the natural environment.

4.14-1 The proposed project could contribute to global climate change through the contribution of greenhouse gases.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The EIR analyzes the following alternatives to the proposed project:

No Project/No Development Alternative: This alternative assumes that the proposed project would not occur and there would be no future development of the site. This alternative assumes any existing operations that have historically occurred on the site would remain.

No Project/General Plan Buildout Alternative: This alternative assumes that the proposed project would not occur and that future development of the site would occur consistent with the existing Yuba City General Plan. This alternative assumes full buildout of the General Plan.

80-acre City Park Alternative: This alternative assumes one 80-acre park. This alternative assumes all other proposed project operations would still occur.

Reduced Footprint Alternative: This alternative provides for a reduced footprint of development by applying project components to a 440-acre footprint. A conceptual land use plan for this alternative was developed to provide the same intensity (same overall dwelling units per acre) of development as the proposed project; however, because the area to be development would be reduced, the overall unit count would also be reduced. This alternative would avoid development in areas where existing residential units reside and would result in fewer park/open space opportunities. The commercial component would be the same as that described for the proposed project.

The relative effects of the alternatives are identified by impact area in Chapter 5, Alternatives.

Potential Areas of Concern

The City received 28 comment letters during the NOP public review period. The areas of potential concern identified through the environmental evaluation process include: traffic impacts from higher density land uses and impacts from widening local streets; impacts to visual resources from increased night lighting, decreased privacy, and changes to existing views; increases in noise levels and air pollution; loss of habitat and agricultural resources, and impacts to heritage trees; impacts to historic buildings and other cultural resources in the project area; impacts to existing septic systems, leech lines, and wells; effects on hydrology, water quality, and drainage with increased development and impervious surfaces; impacts on school districts; impacts to residences adjacent to the proposed fire station; land use compatibility issues and the effect of high density land uses on existing development, and conflicts with Williamson Act contracts; and concerns about funding for parks, the fire station, roads, and schools. Comment letters received in response to the NOP/IS are included in Appendix B.

SUMMARY TABLE

Table 3-1 (Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures), has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4. The summary table is arranged in four columns:

1. Environmental impacts (“Impact”)
2. Level of significance prior to mitigation measures (“Significance”)
3. Mitigation measures (“Mitigation Measure”)
4. Level of significance after mitigation measures (“Residual Significance”)

If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate and feasible. More than one mitigation measure may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including, but not necessarily limited to, City of Yuba City General Plan Policies, laws, and requirements or recommendations of the City of Yuba City. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 4.0, Introduction to the Analysis.

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources			
4.1-1 The proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	S	None available.	SU
4.1-2 The proposed project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	None required.	
4.1-3 The proposed project, in conjunction with development of other projects in Yuba City and within adjacent Sutter County, could substantially cumulatively degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area.	S	None available.	SU
4.1-4 The proposed project, in conjunction with the development of other projects in Yuba City, could create a new source of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	None required.	
4.2 Agricultural Resources			
4.2-1 The proposed project could convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	S	None available.	SU
4.2-2 The proposed project could develop uses such that the productivity of adjacent agricultural activities is substantially reduced due to nuisances associated with project development or operation.	LS	None required.	
4.2-3 The proposed project, in combination with other projects in the City's SOI and Sutter County, could convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	S	None available.	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.3 Air Quality			
<p>4.3-1 Construction activities would generate PM₁₀ emissions that could exceed the air district thresholds.</p>	LS	<p>(Recommended mitigation measure)</p> <p>4.3-1 (a) Non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied to all inactive construction areas, according to manufacturer's specifications.</p> <p>(b) Prior to final occupancy, the project applicant or contractor shall re-establish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.</p> <p>(c) During project construction, paved streets shall be swept (water sweeper with reclaimed water recommended) at the end of each day if substantial volumes of soil material have been carried onto adjacent paved, public roads from the project site.</p> <p>(d) During project construction, wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment exit onto paved streets from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip.</p>	
<p>4.3-2 Construction activities would generate ROG and NO_x emissions from construction equipment that could exceed the air district thresholds.</p>	S	<p>4.3-2 To reduce exhaust emissions during construction, all construction contracts shall include the following heavy-duty off-road equipment requirements to reduce ROG and NO_x emissions:</p> <p>(a) The prime contractor shall submit to the FRAQMD for approval, an Off-road Construction Equipment Emission Reduction Plan prior to groundbreaking demonstrating that heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be</p>	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>used in the construction project, and operated by either the prime contractor or by any subcontractor, shall achieve a fleet-averaged 20 percent NO_x reduction and a 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average; and</p> <p>(b) The prime contractor shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity, pursuant to EPA Method 9 for reading visible emissions, for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed the 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the FRAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The FRAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this measure shall supersede other FRAQMD regulations.</p>	
<p>4.3-3 Operational emissions associated with the proposed project could exceed the air district thresholds.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.3-3 The project applicant shall implement mitigation measures listed below to the extent deemed appropriate and feasible by the applicant and the Yuba City Community Development Department:</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>For all new development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Provide for the use of energy-efficient lighting and process systems such as, low-NO_x water heaters, furnaces, and boiler units. (b) All newly installed wood burning devices shall be EPA Phase II certified. (c) Large residential and commercial projects shall include bus shelters at transit access points where deemed appropriate by Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority. <p>For new residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (d) All residential structures shall include electric outlets in the front and rear of the structure to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment. (e) The applicant shall contribute their fair share to dedication of land for off-site bicycle trails linking the project to designated bicycle commuting routes in accordance with the regional Bikeway Master Plan. (f) The project shall contribute their fair share to the provision of synchronized traffic signals on roadways impacted by the project, as deemed necessary by the Public Works Department. (g) The project shall provide transit amenities e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters as demand and service routes warrant subject to review and approval by local transportation planning agencies. (h) The project shall install solar water heaters for at least 25 percent of the residential units. (i) The project applicant shall use available emissions offset credits. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>For new commercial development:</p> <p>(j) For all new commercial/retail development with more than 50 employees, the project applicant shall prepare a Transportation Systems Management Plan (TSMP) which shall include the following requirements, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools for commercial developments. • Incorporate transit-use incentives such as subsidized transit passes and flexible work schedules to encourage transit use and trip reduction. • Use of clean fuel vehicles in vehicle fleet. • Provide onsite shower/locker facilities for bicycling and pedestrian commuters. • Provide ancillary services within walking distance of the project (no further than 1,500 feet) such as cafeterias, health clubs, automatic tellers, post office etc., as appropriate and in compliance with local development regulations. • Feature alternative work schedules, where practical, that allow for work hours that are compressed into fewer than five days (e.g., 9/80; 4/40; or 3/36 hour schedules); or allow Flextime schedules. • Install solar water heaters for at least 25 percent of the building floor area. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.3-4 Future residents within the plan area could be exposed to toxic air contaminants from diesel trucks and school buses operating in the plan area.	PS	4.3-4 All diesel trucks delivering merchandise to commercial uses and all school buses dropping students off at schools within the Lincoln East Specific Plan shall minimize idling time to 15 minutes or less. Signs shall be posted at high visibility points around the facility where delivery trucks congregate (e.g, loading docks) or around the school at designated student drop-off areas.	LS
4.3-5 The proposed project would increase traffic volumes that could contribute to excessive CO concentrations near roadways and intersections.	LS	None required.	
4.3-6 Construction of the proposed project, combined with other development in the vicinity of the project site, could increase cumulative levels of PM ₁₀ .	LS	4.3-6 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.	
4.3-7 Construction of the proposed project, combined with other development in SVAB, could increase cumulative levels of ROG and NO _x .	S	4.3-7 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-2 (a) and (b).	SU
4.3-8 Operational emissions from the proposed project, combined with other operational emissions from on-going development in the SVAB, could exceed air district thresholds.	PS	4.3-8 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (a) through (j).	SU
4.3-9 Development of the proposed project in combination with other development in the SVAB could expose sensitive receptors to a cumulative TAC risk.	PS	4.3-9 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-4.	LS
4.3-10 The proposed project, in conjunction with other future development in the project vicinity, could contribute to cumulative CO levels.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources			
<p>4.4-1 Implementation of the proposed project could impact wetlands or other “waters of the U.S.”</p>	S	<p>4.4-1 Prior to grading activities, the project applicant shall prepare a wetland assessment for those areas of the project site slated for future development to determine if any wetlands subject to the Clean Water Act sections 401 and 404 exist in the project area. If no seasonal wetland or other “waters of the U.S.” are found, no further mitigation would be required.</p> <p>If seasonal wetlands are found in the project site that could be impacted by future development then the project applicant shall conduct a formal wetland delineation prepared in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetland Delineations, 2001. If seasonal wetlands are determined to be under the jurisdiction of the Corps or the Regional Water Quality Control Board, then the project applicant shall apply for section 404/401 permits with the appropriate regulatory agency. Mitigation measures will be developed during the permitting process which will reduce impacts on wetlands through avoidance, wetland replacement, or payment into an approved mitigation bank. Through the 404 and 401 permitting process impacts on wetlands would be reduce to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LS
<p>4.4-2 Construction associated with project implementation could result in the direct loss or disturbance of nesting birds.</p>	LS	None required.	
<p>4.4-3 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk, white-tailed kite, and other raptors (birds of prey).</p>	PS	<p>4.4-3 Prior to approval of any tentative map within the plan area, the project applicant shall ensure that an appropriate number of acres (+/- 324 acres or as approved by CDFG) of agricultural land, annual grasslands or other suitable raptor foraging habitat are preserved either on-site, or a combination of on-</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		site and off-site preservation of habitat within Sutter County at a 0.75:1 ratio. To the extent possible mitigation lands that provide suitable habitat to mitigate impacts to multiple species shall be considered as well as land that includes farmland. Preserve areas must be established prior to project construction, and may occur through either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Purchase of mitigation credits at an approved CDFG mitigation bank that is within the service area of the plan area; or (b) Payment of a mitigation fee to a habitat development and management company (or mitigation bank), through a negotiated agreement between the applicant, mitigation bank, and CDFG. The lands must be within 10 miles of the project site (consistent with CDFG guidelines); or (c) Purchase of conservation easements or fee title in Sutter County. This mitigation must occur within 10 miles of the project site, unless otherwise approved by CDFG (consistent with CDFG Guidelines). 	
4.4-4 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of native oak trees.	PS	4.4-4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) During any construction activities, the contractor shall avoid construction within the critical root zones of preserved/protected trees, unless the area has been previously paved. Encroachments shall be held to no more than 20 percent of the critical root zone area. Avoidance areas shall be fenced prior to any activities on site. (b) During project construction, an arborist shall be retained to supervise all grade cuts in the critical root zone of protected trees, and properly treat all roots subject to damage as soon as possible after excavation. Cut-faces exposed for more than two to three days should be 	LS

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>covered with a dense burlap fabric and watered to maintain soil moisture at least on a daily basis until the area is permanently covered.</p> <p>(c) Avoid placement of fill exceeding one foot in depth within the critical root zone of all preserved/protected trees. If unavoidable, either design drainage away from the critical root zone of the tree or consider tree removal. Placement of fill materials less than one foot in depth and encroachment of less than 20 percent into the critical root zone area shall not require special mitigative measures.</p> <p>(d) Any proposed structures shall not encroach more than 20 percent into the critical root zone area of a preserved/protected tree. If unavoidable, tree removal shall be considered.</p> <p>(e) Utilities shall be designed to avoid the critical root zone of preserved/protected trees. In some circumstances, hand digging of utilities through the critical root zone areas may be an option. Boring beneath the critical root zone area may also be an option.</p> <p>(f) Branches and limbs that have been torn, broken, or spilt during construction shall be removed. In addition, any dead, diseased, or rubbing limbs shall be removed. Other maintenance pruning shall be postponed for at least one to two years.</p>	
<p>4.4-5 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other development in the central Sacramento Valley, could convert open space to urban uses leading to a continuing loss of habitat including foraging habitat for native resident and migratory wildlife.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4-6 The proposed project, in combination with other current and proposed projects in the vicinity of the project site, could result in a regional loss or disturbance of nesting birds, including protected raptors, and other migratory birds.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.4-7 Implementation of the proposed project combined with other cumulative development in the Sacramento Valley could impact wetlands or other “waters of the U.S.”</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.5 Cultural Resources</p>			
<p>4.5-1 The proposed project could disturb or destroy previously unidentified subsurface archaeological resources or human remains during construction.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>4.5-1 (a) Prior to any grading activities in the area around the Dahling House, the project applicant shall hire a qualified archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology, to perform test excavations around the Dahling House to the west, south, and east of the current property lines to determine if significant artifacts from the Hoog House are present below grade that could be disturbed by grading activities. Prior to any test excavations the Archaeologist shall review historic maps and other documentation to determine the extent of the excavation needed. Details on the area and method of testing shall be submitted to and approved by the City prior to the commencement of the test excavations. All results shall be written up and a report submitted to both the City and the appropriate Information Center. The report shall contain mitigation measures if needed.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>(b) If a Native American site is discovered during any site disturbance activities the evaluation process shall include the following steps.</p> <p>When Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archaeologists who are either certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or meet the federal standards as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. 61), and Native American representatives who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions.</p> <p>In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. When historic archaeological sites or historic architectural features are involved, all identified and treatment is to be carried out by historical archaeologists or architectural historians. These individuals shall meet either SOPA or 36 C.F.R. 61 requirements.</p> <p>If human remains are discovered at any project construction sites during any phase of construction, work within 50 feet of the remains shall be suspended immediately, and the City of Yuba City Community Development Department and the county coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the county coroner to be Native American, the Native</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC who responds in a timely manner (i.e., within 24 hours after being notified by NAHC). As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The City shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation as it deems appropriate, taking account of the provisions of state law, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The City or the project applicant shall implement approved mitigation before the resumption of activities at the site where the remains were discovered.</p> <p>(c) Prior to the commencement of construction activities, all projects requiring grading or excavation shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a search of the sacred lands file for their project area. All follow up communication to local tribes suggested by the NAHC shall also be completed prior to construction activities.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.5-2 The proposed project could alter or destroy historic resources as a result of future development.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.5-2 (a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1. (b) Prior to the alteration or demolition of any building/complex within the plan area, the project applicant shall provide documentation of the age of all structures proposed for alteration or demolition to the City. If any of the structures proposed to be affected is 45 years old or older or the date of construction cannot be documented, Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 (c) shall be implemented. (c) Prior to alteration or demolition of any building found to be 45 years old or older within the plan area or any building/complex listed on the Historic Survey Matrix as requiring further research, a historic properties report shall be prepared by a qualified Architectural Historian and submitted to the City. At a minimum, the historic property report shall include a brief history of the property and area, a description of all buildings on the property, a chain of title including brief histories on any property owners, an estimated date of construction for all buildings including additions, photos of all buildings, a completed DPR 523 form, an evaluation of significance, and recommendations for possible mitigation measures specific to what is proposed for the building (i.e. alteration, demolition, etc.). (d) Prior to the commencement of construction activities within 75 feet of the Dahling House, the project applicant shall hire a historic preservation architect and a registered structural engineer to undertake an existing condition study of the Dahling House. The purpose of the study shall be to establish the baseline condition of the building prior to construction. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations,</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey their historic significance. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Yuba City.</p> <p>The structural engineer shall make periodic site visits to monitor the condition of the property, including monitoring of any instruments, such as crack gauges for the duration of construction activities deemed by the engineer to be potentially harmful to the building. The structural engineer shall consult with the historic preservation architect, especially if any problems with character defining features of a historical resource are discovered. If, in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts on historic resources related to construction activities are found during construction, the monitoring team shall so inform the project applicant or applicant's designated representative responsible for construction activities. The project applicant shall adhere to the monitoring team's recommendations for corrective measures, including halting construction in situations where construction activities would imminently endanger historical resources. The monitoring team shall prepare site visit reports.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The project applicant shall promptly respond to any claims of damage by inspecting the affected property, in no case more than five working days after the claim was filed and received by the project sponsor's designated representative. Any new cracks or other changes in the structures shall be compared to pre-construction conditions and a determination made as to whether the proposed project could have caused such damage. In the event that the project is demonstrated to have caused any damage, such damage shall be repaired by the project applicant to the pre-existing condition.</p> <p>Site visit reports and documents associated with claims processing shall be provided to the City of Yuba City.</p>	
<p>4.5-3 The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>4.5-3 Should paleontological resources be identified at a particular site during project excavation activities, the construction manager shall cease operation until a qualified professional can provide an evaluation. Mitigation shall be conducted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and evaluate paleontological resources by intense field survey where impacts are considered high; 2. Assess effects on identified sites; 3. Consult with the institutional/academic paleontologists conducting research investigations within the geological formations that are slated to be impacted; 4. Obtain comments from the researchers; 	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		5. Comply with researchers' recommendations to address any significant adverse effects where determined by the County to be feasible. In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting paleontologist, the City's Community Development Department Staff shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, Specific Plan policies and land use assumptions, and other considerations. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for paleontological resources is carried out.	
4.5-4 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the City and County, could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, including human remains, as defined in section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	PS	4.5-4 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 and 4.5-2.	LS
4.5-5 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the City and County, could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.	PS	4.5-5 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-3.	LS
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.6-1 The proposed project could expose construction workers to contaminated soils and/or groundwater during site development.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.6-2 The proposed project could expose both existing and future residents to contaminated soils and/or groundwater during both construction of phased development as well as operation of the proposed project.	LS	None required.	
4.6-3 The proposed project could increase the risk of the emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	LS	None required.	
4.6-4 The proposed project could increase the number of people exposed to potential hazards associated with crop dusting on adjacent farmland, which could create a significant hazard to the public through the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	LS	None required.	
4.6-5 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, could expose construction workers to soil and/or groundwater contamination during project construction.	LS	None required.	
4.6-6 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, could expose both current and future residents to contaminated soils and/or groundwater during both operation of the proposed project and during phased development of the specific plan.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.6-7 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, could increase the risk of the emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	LS	None required.	
4.6-8 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, could increase the number of people exposed to potential hazards associated with crop dusting on adjacent farmland, which could create a significant hazard to the public through the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	LS	None required.	
4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.7-1 Development of the proposed project could substantially alter drainage patterns in the area and increase the rate of surface runoff in a manner that could result in an increase in flooding on- or off-site if appropriate storm drainage design features are not implemented.	LS	None required.	
4.7-2 Project construction activities could contribute pollutants to local waterways through construction site stormwater runoff.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7-3 Occupancy of the proposed project could contribute urban pollutants to stormwater runoff discharged to the Live Oak Canal and ultimately the Feather River and Sacramento River.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.7-3 In conjunction with Final Design approval, Yuba City Public Works Department shall require submittal of a site-specific stormwater quality monitoring program for the Lincoln East Specific Plan. The plan shall identify pollutants of concern for the planned land uses, background concentrations and estimated pollutant loading levels that shall not be exceeded based on standard stormwater runoff water quality prediction models, testing methods and frequency, and inspection and maintenance tasks. Data and completed tasks shall be documented in a report submitted to Public Works on an annual basis. If project runoff indicates water quality discharged to the Live Oak Canal has the potential to be degraded, the City shall take corrective action such as increased source controls, more effective BMPs, or equally effective measures.</p> <p>When the City's stormwater management plan ordinance is adopted, this mitigation measure may be discontinued, provided the ordinance achieves the same level of protection as the actions listed above.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>4.7-4 The proposed project could involve the development of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.7-5 Development of the proposed project could expose people or structures to a risk involving flooding as a result of the failure of a dam.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7-6 The proposed project could convert irrigated agricultural land to urban uses, which would increase the amount of impervious surfaces that could affect groundwater recharge potential.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.7-6 To the extent feasible, the City shall ensure Specific Plan drainage features such as detention basins are sited in locations where maximum recharge potential exists. This shall be determined by a site-specific hydrogeological study that shall be prepared by the project applicant prior to Final Design approval. The project applicant shall implement a groundwater level testing program using either remaining private wells at the site and/or new monitoring wells sited at locations appropriate for measuring changes in groundwater levels and flow direction(s). If a long-term decline in private wells is predicted, the City shall provide landowners with an option to connect to City water services.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>4.7-7 The proposed project would increase the demand for water, some of which could come from groundwater wells, the pumping of which could result in localized physical effects on underlying aquifers.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.7-8 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other development within the West Yuba City area, could increase stormwater runoff rates and increase the risk for flooding. Cumulative development could require the expansion of storm drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.7-8 (a) Prior to issuance of grading permits for future development projects that, in combination with development of the Lincoln East Specific Plan, could result in an exceedence of drainage capacity assumed in the Master Drainage Study based on the recommended design criteria for runoff sizing, Yuba City shall ensure the conveyance capacity of the drainage trunk lines in the Specific Plan area is increased consistent with the final design of the West Yuba City Area Master Drainage Study, or any future updates thereof. Alternately, Yuba City shall require the developer to install the larger trunk lines and/or contribute fair-share funding to the Master Drainage Study Recommended Project improvements through a Development Agreement and/or CIP mechanism.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		(b) When the specific locations and design of the individual Master Drainage Study improvements have been established, pre-construction surveys shall be performed to identify listed species and habitat that could be affected by drainage improvements. Impacts on giant garter snake, western pond turtle, Swainson's hawk, waters of the U.S., and any other listed species or habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of combination of avoidance and compensation measures consistent with federal and state laws and regulations. Such measures shall include, but would not be limited to, limiting in-stream (drainage) construction timing, avoiding habitat, creation or restoration of habitat, or compensatory measures identified through the federal and state permitting process to ensure no net loss.	
<p>4.7-9 The proposed project, in combination with other development within areas in Yuba City-Sutter County tributary to the Feather River, could generate construction and post-construction stormwater runoff containing urban pollutants that could be discharged to local waterways and the Feather River.</p>	S	<p>4.7-9 (a) Yuba City shall adopt the required ordinance and implement the post-construction inspection, maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement activities identified in Section E. of the adopted 2003 Yuba City-Sutter County Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). The requirements stated in the SWMP are repeated verbatim herein:</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>To satisfy this minimum control measure, the City will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement strategies, which will include a combination of structural and non-structural BMPs. • Develop technical criteria for the different control strategies. • Create an ordinance requiring the implementation of post-construction runoff controls that also includes an enforcement mechanism for new development and redevelopment. • Implement plan checking procedures to ensure the inclusion of post-construction runoff controls prior to plan approval. • Conduct annual meetings with developers and contractors to discuss construction and post-construction BMPs. • Develop regulatory requirements for the maintenance of privately owned post construction control measures. • Ensure adequate long-term operation and maintenance of controls. <p>(b) In addition, the City shall implement a City-wide stormwater quality monitoring program consistent with the actions outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.7-3.</p>	
<p>4.7-10 The proposed project, in combination with other development within the watershed, could expose people and property to 100-year flood hazard until levees providing state-mandated 200-year flood protection are certified by FEMA.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.7-11 Development of the proposed project, in combination with other development within Sutter County, could increase the number of people and structures that could be exposed to dam failure inundation hazard, but it would not result in any operational changes at existing dams that would increase the risk of dam failure.	LS	None required.	
4.7-12 Development of the proposed project, in combination with other development within the watershed, could deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	LS	None required.	
4.8 Land Use and Planning			
4.8-1 The proposed project could physically divide an established community.	LS	None required.	
4.8-2 The proposed project could result in land use conflicts due to the placement of incompatible uses in proximity to each other.	LS	None required.	
4.9 Noise			
4.9-1 Project construction could generate substantial short-term increases in noise levels in areas near construction activities.	LS	4.9-1 (Recommended mitigation measure) The project contractor(s) shall ensure that the following measures are implemented during all phases of project construction: (a) Whenever construction occurs on parcels adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods, schools or other sensitive uses, when it occurs during later project stages on parcels near residential and other noise-sensitive uses built on-site during earlier project stages, temporary barriers shall be constructed around the construction sites to shield the ground floor and lower stories of the noise-sensitive uses. These barriers shall be of ¾-inch Medium	

LS = Less than Significant
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Density Overlay (MDO) plywood sheeting, or other material of equivalent utility and appearance, and shall achieve a Sound Transmission Class of STC-30, or greater, based on certified sound transmission loss data taken according to ASTM Test Method E90. The barrier shall not contain any gaps at its base or face, except for site access and surveying openings. The barrier height shall be designed to break the line-of-sight and provide at least a 5 dBA insertion loss between the noise producing equipment and the upper-most story of the adjacent noise-sensitive uses. If, for practical reasons, which are subject to the review and approval of the City, a barrier cannot be built to provide noise relief to the upper stories of nearby noise-sensitive uses, then it must be built to the tallest feasible height.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from residential areas while still serving the needs of construction contractor(s). (c) High noise activities, such as jackhammers, drills, impact wrenches and other generators of sporadic high noise peaks, shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, unless it can be proved to the satisfaction of the City that the allowance of work outside these hours and dates would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive receptors. (d) Construction equipment shall be properly muffled and maintained with noise reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise. (e) The unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		(f) Residents and businesses within 500 feet of the construction site shall be notified of the construction scheduling in writing. (g) The construction contractor shall designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” for construction activities. The coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise. The coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (i.e., starting too early, bad muffler, no shielding), and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. A telephone number for the construction coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and be included in the notice sent to neighbors and businesses regarding the construction schedule.	
4.9-2 Project construction activities could generate substantial temporary or periodic increases in vibration levels, thus disturbing residents within the plan area as well as adjacent residents.	PS	4.9-2 The project applicant shall require that all construction contracts include specifications that construction equipment remain a minimum of 50 feet from residential buildings or other buildings where people normally sleep.	LS
4.9-3 The proposed project could expose persons within the LESP to operational noise from motor vehicles and stationary sources that exceed adopted or applicable standards.	S	4.9-3 (a) Residential uses adjacent to main roadways (Franklin Road, Lincoln Road, Bogue Road, George Washington Boulevard, and Harter Parkway) shall include setbacks or sound walls to assure that the City’s 60 dBA CNEL standard is met. Conservative calculations with the TNM model using future traffic volumes on main roadways indicate that the following setbacks (relative to the road centerline) would be sufficient to meet required standards:	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Franklin Road: 130 feet ▪ Lincoln Road: 150 feet ▪ Bogue Road: 110 feet ▪ George Washington Boulevard (south of Franklin): 140 feet ▪ George Washington Boulevard (south of Lincoln): 130 feet ▪ Harter Parkway (proposed; south of Franklin): 190 feet ▪ Harter Parkway (proposed; south of Lincoln): 110 feet <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) Masonry/concrete sound walls between 6- to 8-feet high shall be constructed along the residential property boundary adjacent to the roads listed above. The exact height would be determined by additional noise modeling to be conducted once lotting plans are available. (c) Prior to the issuance of building permits for on-site commercial and school uses, the project applicant shall submit engineering and acoustical specification for project mechanical HVAC equipment to the City demonstrating that the equipment design (types, location, enclosure, specifications) would control noise from the equipment to at least 10 dBA below existing ambient noise levels at nearby residential and other noise-sensitive land uses. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		(d) Garbage storage containers and commercial/educational building loading docks shall be placed to allow adequate separation to shield adjacent residential or other noise-sensitive uses. If the separation of garbage storage containers or loading docks away from adjacent noise-sensitive uses is not feasible, these noise-generating areas shall be enclosed or acoustically shielded to reduce noise-related impacts to these noise-sensitive uses.	
4.9-4 The proposed project could expose persons adjacent to the LESP area to operational noise from motor vehicles that exceed adopted or applicable standards.	S	None available.	SU
4.9-5 Project traffic, in conjunction with traffic from planned future development in the City and the SOI, could generate substantial permanent noise increases in residential areas within the LESP adjacent to major roadways.	S	4.9-5 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-3.	LS
4.9-6 Project traffic, in conjunction with traffic from planned future development in the City and the SOI, could generate substantial permanent noise increases on existing residential areas adjacent to major roadways.	S	None available.	SU
4.10 Population, Employment, and Housing			
4.10-1 The proposed project could directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.	S	None available.	SU
4.10-2 The proposed project, in combination with future buildout of the City of Yuba City as well as the City's SOI, could directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.	S	None available.	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.11 Public Services			
4.11-1 The proposed project could increase response times for the fire department which could adversely affect the physical environment or human health and safety.	LS	None required.	
4.11-2 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in the YCFD's service area, could result in increased response times over the established response time standard, which could adversely affect the physical environment or human health and safety.	LS	None required.	
4.11-3 The proposed project could lead to a reduction in existing police protection service levels and increase response times over established goals, which could adversely affect the physical environment or human health and safety.	LS	None required.	
4.11-4 The proposed project could require additional police protection resources, such as providing a new police station, which could generate adverse physical impacts.	LS	None required.	
4.11-5 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in Yuba City, could lead to a reduction in existing police protection service levels or increase response times over the established goal, which could adversely affect the physical environment or human health and safety.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.11-6 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in Yuba City, could require additional police protection resources, such as providing new police stations, which could generate adverse physical impacts.	LS	None required.	
4.11-7 The proposed project would generate students that could exceed the design capacity of existing or planned schools and result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	None required.	
4.11-8 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in Yuba City and within the school districts, would generate students that could exceed the design capacity of existing or planned schools and result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	None required.	
4.11-9 The proposed project could result in an increase in the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities, resulting in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LS	None required.	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.11-10 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in Yuba City, could result in an increase in the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities resulting in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.11-11 The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new landfills or the expansion of existing landfills to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.11-12 Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in the RWMA area, could require or result in the construction of new solid waste facilities or the expansion of existing facilities to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
<p>4.12 Transportation and Circulation</p>			
<p>4.12-1 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in the City of Yuba City.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Franklin Road/Harding Road 4.12-1 (a) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to pay their fair-share to widen Franklin Road from two to four lanes (including continuous bike lanes and sidewalks) from the proposed Harter Parkway to just west of SR 99 (Franklin Road is already four lanes between the Winco Driveway and SR 99). The inside westbound through lane is recommended to be an exclusive left-turn lane at Harter Parkway. The outside eastbound through lane is recommended to begin as the receiving lane for a “free” right-turn lane from northbound Harter Parkway.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Franklin Road/Walton Avenue (d) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(a). AND (e) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to pay their fair-share to widen Walton Avenue to four lanes from south of Bridge Street to Franklin Road (Walton Avenue currently transitions from four to two lanes south of Bridge Street). The outside southbound through-lane should extend south of the Franklin Road/Walton Avenue intersection a minimum of 600 feet before transitioning back to one lane. The outside northbound through-lane should begin at least 250 feet prior to Franklin Road. AND (f) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to modify the traffic signal and construct the following approach lanes at the Franklin Road/Walton Avenue intersection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastbound and Westbound – two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane. ▪ Northbound and Southbound – one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Lincoln Road/Walton Avenue</p> <p>(g) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to widen Lincoln Road to four lanes between Walton Avenue and SR 99 (this improvement does not include widening Lincoln Road to four lanes through the Lincoln Road/SR 99 intersection). The inside eastbound through lane is recommended to be an exclusive left-turn lane at SR 99. The outside westbound through lane is recommended to begin as the receiving lane for a “free” right-turn lane from southbound SR 99 and should extend west of the Lincoln Road/Walton Avenue intersection a minimum of 600 feet before transitioning back to one lane. The outside eastbound through lane should begin at least 250 feet prior to Walton Avenue.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(h) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to modify the traffic signal and construct the following approach lanes at the Lincoln Road/Walton Avenue intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastbound and Westbound – one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. ▪ Northbound and Southbound – one left-turn lane, one through lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane.. <p>Bogue Road/Walton Avenue</p> <p>(i) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to install a traffic signal and construct the following approach lanes at the Bogue Road/Walton Avenue intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastbound, Northbound, and Southbound – one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. ▪ Westbound – one left-turn lane, one through lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12-3 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in Sutter County.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Franklin Road/George Washington Boulevard 4.12-3 (a) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to modify the intersection to construct one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound, westbound, and southbound approaches at the Franklin Road/George Washington Boulevard intersection.</p> <p>Franklin Road/El Margarita Road (b) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to install a traffic signal and construct the following approach lanes at the Franklin Road/El Margarita Road intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastbound, Northbound, and Southbound – one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. ▪ Westbound – one left-turn lane, one through lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane. <p>Lincoln Road/Sanborn Road (c) The project applicant(s) shall be responsible to install a traffic signal and construct one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane on all approaches at the Lincoln Road/Sanborn Road intersection.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>4.12-4 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project could increase traffic volumes at study intersections under Caltrans' jurisdiction.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>SR 20/El Margarita Road 4.12-4 (a) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to install a traffic signal at the SR 20/El Margarita Road intersection.</p> <p>SR 20/SR 99 (b) The project applicant(s) shall pay traffic impact fees to modify the traffic signal and widen the intersection to provide a third eastbound and westbound through lane. The outside westbound through lane should extend west of the SR 20/SR 99 intersection a minimum of 600 feet before transitioning back to two lanes. The outside eastbound through lane should begin at least 250 feet prior to SR 20.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Bridge Street/SR 99 (c) The project applicant(s) shall pay traffic impact fees to widen SR 99 to six lanes between Franklin Road and SR 20. The outside northbound through lane is recommended to begin at least 250 feet prior to Franklin Road. The inside northbound through lane is recommended to be an exclusive left-turn lane at SR 20. The outside southbound through lane is recommended to begin as the receiving lane for the existing "free" right-turn lane from eastbound SR 20 and extend south of the Franklin Road/SR 99 intersection a minimum of 600 feet before transitioning back to two lanes. This widening would require modifications to the SR 99 intersections at Sunsweet Boulevard, Bridge Street and Franklin Road to include a third northbound and southbound through lane. Franklin Road/SR 99 (d) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-4(c). Lincoln Road/SR 99 (e) The project applicant(s) shall pay traffic impact fees to modify the traffic signal and widen the eastbound approach to provide a second left-turn lane at the Lincoln Road/SR 99 intersection.	
4.12-5 The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs.	S	4.12-5 The project applicant(s) shall contribute its fair share of the cost to provide public transit service and additional park-and-ride space for the plan area as determined by the City of Yuba City through participation in a benefit or assessment district or through a separate agreement between the applicant(s), the City of Yuba City, and Yuba-Sutter Transit. At a minimum, service is expected to include the following components.	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed-route bus service connecting the plan area to existing Yuba-Sutter Transit service with a minimum of hourly headways during normal operating hours. • Demand-responsive service meeting ADA paratransit requirements in the plan area. • Expansion of peak period (AM and PM) weekday commuter bus service to downtown Sacramento. • Expansion of park-and-ride space. <p>Costs shall include the capital costs of transit vehicles and facilities as well as the operating and maintenance cost of the service beyond what would be paid for through the transportation development act (TDA) funding.</p>	
<p>4.12-6 The proposed project could increase demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.12-6 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(a).</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>4.12-7 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in the City of Yuba City.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Franklin Road/Harding Road 4.12-7 (a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(b). Bogue Road/Sanborn Road (b) Until this intersection is added to the City’s Traffic Impact Fee Study Program, the project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to install a traffic signal at the Bogue Road/Sanborn Road intersection. If it is added to the City’s Fee Study Program the project applicant(s) shall be responsible for complying with the Fee Study Program.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p>Bridge Street/Tharp Road (c) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to install a traffic signal and construct the following approach lanes at the Bridge Street/Tharp Road intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound – an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Franklin Road/Tharp Road (d) Until this intersection is added to the City's Traffic Impact Fee Study Program, the project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to install a traffic signal at the Franklin Road/Tharp Road intersection. If it is added to the City's Fee Study Program the project applicant(s) shall be responsible for complying with the Fee Study Program.	
<p>4.12-8 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes on residential streets in the City of Yuba City.</p>	S	Harding Road between Franklin Road and Cherry Street 4.12-8 (a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(b). AND (b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-2(b). Cherry Street between Harding Road and Walton Avenue (c) Install traffic calming measures along Cherry Street between Harding Road and Walton Avenue. Existing Residential Streets in and near the LESP (d) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-2(c).	SU
<p>4.12-9 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections in Sutter County.</p>	S	Lincoln Road/Sanborn Road 4.12-9 (a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-3(c). Lincoln Road/Harter Parkway (b) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to modify the traffic signal to provide an overlap phase for the southbound right-turn movement at the Lincoln Road/Harter Parkway intersection.	SU

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12-10 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project, in combination with other development, could increase traffic volumes at study intersections under Caltrans' jurisdiction.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>SR 20/Harter Parkway 4.12-10 (a) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to modify the traffic signal to provide an overlap phase for the southbound right-turn movement at the SR 20/Harter Parkway intersection.</p> <p>SR 20/Walton Avenue (b) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to modify the traffic signal and widen the SR 20/Walton Avenue intersection to provide a third eastbound and westbound through lane. The outside westbound through lane should extend west of the intersection a minimum of 600 feet before transitioning back to two lanes. The outside eastbound through lane should begin a minimum of 250 feet prior to Walton Avenue.</p> <p>SR 20/SR 99 Northbound Ramps (c) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-10(b).</p> <p>AND (d) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to modify the traffic signal and widen the SR 20/SR 99 Northbound Ramps intersection to provide a second eastbound left-turn lane.</p> <p>Richland Road/SR 99 (e) The project applicant(s) shall pay a fair-share to modify the traffic signal and widen the Richland Road/SR 99 intersection to provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12-11 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.12-11 (a) The City of Yuba City shall coordinate with the City of Marysville, Sutter County, Yuba County, and Caltrans to ensure that roadway improvements implemented in whole or in part as mitigation for the proposed project are designed to minimize impacts on existing and future roadways and intersections according to the LOS policies of affected jurisdictions.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>4.12-12 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect the natural environment.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.12-12 Implement the following Mitigation Measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation Measures 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-3, and 4.3-4, which require emission control measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during project construction and operation; • Mitigation Measures 4.4-1, 4.4-3, and 4.4-4, which require surveys for special status species and their habitat, preservation of suitable raptor foraging habitat, and avoidance of trees identified for preservation; • Mitigation Measures 4.5-1, 4.5-2, and 4.5-3, which require further analysis for identification and preservation of cultural resources and describe the proper handling of discovered prehistoric or historic resources, human remains, and paleontological resources if they are discovered during construction; • Mitigation Measures 4.7-3 and 4.7-6 which require preparation and submittal of a site-specific stormwater quality monitoring program and hydrogeological study to ensure that project flows would meet stormwater quality standards and that groundwater levels would not be substantially reduced; and 	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation Measures 4.9-1, 4.9-2, and 4.9-3 which would reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to construction noise and vibration, limit the hours during which high impact equipment can operate, and reduce exterior and interior noise impacts on new residential uses associated with traffic. 	
4.13 Utilities			
4.13-1 The increase in water demand associated with the proposed project could exceed available sources of water supply.	LS	None required.	
4.13-2 The increase in demand for treated water could exceed the availability of the City's WTP and the distribution system.	LS	None required.	
4.13-3 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, would increase water demand throughout the City and could exceed available water supplies.	S	4.13-3 (a) Water Supply Certifications Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of more than 500 dwelling units, the City shall comply with Government Code section 66473.7. Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of 500 or fewer units, the City need not comply with section 66473.7, or formally consult with other public water system, but shall nevertheless make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by section 66473.7 in order to ensure an adequate water supply is available for development authorized by the map. Prior to recordation of any final subdivision map, or prior to City approval of any similar project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the project applicant shall demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply from a public water system for the amount of	LS

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of a written certification from the water service provider that either existing sources are available or that needed improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.</p> <p>(b) Water Conservation The City's 2005 UWMP did not address the affects of water conversation measures to reduce demands on City water supplies. The LESP includes policies (Policy 9 and 10) that encourage water conservation through a variety of methods. Assuming the proposed project could achieve a 7.5 percent water conservation savings during an average day demand, the proposed project would roughly save approximately 185,881 gpd and reduce the total water demand of the proposed project to 2.5 mgd. The average annual demands would be reduced to 2,658 AFA down from the calculated demand of 2,881 AFA for a savings of 222 AFA. The conservation savings achieved at the project site would not reduce the maximum day demands enough to overcome the 2020 Citywide capacity deficit; therefore, this ultimately is a citywide issue and the City would need to address the future potential maximum day demand deficit on a larger scale to help reduce the cumulative demand for water to reduce the project's potentially significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>(c) Increase Groundwater Pumping As previously discussed, the City maintains a groundwater system that serves 18 percent of City customers. The City has planned to continue to pump 3,600 AFA of groundwater to meet customer demands. The proposed project's average annual demand is estimated at 2.7 mgd and 2.9 mgd when combined with the existing residential uses at the project site. In comparison to citywide demands of 31.2 mgd in 2025 and 2030, the proposed project's demand contribution is ten percent of system demands. Nonetheless, under a dry year scenario, the proposed project would increase demand on the City's water system infrastructure. In an effort to minimize the project's demand, the project could add new wells to the City's groundwater system paid for through developer or other water connection fees. Assuming a new groundwater well could pump roughly 1,000 gpm or 1.44 mgd, four new wells would be needed to meet the project's peak day demands and offset the demand placed on the City's water system. Furthermore, new development would have to pay their fair share to fund new groundwater wells to offset project-specific demands. Upon implementation of this mitigation measure, the potentially significant cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Notwithstanding, an increase of groundwater pumping to mitigate the proposed project's contribution to citywide demands; as stated previously, the City intends to deliver treated water through its centralized treatment and distribution system. Therefore, this mitigation measure should be considered only a short-term solution and the City would still need to rectify the long-term water supply situation.</p> <p>This analysis assumes that additional wells would be installed in the Sutter Subbasin groundwater area. Although this groundwater pumping mitigation measure could supply potable water to meet proposed site demands and offset the service area capacity deficit; this mitigation measure could also cause drawdown of the water supplies in the groundwater basin.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>At present, Sutter County is engaged in preparation of a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP), per the requirements of Water Code Section 10750-10750.10. GMPs are adaptive management tools and represent a critical step in establishing a framework for maintaining a sustainable groundwater resource for the various users overlying the basins. Within these programs Sutter County, in tandem with municipal users in the county, will continually assess the status of the groundwater basin and make appropriate management decisions to sustain the basin. The GMP is scheduled to be released in fall 2009. Progress to date includes a basin description, illustrations of geologic subsurface deposits, groundwater elevations with contour maps, monitoring well stations, land subsidence monitoring, and conductance of wells ranging from 150 to 400 feet and 400 to greater than 1,600 feet below ground surface and groundwater constituent information.¹</p>	

¹ Sutter County, California. Groundwater Management Plan website - <http://www.co.sutter.ca.us/doc/government/depts/pw/wr/gmp/gmphome>. Accessed Thursday, December 11, 2008.

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>(d) Renewal of NYWD Contract Renewal of the NYWD contract to alleviate the supply shortfall or increase the annual quantity to overcome the 2025 supply shortfall of 1,785 AFA. As the contract negotiations are proceeding, public information is not readily available. This information will be incorporated into the Yuba City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. As stated in the WSA, the assumption of contract renewal for the same quantity of water is based on existing case law, which holds that a municipal utility acts in a trust capacity with respect to water supplied to outside communities (Durant v. City of Beverly Hills, 39 Cal. App. 2d 133, 102 P.2d 759 (1940) and Hansen v. City of Buenaventura, 42 Cal. 3d 1172 (1986)). The agreement will be renegotiated prior to its expiration in 2010. Expiration of the contract does not mean that NYWD can terminate water supplied to the City, which has developed a reliance on these water supplies. The contract allows the City to take direct diversions from the Feather River under the NYWD rights as per the allotment schedule shown in Table 4.13-5.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		(e) Optimize SWP Contract As of July 2008, Yuba City along with Solano County Water Agency, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and County of Butte has filed a lawsuit against the State of California Department of Water Resources and the State Water Project contractors for breach of contract; declaratory relief; damages; specific performance; and injunctive relief. If the plaintiffs are successful each area of origin contractor would receive its full SWP allocation. Yuba City would receive its full allocation of 9,600 AFA, as shown in Table 4.13-5. By optimizing the SWP supplies Yuba City would overcome the normal year supply deficits. Under dry year conditions, the City may still face a supply shortfall if the SWP supplies are curtailed to meet export contractor allocations. This can not be completely evaluated until the court makes a decision on this case.	
4.13-4 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan and SOI, would contribute to increased demand for treated water and distribution that could exceed treatment, conveyance or pumping capabilities within the City's WTP.	LS	None required.	
4.13-5 Under existing plus project conditions the project could increase wastewater flows for collection and treatment.	S	4.13-5 The project applicant shall contribute its fair share of the cost to design and construct new collection system infrastructure as described within the LESP and contribute the appropriate connection fees for both collection and treatment of wastewater. This mitigation measure can be defined through a development agreement that will also address financing of new infrastructure to serve the entire LESP area.	LS

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.13-6 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of the Yuba City General Plan, could increase flows to be treated and discharged at the WWTF, which could require expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities and construction of new collection and conveyance systems.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	
4.14 Climate Change			
<p>4.14-1 The proposed project could contribute to global climate change through the contribution of greenhouse gases.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.14-1 The following measures shall be used singularly or in combination to accomplish an overall reduction in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of green-building materials on buildings and other outdoor structures, such as low-emission concrete, recycled aggregate, recycled reinforcing, or waffle pods to be used in foundations; recycled plastics to be used in community structures such as fencing or playground equipment; wood flooring materials to be treated with low emissions varnishes and floor board substrates to be made from low emission particleboard; and other recycled building materials like recycled aluminum for window frames or post-consumer plastic for piping; • Installation of photovoltaic rooftop energy systems where feasible; • Establishment of tree-planting guidelines that encourage residents to plant trees to shade buildings primarily on the west and south sides of the buildings. Use of deciduous trees (to allow solar gain during the winter) and direct shading of air conditioning systems shall be included in the guidelines; 	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include energy-conserving features as options for home buyers, such as <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased wall and ceiling insulation (beyond building code requirements); 2. Energy efficient windows (double-paned or low-E); 3. Radiant heat barriers; 4. Solar water-heating systems; and 5. Low NOx-emitting or high-efficiency, energy efficient water heaters. • Awnings or other shading mechanisms for windows; • Porch, patio, and walkway overhangs; • Ceiling fans or whole-house fans; • Daylighting (natural lighting) systems such as skylights, light shelves, and interior transom windows; • Electrical outlets around the exterior of units to encourage the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment; • Use of low and no-VOC coatings and paint; • Natural gas lines (if available to the project area) in backyard or patio areas to encourage the use of gas barbecues; and; • Pre-wire units with high-speed modem connections/DSL and extra phone lines. <p>4.14-2 The applicant shall provide each home and business within the project site with an information packet that will contain, at a minimum, the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commute options to inform plan area occupants of the alternative travel amenities provided, including ridesharing and public transit availability/schedules; and • Maps showing plan area pedestrian and bicycle paths to community centers, shopping areas, employment areas, schools, parks, and recreation areas. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		4.14-3 The following measures shall be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of public areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use water-efficient landscaping for all publicly landscaped areas; • Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste; • Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations; and • Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives in a prominent place within the community. 	

LS = Less than Significant
 SU = Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant
 NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

