Meeting Date: April 24, 2019

To: Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Development Services Department

Presentation By: Darin Gale, Interim Development Services Director

Project: Subdivision Map (SM) 16-04 and Development Plan (DP) 16-01, Yuba Crossing. A request to consider an extension of time in which to file a final subdivision map and to begin construction of the development project.

Applicant: New Faze Development, 1825 Del Paso Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95815

Project Location: The project is located on the north side of Franklin Avenue, approximately 575 feet west of State Route 99, across from Winco Foods (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 58-120-004, 007, 008, and 009; 58-130-024).

Request:
The applicant submitted a timely request on March 6, 2017 for an extensions of time for SM 16-04 and an April 4, 2019 submittal for DP 16-01. The request is for an 18-month extension of time for the tentative subdivision map, and for a two-year time extension for the development plan, as provided for in the City ordinance.

Background
On May 24, 2017 the Planning Commission approved SM 16-04, which subdivides the property into 53 zero lot line single-family residential lots, live work units, and two multi-story mixed commercial/residential buildings on 8.7 acres. The Planning Commission also adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. Since the project also involved a general plan amendment and rezoning the actual approval date of the project was the date the re-zoning became effective following the City Council hearing, which was August 18, 2017.

Pursuant to City Municipal Code Section 8-2.610 the SM 16-04 was approved for two years with an expiration date of August 18, 2019. The code section also provides that the subdivider may apply for up to two 18-month extensions of time if the subdivision has not submitted for recordation. For the Development Plan the City ordinance provides for a two-year extension of time.

Staff Comments:
The applicant has indicated that due to delays from the weather as well as delays caused by trade workers being fully utilized due to the Camp Fire, they need a time extension to complete the subdivision portion of the project. The applicant stated that they hope to record the final subdivision map during the first quarter of 2020. For the subdivision this extension would be the first of a permitted two 18-month extensions. If the final map is not recorded by the end of the time extensions provided for in the City codes, there may be other extensions provided for in the California Subdivision Map Act.
For the Development Plan the City ordinance provides for an unlimited number of two-year extensions, provided that the Planning Commission determines that significant changes have not occurred.

If approved as recommended, the new expiration date for SM-16-04 will be February 18, 2021. For DP 16-01 the new expiration date will be August 18, 2021.

**Recommended Action:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Determine that the previously prepared mitigated negative declaration prepared for the project remains valid and no further environmental review is required.


3. Approve a two-year extension of time for Development Plan 16-01 pursuant to City Municipal Code Section 8-5.7106, resulting in a new expiration date of August 18, 2021.

**Attachments:**

1. Vicinity Map
2. Original Planning Commission staff report including approved Subdivision Map 16-04 and approved Development Plan 16-01
Meeting Date: May 24, 2017

To: Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Development Services Department

Presentation By: Ed Palmeri, Senior Planner

Public Hearing: A proposal to develop a mixed-use complex consisting of 53 zero lot line single-family homes, live/work units, and two multi-story mixed commercial/residential buildings on approximately 8.7 acres.

Project Location: The 8.7 acre project is located on the north side of Franklin Road approximately 575 feet west of the intersection of State Route 99 and Franklin Road. Assessor’s parcel numbers 58-120-004, 007, 008, 009; 58-130-024 and 025 (Attachment 1).

Project Proposal:

The project consists of the following components:

1. General Plan Amendment (GPA) 16-07: To redesignate the northern 5.9 acre portion of the property from the Community Commercial Planned Land Use designation of the City’s General Plan to the Low Density Residential designation;

2. Rezoning (RZ) 16-06: To rezone the northern 5.9 acre portion of the property from the Community Commercial District (C-2) zone district to the One-Family Residential District/Combining District (R-1 X) zone district and 2.8 acres from the Community Commercial District (C-2) zone district to the Community Commercial/Combining District (C-2 X) zone district;

3. Development Plan Review (DP) 16-01: To develop a mixed-use complex consisting of 53 zero lot line single-family lots and 10 three-story live-work units in Phase 1. Phase 2 consists of 26 second-story apartments above commercial space, internal roads, on-site amenities, parking, landscaping and public improvements;

4. Tentative Subdivision Map (SM) 16-04: Tentative subdivision map to create 57 lots for residential and commercial/retail/office use in two phases.

5. Environmental Assessment (EA) 16-16: Environmental assessment of the proposed project.

Project Information:

The project consists of:
Table 1: Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Configuration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family zero lot line (Phase 1)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live/Work units (Phase 1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second story apartments (Phase 2)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Retail (Phase 2)</td>
<td>15,281 square feet in two structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Type of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-story buildings</td>
<td>24.5 feet to 27 feet</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-story buildings</td>
<td>36 feet</td>
<td>Live/Work Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.25 feet</td>
<td>Commercial-Retail/Apartment units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use type</th>
<th>Code Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family*</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live/Work</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1 per unit + 1/10 guest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 250 square feet</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access

Phase I access is from Franklin Road
Phase II access includes Franklin Road ingress/egress and signalized Oji Way
*Each single family home will provide 2 tandem parking spaces in a garage. Tandem parking are two spaces, however one space is behind the other, rather than side by side.

Property Description:
The property is relatively flat with no unique topographic features and drains to the southwest. There are no rock outcroppings or heritage-type trees on the site. There is one single-family structure located on the site located at 1346 Franklin Road that will be removed prior to construction of the project. The structure is vernacular in design and was constructed in the 1960’s. The structure does not represent a unique period or architectural style of historical value. The single-family home is not on any historical preservation list. While there is currently one single family home on the site, it should be noted that several homes where demolished during the past 18 months, including a home that was demolished approximately three weeks ago.

General Plan Designation:
Existing: Community Commercial General Plan land use designation. This designation provides for a wide range of commercial activities focused around shopping centers, retail plazas, etc. The retail shopping area could include a wide variety of retail business, including retail stores, eating, and drinking establishments, as well as medical or professional offices in a retail-type setting. Mixed use development could include residential when secondary to commercial uses at a density of 12-36 units per gross acre.
Proposal: Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for approximately 5.9 acres located on the
northerly portion of the site and Community Commercial (CC) for property fronting Franklin Road (Attachment 2).

The LDR designation provides for a residential density with a range of 2 to 8 units per acre. This designation is designed for single-family housing projects.

The NC designation encourages small shopping areas and mixed use development which could include residential development (at a density of 12-36 units per gross acre) such as apartments above ground-floor retail. The proposed project is multi-use which includes zero-lot line single-family homes, live-work units, and apartments above a retail area. The live-work and apartment units are at a density of approximately 21.1 residences per acre.

**Zoning Classification:**

**Existing:** The site is currently zoned Community Commercial District (C-2) as approved per Rezone 12-01 in 2013. The C-2 district is designed to allow for a wide range of retail and personal services ranging from a neighborhood center to a community center. The C-2 zoning district allows second story multi-residential above a bona fide business.

**Proposal:** To reclassify the northern 5.9 acre portion of the C-2 Zone District to the One-Family Residence District/Combined District (R-1 X) Zone District and 2.8 acres from the C-2 Zone District to Community Commercial District/Combined District (C-2 X). The R-1 Combined Zone District is necessary in order to be consistent with the proposed LDR General Plan designation and to accommodate the proposed zero-lot line single-family units in Phase I (Attachment 3). The Combining Zone (X) is needed to allow for the live-work residential units.

**Bordering Uses:**

Surrounding uses include a mix of residential and commercial/retail uses, including single-family, commercial/retail, and a religious institution. Adjacent land uses include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Bordering Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: Properties to the north are developed with single-family homes fronting onto Munz Circle within the Victoria Estates complex. All of the existing single-family homes on Munz Circle are single story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Retail/Commercial (WinCo shopping center) and a religious institution. Single-family residential uses line the south property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Single-family homes and a City owned property that is a portion of future Oji Way right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Single-family residences fronting on Franklin Road and Neil Drive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Commission/Council Actions:**

Over the past 10 years the site has been the subject of several land use entitlements to develop the property with a variety of uses. The following provides a synopsis of these proposals:

2007 - New Faze Development submitted a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to allow development of the site with a project similar to the proposed project. The application was subsequently withdrawn.
and no further action taken.

2012 - The applicant submitted applications (GP 12-02, RZ 12-01, DP 12-03, & UP 12-05) to amend the General Plan and zoning to allow development of the site with a commercial shopping center and storage facility. At the Planning Commission meeting of July 24, 2013, Commission expressed concerns regarding development of the site with commercial uses adjacent to residential areas and traffic impacts. The Planning Commission did not reach consensus on the project with a 3-3 split vote to either approve or deny the project. As a result, the project was forwarded to the City Council without a recommendation.

At its meeting of August 20, 2013, the City Council approved the project however the project was not developed and the site remains vacant.

**Staff Comments:**

*General Plan Amendment & Rezone*

The applicant is proposing to amend the General Plan and to rezone the northern 5.9 acre portion of the site to facilitate the development of single-family homes. The existing Community Commercial designation is intended to encourage development of a shopping center or retail plaza and will be retained for a 2.8 acre portion of the project to be developed with live-work units and second story apartment/commercial buildings fronting onto Franklin Road. The General Plan Amendment to reclassify the property to the Low Density Residential designation is required to accommodate the proposed single-family units. The existing Community Commercial designation will remain on the front 2.8 acres of the site that is proposed for live-work units and apartments over commercial uses. The Combining Zone (X) is needed to allow for the live-work residential units.

While commercial opportunities will be reduced per the request, the City’s 2013-2021 Housing Element Update encourages a diversity of residential dwelling types to accommodate the housing needs of the City’s population. The Housing Element Program H-E-2 encourages zoning standards that facilitate the construction of a diversity of housing types. The proposed project provides a diversity of residential types including zero lot line single-family, live/work, and second story apartment units over commercial uses, both atypical in the City. The project will provide alternative housing options for those who do not wish to live conventional single-family home, have a small business in their home, or live proximate to commercial areas.

*Subdivision Map*

The applicant is proposing a planned development for the northern 5.9 acres which allows for modified development standards. The applicant is proposing parcels between 2,300 and 3,400 square feet, which is less than the prescribed R-1 lot sizes. Regardless of the reduced lot sizes, staff is recommending that 20 foot driveways be provided, while the homes will provide a front yard setback between 14 and 18 feet. By doing so, the garages will be recessed from the front of the home which will allow the home to dominant the streetscape, rather than the garage. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing 5 and 15 foot rear yards, respectively, which staff supports. Homes on the periphery will provide the latter rear yard setback.

*Compatibility with Surrounding Uses*

Compatibility with neighboring uses is one of the most critical issues that must be considered for this
As discussed above, the site needs to be designed to be compatible with the neighboring uses. There is the potential for aesthetic impacts on the neighboring single-family residences located along the north, east, and west boundary of the project. All adjacent residential units in the area are single story structures. As previously noted the proposed single family homes are two-story structures that range in height from 24.5 to 27 feet. However, the potential impacts to the nearby single-family homes from the proposed two-story single family homes will be mitigated through the design of the project.

**Traffic Impacts:**

**Traffic Impact Analysis & Trip Generation**

A traffic impact analysis was prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. (KDA) on April 12, 2016 to evaluate the number of vehicle trips expected to be generated by the proposed project (Attachment 4). Applying the factors outlined in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, this analysis also predicts the direction in which these trips will travel.

The traffic study forecasts that the proposed mix-use project can be expected to generate a total of 1,533 daily external trips with 73 trips in the a.m. peak (7 to 9 a.m.) and 114 trips in the p.m. peak (4 to 6 p.m.) peak hours. The assumption of 9.52 vehicle trips for single family residential and 6.62 vehicle trips per multi-residence per day is based on national averages.

### Table 3: Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/ ITE Code</th>
<th>Trips per Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Trips</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (210)</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (220)</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Retail (826)</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live work – Office (110)</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an effort to determine local impacts, the study evaluated seven intersections:

1. Franklin Road/Walton Road (Signalized)
2. Franklin Road/Neil Drive (side street stop)
3. Franklin Road/Littlejohn Road (side street stop)
4. Franklin Road/existing driveway/project access (side street stop)
5. Franklin Road/WinCo driveway/main project access (signalized)
6. Franklin Road/Onstott Road (side street stop)
7. Franklin Road/State Route 99 (signalized)

To summarize the traffic study results, the estimated additional 1,533 VTD generated by the project will:

- Not require changes to the configuration of area traffic signals in the immediate future
- The additional traffic is projected to result in relatively minor increases in delay at each of the intersections noted above.
- Existing public street intersections will operate at LOS D or better.
These impacts are considered less than significant based upon Yuba City and Caltrans standards of significance. However, the project’s access to Franklin Road is projected to operate at LOS E in the p.m. peak hour and increase delays for eastbound traffic on Franklin Road attempting to travel northbound on State Route 99.

Traffic Patterns

In an effort to better understand traffic patterns, the traffic study disaggregated the directions of travel that the new vehicle trips will take in and out of the development complex onto the various roads. Table 4 highlights the flow of traffic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Trip Distribution Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West on Franklin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on Walton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on Walton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on Neil Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on Littlejohn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South to WinCo Center North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Onstott Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East on Franklin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on SR 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on SR 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Access from Franklin Road

The sole access into the project for Phase I will be a driveway onto Franklin Road. The traffic study reviewed the need for a left turn pocket for westbound Franklin Road traffic that turns left into the project. The study concludes that the need for the left turn lane does not meet the threshold of significance for existing traffic levels.

Project Mitigation

The traffic impact study considered three mitigation approaches to decrease traffic impacts to less than significant:

1. **Limited Site Development Alternative**: This would allow for development of the site with residential development including single family, home/work, apartments, and without the commercial/retail component.

2. **Prohibit Outbound Left Turns Alternative**: Under this scenario all traffic leaving the site would be forced to turn right. Motorists wanting to travel east would make a U-turn at the first opportunity,
which is generally the Littlejohn Road intersection.

3. **Connect to WinCo Signal Alternative.** This alternative includes construction in Phase 2 of a portion of Oji Way which connects to the existing WinCo signal. Motorists leaving the site at the driveway would be forced to turn right. Eastbound motorists leaving the site would use Oji Way and the existing signal.

**Recommended Alternative:**

Of the three alternatives above, Option 3 is included in the Conditions of Approval, which will require that the intersection of Oji Way be completed as part of Phase 2 of the project. It is worth noting that the applicant will offer an irrevocable offer for the land necessary for the completion of Oji Way within their project area as part of Phase 1.

**Cumulative Long Term Traffic Impacts**

The traffic study also considered the impacts the project will have on these same intersections over the long-term (Year 2035), considered to be “cumulative” impacts. The cumulative impact review considers this project, the existing traffic conditions, and adds the long-term growth of the City based on the General Plan. The traffic study concludes that build-out of the project will create some potentially significant cumulative impacts.

The traffic study used the El Margarita Master Plan traffic study to consider cumulative conditions on Franklin Road and certain improvements to include six lanes on SR 99 and completion of Lincoln Road as a 4-lane facility between SR 99 and Garden Highway. Other improvements include improvements at SR 99 and Franklin Road as well as extension of Oji Way to Franklin Road.

Long-term, this project would not generate all of the new traffic that will impact these intersections, and because the needed improvements will not be needed for years into the future, the project may only be required to pay its “fair share” of the costs for the WinCo/Oji Way signal, as opposed to installing new signals.

**Subdivision:**

The project also includes a subdivision to create 57 lots in two phases (Attachment 5). As previously noted Phase I includes 53 single family units and live-work units. All streets within the project are private. Phase II includes the apartment units over retail/commercial uses and parking area. Public improvements with Phase 1 include curb, gutter, and sidewalk along Franklin Road. Phase 2 public improvements include construction of a portion of Oji Way allowing on-site traffic to travel east bound from the signal at Oji Way and Franklin Road.

It should be noted that parking for single family units include tandem parking which provides increased open space and reduced hard surfaces. In addition, interior streets are designed to allow on-street parking.

**Homeowner’s Association:**

The proposed subdivision will be served by private roads. As a result, the applicant will create a
Homeowner’s Association that will be responsible for street maintenance, including curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, walls, street trees, landscaping, park maintenance, etc.

**Open Space:**

In addition to the open space that is provided in single family yard areas, the project will provide two communal open spaces. Both the tot-lot and park open space are located in Phase 1 and are central to the project. The park is approximately 4,447 square feet and includes a barbeque/picnic area and benches. The tot-lot is approximately 3,491 square feet and includes a triangular tensile shade structure and benches. Although the park and tot-lot are centrally located, residential units along the northerly property boundary would be required to walk around single family units centrally located (lots 16–28 and 29–41). Staff recommends that a pathway be provided approximately half-way between centrally located units so pedestrians living in units on the north side will have a more direct route to the open space areas as well as the commercial/retail opportunities on Franklin Road and the Yuba Sutter transit kiosk adjacent to the project on Franklin Road.

**Design Review:**

The site is surrounded on three sides by existing development and is highly visible from Franklin Road. It is important that equal treatment be given to all structures within the project. In addition, it is important to note that the structures fronting Franklin Road will be a primary focus of the project. To that end the proposed structures, as well as the project entrance and landscaping along Franklin Road, are of particular importance. The second part of the design review is for the interior design, which while not highly visible by passers-by, it is important to the residents and to the City in presenting a positive community image.

A variety of landscaping is provided throughout the project as well as landscaping along public right-of-way (Attachment 6). The plan incorporates a variety of trees for shading, accent, and screening. In addition, various types of plant materials include accent plantings, lawn ornamental grasses, groundcover, and screening shrubs are dispersed throughout the project. Particular attention has been given to the project entrance from Franklin Road so as to avoid a visually stark approach into the interior of the site.

The interior buildings are of the same quality as the highly visible buildings along Franklin Road. The structures present a variety of roof lines and elevations which provides the structures with shadows and visual interest. A palette of colors is proposed which assist with the visual interest and is repeated throughout the mixed-use complex. The ends of the interior buildings provide openings, such as windows, and a mix of materials to avoid uninterrupted and unarticulated walls. Some of those walls are highly visible from within the project. These walls have additional treatment and elevation relief. Regardless, staff is recommending minor modifications which will enhance the project for future residents and the community, alike.

In addition, there are open exterior staircases which do not contribute to the overall appearance of the structures. Staff recommends that the open staircases be enclosed to provide protection during incremental weather and add to the articulation to the buildings.

The plan does not depict the use of building lighting. Decorative outdoor light fixtures can help break up large, featureless wall areas. A condition is provided that requires wall lighting, consistent with the building design, except for wall-packs, which diminish the appearance of a facility. In addition, a condition
has been added that requires that pedestrian-scale lighting be spaced appropriately for the fixture to provide lighting levels sufficient that allow people to feel secure.

**Availability of City Services:**

All City services, including water, sewer and storm-water drainage are available to this site.

**Environmental Determination:**

An environmental assessment was prepared for this project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This process included the distribution of requests for comment from other responsible or affected agencies and interested organizations. Given that the project includes a general plan amendment, Native American Tribal consultation was conducted pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18.

Based upon the attached environmental assessment and the list of identified mitigation measures, staff has determined that there is no evidence in the record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment and recommends adoption of a mitigated negative declaration and mitigation monitoring plan for this project. The findings of the mitigated negative declaration is that, with the proposed mitigations for air quality, cultural resources, water quality, and traffic, the project will not create any significant impacts on the environment. As a result, the filing of a mitigated negative declaration is appropriate in accordance with the provisions of CEQA. The proposed mitigations are included in the project conditions of approval (Attachment 7).

**Recommended Action:**

The appropriateness of the proposed project has been examined with respect to its consistency with goals and policies of the General Plan, its compatibility with surrounding uses, and its avoidance or mitigation of potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. These factors have been evaluated as described above and by the accompanying environmental assessment. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the following findings:

1. **Environmental:**

   After reviewing and considering the mitigated negative declaration prepared for this project with the proposed mitigation measures, this mixed-use complex will not create any significant environmental impacts.

   *Based on the whole record there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the mitigated negative declaration reflects the lead agency’s independent judgment and analysis.*

   *The project will not cause substantial environmental damage to fish and/or wildlife and their habitats, nor have the potential for adverse effect(s) on wildlife resources or the habitat upon which wildlife depends. A Notice of Determination will be recorded with the County Recorder.*

   **Staff Analysis:** As noted above an environmental assessment (EA 16-16) has been prepared for the project. The project was circulated for comments. Based on comments received as well as documents referenced in initial study a mitigated negative declaration and mitigation monitoring program was
prepared for the project. Mitigation, conditions of approval, and best management practices will reduce all identified potentially significant impacts to less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

2. **Subdivision Map:**

   *The proposed tentative map is consistent with the General Plan and the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the General Plan.*

   **Staff Analysis:** The proposed tentative map conforms to the General Plan and the Yuba City Zoning Regulations in all respects. Specifically, the proposed parcels comply with all zoning and development standards for the future building to be constructed on 57 lots.

   *The site is physically suited for the type and proposed density of development.*

   **Staff Analysis:** The project site accommodates the proposed development and all required improvements, such as parking, drive aisles, and landscaping.

   *The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage and the types of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems.*

   **Staff Analysis:** Division of the property into 57 parcels will not result in environmental damage or public health problems.

   *The design of the subdivision or type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.*

   **Staff Analysis:** The project, with regards to proposed Phase 1 and Phase 2, is designed to provide shared parking, access, maintenance, etc., and cross access easements that will reserved in deeds to ensure continued shared use.

   The appropriateness of the proposed project has been examined with respect to its consistency with the General Plan and its compatibility with surrounding uses. These factors have been evaluated as described above and the environmental assessment. Staff has determined that the proposed lots are consistent with General Plan policies, Municipal Code requirements, and compatible with surrounding uses.

3. **General Plan Consistency:** Re-designating the 5.9 acre portion of the property from Community Commercial to Low Density Residential is required in order to develop the proposed single family units in Phase 1. The Low Density Residential designation is the appropriate designation for single family residential uses.

4. **Rezoning:** The proposed rezone to One-Family Residence/Combining District (R-1X) Zone District is compatible with the Low Density Residential General Plan Designation and the proposed rezone to Community Commercial/Combining District (C-2X) Zone District is compatible with the existing Community Commercial General Plan Designation.

5. **Development Plan 16-07 findings**
Based upon analysis of the Development Plan application and subject to the applicant’s compliance with the conditions of approval noted, staff concludes that the following required findings of Section 8-5.7001(C) of the Municipal Code can be made.

I. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate said use, public access, parking and loading, yards, landscaping, and other features required by this chapter.

   The 8.7 acre site is of adequate size to accommodate the project. The project meets all open space requirements, provides off-street parking that exceeds the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, and provides adequate setbacks, landscaping, and fencing from abutting properties that minimize any potential issues. Moreover, the project exceeds the minimum setbacks for multi-story buildings when adjacent to single-family homes, while the project conditions will ensure that the project provides sufficient lighting, refuse collection areas, open space, and pedestrian paths.

II. The streets serving the site are adequate to carry the quantity of traffic generated by the proposed use.

   The traffic study completed for the project concluded that, with the mitigation measures recommended for the project and the payment of the City’s development impact fees for roads, there would be no short-term or long-term significant impacts to traffic in the vicinity.

III. The site design, design of the buildings, and the scale of the project will complement neighboring facilities.

   Based on the analysis provided in the staff report, the design of the project adequately considered the impacts on neighboring properties. The project’s design provides adequate building setbacks from the property lines, in excess of code requirements and that there is adequate perimeter landscaping that also reduces the project’s appearance to the neighboring homes. Moreover, the proposed six-foot tall masonry wall, with landscaping, will mitigate potential noise while also creating a visually appealing environment.

6. Recommend to the City Council adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration 16-16, attached as Attachment 7.

7. Recommend to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment 16-07, Rezoning 16-06, and Development Plan Review 16-01, subject to the mitigation measures and conditions below.

Commission Action:

The Commission’s action will be considered by the City Council given that the project includes a Plan Amendment, Rezone, Development Plan, and tentative subdivision map for a mixed-use complex.

Attachments:

1. Aerial photo
2. Plan Amendment map
3. Rezone map
4. KD Anderson & Associates Traffic Impact Study (summary pages)
5. Tentative Subdivision Map (Large Map TM-1)
6. Project site plan, Building elevations, landscape plan
   a. Site Plan Layout: (Large map SP 1)
   b. Development Plan: (Large map A2)
   c. Zero Lotline: (Large map A3)
   d. Retail/Apartment Phase 2 (Large map A9)
   e. Title Sheet (Small A1)
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Mitigation Measures

**Air Quality Mitigation Measure 1**: Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit obtain a Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) approved Fugitive Dust Control Plan.

**Cultural/Tribal Resources Mitigation Measure 1**: Should artifacts or unusual amounts of bone or shell be uncovered during demolition or construction activity, all work shall be stopped and a qualified archeologist shall be contacted for on-site consultation. Avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be completed according to CEQA guidelines. The State Office of Historic Preservation has issued recommendations for the preparation of Archeological Resource Management Reports which shall be used for guidelines. If the bone appears to be human, California law mandates that the Sutter County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be contacted.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Measure 1**: Temporary silt fencing shall be erected during construction so that transport of construction debris can be retained on-site.

To prevent track-out, wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment exit onto paved street from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip. Alternatively, a gravel bed may be installed as appropriate at vehicle/equipment site exit points to effectively remove soil buildup on tires and tracks to prevent/diminish track-out.

Paved streets shall be swept frequently (water sweeper with reclaimed water recommended; wet broom) if soil material has been carried onto adjacent paved, public thoroughfares from the project site.

**Traffic Mitigation Measure 1**: Install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road/WinCo signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate with this fourth leg. At such time when the project is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal, the developer shall install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate the fourth leg. Modification shall include the installation of a street light. Installation the portion of Oji Way and modification of the traffic signal will reduce significant impacts to less than significant
Development Plan 16-01 Yuba Crossings

Conditions of Approval

Expiration

1. Approval of Development Plan DP 16-01 shall be null and void without further action if either the project has not been substantially commenced within 2 years of the approval date of the development plan or that a request for an extension of time has been submitted to the City.

2. Development Plan 16-01 is contingent upon the approval of General Plan Amendment 16-07 and Rezone 16-06.

3. Tentative Subdivision Map approval shall not be effective until such time as the City Council has approved General Plan Amendment GPA-16-07, Rezone RZ-16-06, and Development Plan DP-16-01.

4. The project shall comply with all mitigation as stated in the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Planning Division

5. Prior to final map approval, the owner of the subject property shall execute a covenant with the City of Yuba City regarding the future development of Oji Way connecting Franklin Road to Whyler Road. Said covenant is to run with the land and shall acknowledge and agree that the subject property is proximate to the future development of a through road and that the residents of said property should be prepared to accept the inconveniences and discomfort associated with normal construction and activities to the use of said road. The covenant shall be recorded prior to or concurrent with the recording of the Final Map of Tentative Subdivision Map. The covenant shall be recorded against each new parcel.

6. The project shall be constructed per the plans approved by the City Council.

7. A pedestrian path shall be provided in approximately the middle of lots 16 – 28 and 29 – 41. Said pathway shall be flanked by landscaping and pedestrian oriented lighting.

8. Relinquish access rights to the following:
   a. East property line of Lot E.
   b. West property line of Lot F.
   c. East property line of Lot 15
   d. West property lines of lots 16 and 41.
   e. East property lines of lots 28 and 29.
   f. East property line of lot 42.
9. Building setbacks
   a. Lots shall provide building setbacks per Sheet SP1. No accessory structures and/or canopies, attached or detached shall be permitted within the building setbacks.

10. The mail facility shall incorporate design features, such as materials, colors, roof material, etc., that are consistent with the project's building style.

11. Walkways should be designed to provide convenient access and connections both internally and externally. Walkways should be safe, accessible, well-lit, landscaped and connected to the recreation areas, and refuse collection areas.

12. Building lighting fixtures shall be decorative and be compatible with the design of the buildings. Wall packs shall not be permitted.

13. The buildings shall incorporate color variation, while accent colors shall be used to enhance important building features such as window sashes, mullions and trim.

14. Lights shall be residential/pedestrian in scale and be spaced appropriately for the fixture, type of illumination and pole height shall not exceed 18 feet. A lighting plan required by Article 58 of the Zoning Regulations shall be approved prior to the issuance of building permits.

15. The entire site should be well lit, with special attention given unit entries, mail box areas and other common facilities.

16. Building lighting fixtures shall be decorative and be compatible with the design of the buildings. Wall packs shall not be permitted.

17. Utility and mechanical equipment (e.g. electric and gas meters, electrical panels, transformers and cable and telephone junction boxes, HVAC units) shall be screened from view with landscaping and/or construction that is compatible with the building design.

18. Where trash enclosures abut a parking stall, said parking stall shall provide a minimum width of 11 feet.

19. Trash enclosures should be constructed from the same or similar materials and finishes as adjacent buildings. The trash enclosures shall provide an architectural canopy.

20. Building numbers and individual unit numbers should be readily visible, in a consistent location, well lit at night, and compatible with the overall design of the development.

21. The identification sign shall be of high quality and compatible with the overall design of the development. The sign shall externally lit or backlit.

22. At least 10 percent of the common parking area shall be landscaped.
23. Signs shall not be located above the first floor for the mixed-use component along Franklin Road.

24. Signs shall not be internally lit, and shall be either backlit, halo lit, front lit, up lit, or down lit.

25. Enhanced building elevations shall be provided for the buildings noted below. Enhanced building elevations should include plane breaks to add visual interest, fenestration, and/or building materials.
   a. East side of home on Lots 15, 16, 41 & 42
   b. East side of building on lot 55
   c. East side of the east building on lot 56
   d. West side of the west building on lot 56
   e. East side of the building on lot 57

26. Changes in building materials and colors should occur on interior corners.

27. Light fixtures along the private easement (Lot A) shall be decorative, and shall be oriented for pedestrians and drivers, alike.

28. The staircases shall be integrated into the building design and shall be enclosed.

29. Sidewalks shall be installed along the Franklin Road entrance along the private road (Lot A), on both sides, with a planter strip.

30. A sidewalk shall be provided, as part of Phase 2, from the development to Oji Way, proximate to Franklin Road and Kean Avenue.

**Engineering Division**

31. The Developer shall prepare and submit improvement plans for the construction of all public improvements including water, sanitary sewer, storm drain facilities, roadway improvements, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, parkway strips, signing, striping and streetlights.


33. Traffic control construction signs shall be installed/erected per City of Yuba City Standards and Details, CalTrans Standards and Details, and the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The signs shall be maintained throughout the project duration.

34. All grading operations on the project shall be suspended as directed by the Feather River Air Quality Management District when sustained winds exceed 20 miles per hour or when winds
carry dust beyond the property line despite implementation of all feasible dust control measures. An operational water truck shall be onsite at all times to assist in dust control.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

35. Onsite dirt piles or other stockpiled particulate matter shall be covered, wind breaks installed, and water and/or soil stabilizer employed to reduce wind blown dust emissions. Incorporate the use of approved non-toxic soil stabilizer according to manufacturers’ specifications to all inactive construction areas. Contractor to provide the specifications to the City Inspector.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

36. All transfer processes involving a free fall of soil or other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions.

37. To help contain fugitive dust, construction sites shall be watered down during the construction phase of the project or as directed by the Public Works Department.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

38. Temporary silt fencing shall be erected during construction and permanent fencing shall be completed prior to occupancy so that transport of construction debris can be retained on-site.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

39. Open burning is a source of fugitive gas and particulate emissions, which shall be prohibited at the project site. No open burning of vegetative waste (natural plant growth wastes) or other legal or illegal burn materials (trash, demolition debris, et. al.) shall be conducted at the project site. Vegetative wastes should be chipped or delivered to waste facilities (permitted biomass facilities), mulched, composted, or used for firewood. It is unlawful to haul waste materials offsite for disposal by open burning.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

40. To prevent track-out, wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment exit onto paved street from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip. Alternatively, a gravel bed may be installed as appropriate at vehicle/equipment site exit points to effectively remove soil buildup on tires and tracks to prevent/diminish track-out.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

41. Paved streets shall be swept frequently (water sweeper with reclaimed water recommended; wet broom) if soil material has been carried onto adjacent paved, public thoroughfares from the project site.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

42. Provide temporary traffic control as needed, and/or as deemed appropriate by the Public Works Department during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow and to reduce vehicle dust emissions. Effective measures are to enforce vehicle traffic speeds at or below 15 mph and to reduce unnecessary vehicle traffic by restricting access. Provide appropriate training, onsite enforcement, and signage.  

(Engineering, FRAQMD)

43. If any hazardous waste is encountered during the construction of this project, all work shall be immediately stopped and the Sutter County Environmental Health Department, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the City Inspector shall be notified immediately.
Work shall not proceed until clearance has been issued by all of these agencies.

44. During construction, the Contractor shall be responsible for controlling noise, odors, dust and debris to minimize impacts on surrounding properties and roadways. Contractor shall be responsible that all construction equipment is equipped with manufacturers approved muffler’s baffles. Failure to do so may result in the issuance of an order to stop work. (Engineering, FRAQMD)

45. The Developer, at their expense, shall be solely responsible for all quality control associated with the project. The quality control shall include, but is not limited to, the following: survey work, potholing existing utilities, all geotechnical testing, soil reports, concrete testing, asphalt testing, and any other required special testing/inspections. The City will only perform necessary testing to insure compliance.

46. The Developer’s Superintendent/Representative shall be onsite when contractor is working and be available to the City’s Inspector(s) assigned to the project. The Developer shall be responsible for making sure that the contractor is working from signed improvement plans, signed special provisions, signed storm water pollution prevention plan, and the approved project agreement conditions.

47. The Developer’s Superintendent/Representative shall ensure that all private vehicles be either parked off-site or outside of construction areas. All vehicles, construction equipment, and construction material related to the project shall be organized in such a manner to provide emergency vehicle access to the entire project. (Engineering)

48. Sidewalks, within and adjacent to the construction area, shall be kept clean and remain accessible for American Disability Act compliance. (Engineering)

49. Storage of construction material is not allowed in the travel way. (Engineering)

50. The Developer and/or the Developer’s Superintendent/Representative shall have a pre-construction meeting with the City prior to commencing construction of public improvements. The Developer shall notify the City of the meeting no less than two working days in advance of such meeting. Those in attendance at the meeting shall include: the City, the Developer and/or the Developer’s Superintendent/Representative, the Contractor, the Design Engineer, the Developer’s safety representative, and the Developer’s SWPPP representative.

**Prior to issuance of Grading Permit**

**Engineering Division**

51. On proposed developments that are larger than one acre, provide evidence that a Notice of Intent has been submitted and received by the local Water Quality Control Board for a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. Two copies of the project Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan shall be provided to the City.
52. The Developer shall be responsible for implementing the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) through the use of Best Management Practices (BMP). The Developer shall be responsible for maintaining the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall conform to the provisions in Section 13, "Water Pollution Control," of the Caltrans Standard Specifications for construction of streets and local roads dated 2010, the requirements in the Manuals, and the requirements of the Permits. The Developer shall be responsible to include provisions for SWPPP requirements on the contract documents for the work under the proposed development. These provisions shall direct the successful contractor to develop a SWPPP document per the directions on the Caltrans website at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/stormwater/. The Contractor shall submit the SWPPP document within the time lines set forth on the development’s special provisions and allow 15 days for the City of Yuba City to review and approve or return the document for revisions. The developer/Contractor shall not start any work until the SWPPP document has been approved by the City of Yuba City. Should the Developer fail to ensure satisfactorily compliance with the SWPPP, the City Inspector may issue a stop work order until compliance is achieved.

53. Project shall comply with the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Title 4, Chapter 21 of the Yuba City Municipal Code).

54. Project shall comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance (Title 7, Chapter 16 of the Yuba City Municipal Code).

55. The improvement plans for the development of the subject property shall include all measures required to ensure that no drainage runoff resulting from the development of the property flow onto the adjacent residential lands or impede the drainage from those properties. The Engineer of Record shall designate on the plans as to where any retaining walls are required and provide details of all proposed retaining walls. The retaining wall is required where grade differences between the proposed development and the surrounding land is greater than 6” (inches). If retaining walls are required they shall be constructed of concrete or masonry block.

56. The applicant shall submit, with the first improvement plan check, to the City for review and approval, a detailed geotechnical investigation prepared by a Civil Engineer registered in the State of California and qualified to perform geotechnical work. The grading plan shall incorporate the recommendations of the approved geotechnical investigation.

**Building Division**

57. Prior to beginning construction, the applicant shall obtain a demolition permit from the City for removal of all existing structures on the site.

**Prior to approval of Improvement Plans**

**Engineering Division**
58. A Subdivision Agreement outlining any costs (hot tap, connection fee, fair share contribution, etc.) associated with the development shall be accepted by the City prior to approval of plans.

59. Obtain all necessary approvals from City, State, and Federal agencies, utilities and other effected parties that are required for the project including, but not limited to, the preparation of drawings, studies, reports and permit applications, and payment of fees. Prior to City approval of improvement plans the Developer shall provide evidence, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department, that all such obligations have been met.

60. The contractor shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from the City prior to performing any work within public rights of way.

61. Where an excavation for a trench and/or structure is 5 feet deep or more, the contractor shall conform to O.S.H.A. requirements. The contractor shall provide a copy of the approved O.S.H.A. permit, and shoring details and calculations prepared by California licensed structural engineer to the Public Works Department.

62. At Phase 2 Improvements, Oji Way shall be constructed to a width of 53.0 feet back of curb to back of curb with parking permitted on both sides and a bike lane on both sides. Right-of-way shall be dedicated to a width of 54.0 feet together with a 20.5 foot Public Service Easement (PSE) behind the right-of-way. Within the PSE there shall be a 10.0 PUE, a 5.0 foot detached sidewalk, and a planter strip. Construction shall include street section, curbs, gutters, 6.0 foot landscape strips and 5.0 foot detached sidewalks, street trees, and street lights.

63. The drive entrance, from Franklin Road to the Private Road, shall be a roadway entrance. Decorative concrete and/or pavers should be provided at the entrance to the project proximate to Franklin Road.

64. The structural section of all road improvements shall be designed using a geotechnical investigation which provides the basement soils R-value and expansion pressure test results. The structural section shall be designed to the following standards:
   a. Use 3” minimum for residential, 4” minimum for collectors and 5” minimum for arterials, of ‘Type A’ asphaltic concrete over Class 2 aggregate base (the thickness of the base shall be designed to the R-value of the soil)
   b. Use a traffic index of 6 for residential streets
   c. Use a traffic index of 7 for collector streets
   d. Use a traffic index of 10 for arterial streets

   A copy of the geotechnical investigation, including R-value, test locations and structural section calculations, shall also be submitted with the first improvement plan check.

65. Kean Avenue shall be limited to emergency access only. A gate, with a knox box, shall be installed at the western terminus of Kean Ave. The gate and knox box shall comply with Municipal Code Section 4-5.02 – Revisions to the 2012 International Fire Code; Security Gates; and be approved by the Fire Department. At such time that Oji Way develops and extends
northward to connect to Kean Avenue, then the gate and knox box may be removed at the
discretion of the Public Works Director.

66. The emergency access at the westerly end of Kean Avenue shall be a roadway access. The
access shall be 20.0 feet face of curb to face of curb. The emergency gate shall be a minimum
clearance of 16.0 feet wide, with end of roadway signs, on both sides, installed. A walk gate
shall be provided at one side of the emergency gate.

67. The gates noted above, at the west end of Kean Ave., shall be six feet in height and decorative
wrought iron. Decorative posts shall be included as part of the design.

68. Striping, pavement markings and traffic signage shall be provided as necessary and as required
by the Public Works Department. Signage restricting parking and red painted curbing shall be
installed where appropriate.

69. All service laterals (water, sewer, irrigation, fire suppression), along with required meters, are
to be shown on the civil improvement plans.

70. All domestic, landscape, and fire service lines shall have reduced pressure backflow
preventers.

71. The City will own and maintain the looped water system, the fire hydrants, the fire hydrant
runs, the water service laterals (from the main to the meter), and the water meters. The
water mains, service laterals, meter boxes, and fire hydrant assemblies shall be installed per
Yuba City standards.

72. The fire suppression system(s) that will be servicing the property(ies) shall tie-in directly to the
City water main. Hot tap fees shall apply.

73. All interior streets are considered private. The storm drain lines, sewer mains and laterals,
landscaping, streetlights, sidewalks and roadways will be considered to be private facilities and
shall be maintained by the property owners through a Homeowner’s Association. The water
line will be the property of the City and will be maintained by the City.

74. Improvement plans shall be approved by the Yuba City Fire Department.

75. Project shall comply with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

76. The proposed landscaping and street trees, along the Franklin Road frontage, shall be installed
prior to building permit applications of more than 25% of the single-family homes.

77. The Developer shall be responsible for preparation of a street tree and irrigation plan that is
deemed acceptable by the Development Services Director prior to entering into a Subdivision
Agreement with the City.
78. The street landscape planters, the street trees, and street lighting are public improvements which shall meet the Parks Division Planting Standards and Yuba City Standard Details and be included in the improvement plans and specifications for the subdivision when the improvement plans are submitted for the first improvement plan check.

79. The street trees proposed by the Developer shall be a minimum of 15 gallon in size with a one-inch dbh (diameter at breast height). The tree specie(s) shall be a shade type approved by the City Arborist and the Public Works Department.

80. The final improvement plans shall reflect street tree placement so that no interference with streets, streetlights, traffic control signage, and driveways will occur to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department.

81. The Design Engineer shall provide hydrology/hydraulic calculations to substantiate the sizing of pipes.

82. The Design Engineer shall confirm that the subdivision configuration meets current storm water requirements and provide design calculations to substantiate design.

83. Prior to the approval of the Improvement Plans, the Developer shall submit to the Gilsizer Drainage District a drainage plan for any drainage improvements that utilize Gilsizer facilities for approval by the Gilsizer Drainage District.

84. A solid six-foot high masonry block wall shall be constructed along:
   a. The westerly property lines of the project, including along lots 54 and 57.
   b. Easterly property lines of the project, including lots 55 and 56.
   c. The south property lines of Lots 50 thru 53 and along a portion of the south property line of Lot 49, as said lots are shown on the tentative map dated 6-23-16.
   d. The east property line of Lot E
   e. The west property line of Lot F
   f. The east property lines of lots 16 and 41
   g. The west property lines of Lots 28 and 29
   h. Along the property lines of the pedestrian pathway described above.

85. A detail of the wall shall be shown on the improvement plans with the first phase of development. Design of the wall shall be approved by the City prior to its construction. The wall shall, at a minimum, be six feet in height, and shall provide a decorative cap and shall provide decorative columns.

86. Special drop inlet frames and grates shall be installed at all drop inlets and junction drop inlets throughout the development area. Cast into the curb back shall be a message “Dump No Waste – Drains to River”. If casting cannot be found that fits the City’s standard drop inlet, then designated markers, approved by the City, shall be installed to the manufacturer’s specifications on the top of curb, or at an appropriate alternative nearby location when no curb is available, at all storm drain inlets in the development area.
87. The Improvement Plans shall show provisions for the placement of centralized mail delivery units in the Public Utility Easement (P.U.E.). Developers will provide a concrete base for placement of the centralized mail delivery unit. Specifications and location of such base shall be determined pursuant to the applicable requirements of the Postal Service and the Yuba City Public Works Department, with due consideration for street light location, traffic safety, security and consumer convenience.

88. Required Improvement Plan Notes:
   a. "Any excess materials shall be considered the property of the contractor/owner and shall be disposed of away from the job site in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations."
   
   b. "During construction, the Contractor shall be responsible for controlling noise, odors, dust and debris to minimize impacts on surrounding properties and roadways. The Contractor shall be responsible that all construction equipment is equipped with manufacturers approved muffler baffles. Failure to do so may result in the issuance of an order to stop work."
   
   c. “If any hazardous waste is encountered during the construction of this project, all work shall be immediately stopped and the Sutter County Environmental Health Department, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the City Inspector shall be notified immediately. Work shall not proceed until clearance has been issued by all of these agencies.”
   
   d. “The Contractor(s) shall be required to maintain traffic flow on affected roadways during non-working hours, and to minimize traffic restriction during construction. The Contractor shall be required to follow traffic safety measures in accordance with the CalTrans “Manual of Traffic Safety Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones.” The City of Yuba City emergency service providers shall be notified, at least two working days in advance, of proposed construction scheduled by the contractor(s).”
   
   e. “Soil shall not be treated with lime or other cementitious material without prior express permission by the Public Works Department.”

**Prior to acceptance of Public Improvements**

**Engineering Division**

89. All existing well(s), septic tank(s), and service lines shall be destroyed in accordance with the requirements of the Sutter County Environmental Health and Yuba City Building Departments, respectively.

90. Prior to paving, the Developer shall vacuum test all manholes to ensure no leakage will occur.
91. Prior to paving, the Developer shall hydroflush, and televise, all storm drain mains and all sewer mains.

92. Where soil or geologic conditions encountered during grading operations are different from those anticipated in the geotechnical investigation, or where such conditions warrant changes to the recommendations contained in the original soil investigation, a revised soil or geologic investigation shall be submitted for approval by the Public Works Department. It shall be accompanied by an engineering and geological opinion as to the safety of the site from hazards of settlement and seismic activity.

93. The contractor shall maintain record drawings of the improvements and keep them on site at all times. When the project is complete, the contractor shall deliver a marked set of plans to the Engineer of Record. The Engineer of Record shall update the improvement plans with the record information. Once the changes have been added to the plans, the Engineer of Record shall submit both an electronic copy (AutoCad version 2007 or newer) and a hard copy to the City. The City will not accept the completion of the improvements until the electronic copy and hard copy have been submitted.

Prior to Final Map Recordation

Engineering Division

94. The developer shall offer the City of Yuba City an irrevocable offer of dedication, with recordation of Phase 1 for the future Oji Way right-of-way, the public utility easements along the future Oji Way right-of-way, and the public service easements along the future Oji Way right-of-way.

95. A street light shall be installed on Franklin Road in the vicinity of private road access.

96. A street light shall be installed on the north side of the driveway that connects the development to the proposed (Phase 2) roadway improvements at such time when the project is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal.

97. A street light shall be installed, on the project’s property, at the emergency access to Kean Avenue. It should be placed in such a manner that it does not interfere with future driveway connections to future Oji Way.

98. All street lighting shall be dedicated to the City of Yuba City.

99. The property shall petition for formation of a Zone of Benefit of the Yuba City Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District for the purpose of maintaining street trees which are to be planted along all public streets, maintaining the street lights along all public streets, and for maintaining the land at current assessor parcel numbers 58-130-024 & 58-130-025. The Engineering Division shall be reimbursed actual costs associated with the formation of the district.
100. This project shall comply with the traffic impact mitigation measure of limited site development as outlined in the Traffic Impact Analysis for the Yuba Crossings Mixed Use Development; prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc.; dated April 12, 2016. The site development shall be limited until the project is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal.
   i. 100% of the single-family residential development
   j. 100% of the home/work units and their accompanying commercial space
   k. 100% of the mixed use area’s apartments

101. At such time when the project is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal, the developer shall install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road / WinCo Shopping Center signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate the fourth leg. Modification shall include the installation of a street light.

102. A public utility easement shall be provided along all right-of-way frontages extending 10 feet behind the back of the sidewalk.

103. Lot A and Lot B, as shown as private roads on the tentative map dated 6-23-16, shall be designated as Parcel A on the final map. Each owner shall be vested equally with an undivided interest in Parcel A.

104. A public utility easement shall be provided covering Parcel A extending 10.5 feet behind the back of curb.

105. The developer shall provide for the maintenance of Parcel A through formation of a Homeowner’s Association. The documents creating the Homeowner’s Association shall meet the following requirements:
   a. Assignment to the Homeowner’s Association responsibility for the maintenance of the private street, the storm drain system under Parcel A, the sewer system under Parcel A, landscaping and street trees on Parcel A, streetlights on Parcel A, bio-filtration swales, Lot E and Lot F (parks), gates, call box and emergency access systems, and as determined by the Public Works Director.
   b. Assignment to the Homeowner’s Association responsibility to monitor and report to the City of Yuba City on activities and violations of any of these conditions, easement restrictions, or any other ordinance, rule or regulation of the City occurring within Parcel A.
   c. Statement that the City may, at its option, cause the maintenance of Parcel A to be performed and assess (lien) the cost to the Homeowner’s Association in the event Parcel A is not maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

106. The document creating the Homeowner’s Association shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney for compliance with the above noted conditions prior to recordation of the map.
107. At Lots 54, 56, 57, & 58, as shown on the tentative map dated 6-23-16, cross easements over all property not occupied by buildings shall be reserved in deeds for all underground utilities, ingress and egress, parking, drainage, landscaping, and the maintenance thereof to the benefit of all parcels involved in the division.

108. The developer shall provide a 10.0 foot wide storm drain easement dedicated to the Gilsizer Drainage District. The easement shall be centered along the existing 36” storm drain pipe that runs along the north property line of the project and the existing 42” storm drain pipe that runs along the west property line of the project.

Prior to Building Permit

Engineering Division

109. The houses on assessor parcel number 58-130-024 & 58-130-025 shall be demolished (along with any septic tanks/leach fields) prior to the issuance of the first building permit in Phase 1.

110. The Developer’s Superintendent/Representative shall submit three sets of Pacific Gas and Electric approved utility plans showing joint trench locations and distribution lines prior to issuance of first building permit for each phase of construction.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

Engineering Division

111. The curb, gutter, sidewalk, and lot drainage shall be inspected and approved by the City. Any curb, gutter and sidewalk which is not in accord with City standards or is damaged before or during construction, shall be replaced. All sidewalks along the City right-of-way shall be free of any non-control joint cracking. In addition, any concrete with cracks, chips, blemishes, and spalling greater than an inch in diameter shall be replaced from control joint to control joint.

112. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, all required reduced pressure backflow preventers shall be tested and a back flow preventer certification performed by an AWWA licensed tester shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.

Building Division

113. All street lighting shall be energized prior to the issuance of any building permits.

114. Proposed utilities, both onsite and along all project frontages shall be placed underground. Appropriate easements shall be obtained by the Developer to facilitate these installations.

115. All underground utilities, public improvements, and site improvements, including rough grading, shall be completed.
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TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR
YUBA CROSSINGS MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION / SUMMARY

Study Purpose and Project Description

Location. This traffic impact study presents an analysis of the traffic-related impacts associated with the proposed Yuba Crossings Mixed Use Development on Franklin Road in the City of Yuba City. Figure 1 presents the regional location of the project site on the north side of Franklin Road in the area west of State Route 99 and across the street from an existing shopping center anchored by WinCo Foods.

Access. Figure 2 presents the preliminary site plan. Primary access to the site will be provided by a new driveway on Franklin Road roughly midway between Littlejohn Road and the existing signalized intersection serving the WinCo Foods center. Eventually the City of Yuba City may extend Oji Way southerly to Franklin Road along the project's eastern boundary, and at that time secondary access will be created on Oji Way north of Franklin Road. At that time the project access on Franklin Road is expected to be limited to right turns in and out only.

Land Use. For the purpose of this analysis, the development anticipated on the site consists of the following:

- 53 single family residences
- Live / work units that will include 16 residences and roughly 6,825 sf of retail/office space
- Mixed use combining up to 36 apartments and 16,250 sf of retail space.

Overall Analysis Approach

This traffic impact study presents an analysis of traffic operations under the following four (4) scenarios:

- Existing a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions
- Existing Plus Project conditions
- Year 2035 a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions without the project
- Year 2035 Plus Project

Study Area Intersections. The quality of traffic flow is typically governed by the operation of intersections along an arterial street system. To quantitatively evaluate traffic conditions and to provide a basis for comparison of operating conditions with and without traffic generated by the
proposed project, traffic operations at the following seven (7) study area intersections were evaluated:

- Franklin Road / Walton Road (signalized),
- Franklin Road / Neil Drive (side street stop),
- Franklin Road / Littlejohn Road (side street stop),
- Franklin Road / existing driveway / project access (side street stop),
- Franklin Road / WinCo driveway / main project access (signalized),
- Franklin Road / Onstott Road (side street stop), and
- Franklin Road / State Route 99 (signalized)

## Summary Conclusions

### Trip Generation. The proposed project is projected to generate a total of 1,533 daily external trips with 73 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 114 trips in the p.m. peak hour.

### Project Impacts. Full build out of the project would not impact existing public road intersections on Franklin Road, but if only access to Franklin Road is available then LOS E conditions are forecast at the project’s Franklin Road driveway in the p.m. peak hour. LOS E exceeds the City’s LOS D minimum.

### Mitigation Options. Alternative actions that could be taken to improve the Level of Service at the access on Franklin Road have been identified and evaluated.

- Limit the amount of development occurring on site until such time as the project site is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo SC signal. The access would operate at LOS D and meet City standards if Phase 1 included:

  1. 100% of the single family residential development
  2. 100% of the home / work units and their accompanying commercial space
  3. 100% of the mixed use area’s apartments

  This phase would generate 911 external daily trips, with 57 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 77 p.m. peak hour trips.

- Limit project access to right turns in and out only and require that motorists intended to turn left instead make u-turns at adjoining intersections. This alternative would improve the Level of Service at the driveway but the number of u-turns created on westbound Franklin Road could create conflicts between eastbound and westbound queues in the Two-Way Left Turn Lane. This option is not recommended.

- Install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road / WinCo SC signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate with this fourth leg. Satisfactory Level of Service would occur.
Cumulative Impacts. Under long term conditions left turns will be problematic at the project’s access and at other un-signalized locations on Franklin Road, and measures to prohibit left turns will be needed. With the creation of access to the Franklin Road / WinCo SC/ Oji Way signal, the project’s cumulative impacts are not significant.
VICINITY MAP

figure 1
EXISTING SETTING

Study Area

This traffic impact study presents analyses of traffic operating conditions at seven (7) intersections with the area that may be affected by the proposed project. The limits of the study area were identified through discussions with Yuba City staff based on their knowledge of the community and the results of previous traffic studies conducted for development in southern Yuba City.

Roadways. The following information is a description of area roadways that provide vehicular access to the project site. These roadways are shown in Figure 3.

- **State Route 99 (SR 99)** provides regional access to the project site and serves as the primary north-south travel corridor through Yuba City. In the study area, SR 99 is a four-lane highway. The posted speed limit on SR 99 is 45 mph north of Franklin Road and 55 mph south of Franklin Road. The most recent traffic volume information available from the California Department of Transportation indicates that SR 99 carries an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 33,000 vehicles per day in the area of the Franklin Road intersection. Trucks comprise roughly 10% of the daily traffic volume on SR 99 in this area.

- **Franklin Road** is an east-west arterial that extends from Sutter County in the west through Yuba City to the Garden Highway in the east. The facility is a 4-lane roadway with center turn lane through the study area from Walton Road to SR 99. The posted speed limit on Franklin Road in the study area is 35 mph.

- **Walton Avenue** is a north-south arterial that extends north from Oswald Road in Sutter County to SR 20. Walton Avenue is a 4-lane facility from SR 20 to just south of Franklin Road where it narrows to two lanes. In the study area, Walton Avenue has a posted speed limit of 35 mph.

- **West Onstott Road** is a two-lane frontage road that parallels SR 99 between Bridge Street and Franklin Road. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph.

- **Littlejohn Road** is a two-lane collector street that extends northerly from Richland Road in the south to Franklin Road. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph.

- **Neil Drive** is a two-lane residential street with a posted speed limit of 25 mph.

- **Oji Way** is a two lane local street that connects Bridge Street and Whyler Road in the area north of the project. The City of Yuba City anticipates that in the future Oji Way may be extended southerly to Franklin Road. The probable route would traverse the existing Cinemark parking lot, run along the east side of the proposed project and connect to Franklin Road at the WinCo Shopping center traffic signal.
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities, Transit

Class II bike lanes and sidewalks are provided along the length of Franklin Road throughout the study area. Crosswalks with push-button pedestrian activation are provided at each of the three signalized study intersections.

Yuba-Sutter Transit provides fixed route bus service in the study area. Yuba-Sutter Transit Route 5 (Southwest Yuba City) provides hourly service in both directions along Franklin Road. A bus stop is provided on the north side of Franklin Road just west of the signalized WinCo driveway intersection adjacent to the project site.

Evaluation Methodology

The following is a description of the methods used in this impact study to analyze intersection operations.

Level of Service Analysis Procedures. Level of Service (LOS) analysis provides a basis for describing existing traffic conditions and for evaluating the significance of project-related traffic impacts. Level of Service measures the quality of traffic flow and is represented by letter designations from A to F, with a grade of A referring to the best conditions, and F representing the worst conditions. The characteristics associated with the various LOS for intersections are presented in Table 1 and further discussed below.

Both signalized intersections and un-signalized stop sign controlled intersections have been analyzed using methods presented in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The “Synchro” traffic simulation software has been used to calculate the levels of service at study intersections on Franklin Road using the HCM procedures. The analysis of existing conditions utilizes observed cycle length timing at the signalized study intersections along Franklin Blvd. These cycle time parameters have also been held constant for analysis of Existing plus Project conditions. The calculations utilize a heavy vehicle percentage of 6% for SR 99’s peak hour through movements and a 2% heavy vehicle component for all other movements.

Un-signalized intersections with side street stop sign control have also been evaluated using Highway Capacity Manual procedures. At side street stop-sign-controlled intersections, the LOS is presented for turning movements experiencing the most delay. This is typically a left turn made from the minor street stop-sign-controlled approach onto the major street.
TABLE 1
LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A”</td>
<td>Uncongested operations, all queues clear in a single-signal cycle. Delay ≤ 10.0 sec</td>
<td>Little or no delay. Delay ≤ 10 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“B”</td>
<td>Uncongested operations, all queues clear in a single cycle. Delay &gt; 10.0 sec and ≤ 20.0 sec</td>
<td>Short traffic delays. Delay &gt; 10 sec/veh and ≤ 15 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“C”</td>
<td>Light congestion, occasional backups on critical approaches. Delay &gt; 20.0 sec and ≤ 35.0 sec</td>
<td>Average traffic delays. Delay &gt; 15 sec/veh and ≤ 25 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“D”</td>
<td>Significant congestions of critical approaches but intersection functional. Cars required to wait through more than one cycle during short peaks. No long queues formed. Delay &gt; 35.0 sec and ≤ 55.0 sec</td>
<td>Long traffic delays. Delay &gt; 25 sec/veh and ≤ 35 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“E”</td>
<td>Severe congestion with some long standing queues on critical approaches. Blockage of intersection may occur if traffic signal does not provide for protected turning movements. Traffic queue may block nearby intersection(s) upstream of critical approach(es). Delay &gt; 55.0 sec and ≤ 80.0 sec</td>
<td>Very long traffic delays, failure, extreme congestion. Delay &gt; 35 sec/veh and ≤ 50 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“F”</td>
<td>Total breakdown, stop-and-go operation. Delay &gt; 80.0 sec</td>
<td>Intersection blocked by external causes. Delay &gt; 50 sec/veh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Standards of Significance / Level of Service Thresholds. In this traffic impact study, the significance of the proposed projects impact on traffic operating conditions is based on a determination of whether project generated traffic results in roadway or intersection operating conditions below acceptable standards as defined by the governing agency. A project’s impact on traffic conditions is considered significant if implementation of the project would result in LOS changing from levels considered acceptable to levels considered unacceptable, or if the project would significantly worsen an already unacceptable LOS without the project. Relevant policies for the study area consist of the following.

State Route 99 Transportation Concept Report (Caltrans District 3, May 2004)

The Route Concept Report for SR 99 identifies the following standard:

- Concept LOS E is identified for SR 99 roadway segments in the City of Yuba City

Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (Caltrans District 3)

The Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies identifies the following LOS standards for State roadway facilities:
Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D" on State Highway facilities; however, Caltrans acknowledges that this may not always be feasible and recommends that the lead agency consult with Caltrans to determine the appropriate target LOS. If an existing State highway facility is operating at less than the appropriate target LOS the existing measure of effectiveness (MOE) should be maintained.

Based on this, Caltrans District 3 has recommended a LOS D policy for SR 99 intersections through Yuba City be used for past studies conducted in this area.

*Yuba City General Plan (Adopted April 2004)*

Implementing Policy 5.2-1-12 (*Traffic Level of Service*) of the General Plan's Transportation section states the following:

- Develop and manage the roadway system to obtain LOS D or better for all major roadways and intersections in the City. This policy does not extend to residential streets (i.e., streets with direct driveway access to homes) or bridges across the Feather River nor does the policy apply to state highways and their intersections, where Caltrans policies apply. Exceptions to LOS D policy may be allowed by the City Council in areas, such as downtown, where allowing a lower LOS would result in clear public benefits.

- No new development will be approved unless it can be shown that the required level of service can be maintained on the affected roadways.

- Based upon the above, the following standards and significance criteria have been used for this analysis to identify a significant impact.

- Cause level of service at a study intersection to degrade from LOS D or better to LOS E or F.

- Exacerbate the no project level of service at a study intersection operating at LOS E or F. Based upon direction provided by City staff for past studies in this area, exacerbation of unacceptable operations at a City signalized intersection is considered an impact if the proposed project causes an increase in the average vehicle delay of 5 seconds or more.

**Signal Warrants.** Traffic signal warrants are a series of standards which provide guidelines for determining if a traffic signal is an appropriate control. Signal warrant analyses are typically conducted at intersections of uncontrolled major streets and stop sign-controlled minor streets. If one or more signal warrants are met, signalization of the intersection may be appropriate. However, a signal should typically not be installed if none of the warrants are met, since the installation of signals would increase delays on the previously uncontrolled major street, and may increase the occurrence of particular types of accidents.
For this traffic impact study, available data is limited to peak hour volumes. Therefore, unsignalized intersections were evaluated using the Peak Hour Warrant (Warrant Number 3) from the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (2012). This warrant was applied where the minor street experiences long delays in entering or crossing the major street for at least one hour of the day. It should also be noted that even if the Peak Hour Warrant is met, a more detailed signal warrant study is typically recommended before a signal is installed. The more detailed study should consider volumes during the eight highest hours of the day, pedestrian traffic, and accident histories.

**Existing Traffic Conditions and Levels of Service**

The following is a description of existing traffic operating conditions in the study area.

**Existing Traffic Volumes.** New traffic volume data was collected for this traffic impact study at the seven study intersections on February 9, 2016. Data was collected in 15-minute increments from 7:00 – 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. The contiguous one hour periods with the highest volumes within the two-hour data collection period were used in this traffic impact study as the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Figure 3 presents the existing lane configurations and existing peak hour traffic volumes at the seven study intersections.

**Existing Intersection Levels of Service.** Table 2 presents a summary of existing peak hour LOS at the seven (7) study intersections. Level of Service calculations are provided in the Appendix. As shown in Table 2, all study intersections currently operate satisfactorily within the minimum standards for Level of Service established by the City of Yuba City. The major signalized intersections on Walton Road and SR 99 operate at LOS C and LOS D. Level of Service D or better is also provided at intersections controlled by stop signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Existing AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Franklin Road / Walton Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin Road / Neil Drive</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Left + Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin Road / Littlejohn Road</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left + Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Franklin Road / Existing Driveway</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left + Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Franklin Road / WinCo SC Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin Road / Onstott Road SB</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Franklin Road / SR 99</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROJECT TRAFFIC IMPACTS

Development of the proposed project would attract additional traffic to the site, either as trips made by patrons of commercial uses or as trips made by project residents. This section of the traffic impact study identifies the assumptions made regarding the travel characteristics of the project and describes the impacts of project-related traffic relative to existing traffic conditions in the study area.

Project Characteristics

Trip Generation. Development of the project would generate new vehicle trips and potentially affect traffic operations at the study intersections. The number of vehicle trips that are expected to be generated by development of the proposed project has been estimated using published trip generation data. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publication *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition*, has been used.

The Trip Generation Manual was reviewed to identify the land use categories that are most similar to the use planned in the proposed project. As indicated in Table 3, standard ITE rates for single family residential units have been employed for detached homes and the ITE rates for apartments have been used for the residences anticipated with the mixed use and live/work areas. Because no specific businesses are known in the commercial areas, average ITE rates for Specialty Retail use have been employed. It has been assumed that ½ of the live work areas identified as commercial will also be retail, while the other ½ will be office space, and the average ITE rates for office building have been employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use / ITE Code</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Trips per Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (210)</td>
<td>dwelling</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (220)</td>
<td>dwelling</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Retail (826)</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live work – Office (110)</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identified trip generation rates have been applied to the project’s land use quantities, and the resulting trip generation estimates are presented in Table 4. As shown, the proposed project is projected to generate a gross total of 1,653 daily trips with 83 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 133 trips in the p.m. peak hour.
A portion of the trips generated by the project’s uses will likely be made between complimentary uses and never be made by motor vehicles that reach the area street system. The most obvious “internal” interaction will be made between the residential and commercial areas of the live work units. The peak hour trips that would normally be made by these uses have been assumed to remain on-site, and their trips have been subtracted to yield the project’s external trip forecast.

The extent to which a portion of the trips attracted to the commercial retail uses may be drawn from the stream of traffic already passing the site (i.e., “pass-by trips”) on Franklin Road has also been considered. While information in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook suggests high pass-by rates for small retail uses, because the types of uses are unknown, a minimal pass-by percentage has been assumed and only applied on a daily and p.m. peak hour basis. Based on these pass-by rates, we forecast that the project will generate 1,533 “new” daily trips, with 73 new trips occurring in the a.m. peak hour and 114 trips generated in the p.m. peak hour.

**Trip Distribution.** The geographic distribution of vehicle trips associated with the proposed development has been based on existing traffic patterns, the location of probable origins or retail patrons within the project’s probable trade areas and in the case of residential uses the locations of local schools and assumptions made on other recent traffic studies.1 Table 5 presents the geographic trip distribution percentages for the project’s new trips used for this analysis.

---


---

**TABLE 4**

**TRIP GENERATION FORECAST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Trips per Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>53 du's</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments / Live Work</td>
<td>36 du's</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Retail</td>
<td>16.25 Ksf</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live work - Retail</td>
<td>3.43 Ksf</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live work - Office</td>
<td>3.40 Ksf</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Internal – Live Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-By Trips</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net New External Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West on Franklin Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on Walton Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on Walton Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on Neil Drive</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on Littlejohn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South to WinCo Center</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on Onstott Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East on Franklin Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North on SR 99</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South on SR 99</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trip Assignment.** The trips associated with the project were directed to the study area circulation system via the main access on Franklin Road, and full access at this location was assumed. Figure 4 displays the “project only” traffic volumes for each study intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

**Existing plus Project Intersection Levels of Service**

**Project Impacts.** To evaluate the project’s impact the project’s trips were superimposed onto current background traffic volumes, and Figure 5 displays the resulting “Existing Plus Project” traffic volumes anticipated at each study intersection during the peak hours. These volumes were then employed to calculate operating Levels of Service.

Table 6 displays the peak hour LOS at each study intersection under the Existing plus Project conditions. As shown, because the project’s trip generation is relatively small and no changes to the configuration of area traffic signals is immediately planned, the addition of project generated traffic is projected to result in relatively minor increases in delay at each of the existing intersections. Existing public street intersections will operate at LOS D or better. These impacts are considered less than significant based upon Yuba City and Caltrans standards of significance.

The project’s access on Franklin Road is, however, projected to operate at LOS E in the p.m. peak hour, and the introduction of traffic at this location will concurrently increase delays for existing traffic on the northbound approach. While the Level of Service at other private driveways is not a significance criteria, LOS E conditions at the proposed access is a significant impact under City of Yuba City standards.
PROJECT ONLY - FULL ACCESS TO FRANKLIN RD
TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND LANE CONFIGURATIONS

figure 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing Plus Project</td>
<td>Existing Plus Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Franklin Road / Walton Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin Road / Neil Drive</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Left Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin Road / Littlejohn Road</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Franklin Road / Project Access</td>
<td>NB/ SB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left+ Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Right +Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Franklin Road / WinCo Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin Road / Onstott Road</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Franklin Road / SR 99</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Alternatives. Alternative actions that could be taken to improve the Level of Service at the Project’s access on Franklin Road have been identified and evaluated in terms of Level of Service during the p.m. peak hour.

- Limit the amount of development occurring on site until such time as the project site is connected to the Franklin Road / WinCo SC signal.
- Limit project access to right turns in and out only and require that motorists intended to turn left instead make u-turns at adjoining intersections.
- Install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road / WinCo SC signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate with this fourth leg.

Limited Site Development Alternative. The effects of a limited project development alternative have been investigated by identifying the traffic volumes associated with this alternative and re-evaluating Level of Service. For this analysis it has been assumed that the phase of the project could include:

1. 100% of the single family residential development
2. 100% of the home / work units and their accompanying commercial space
3. 100% of the mixed use area’s apartments

This phase would not include the 16.25 ksf of proposed retail space.

This phase would generate 911 external daily trips, with 57 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 77 p.m. peak hour trips. These projections represent roughly 60% of the external daily trips associated with the full project build out, as well as 78% of the a.m. and 64% of the p.m. external trips. Figure 6 presents Existing Plus Reduced Project traffic volumes.

Table 7 identifies mitigated p.m. peak hour Levels of Service. As shown, the northbound and southbound approaches to the Franklin Road / Yuba Crossings Access intersection would deliver LOS D, which would satisfy the minimum standard. Thus, the project’s impacts would be less than significant.

Prohibit Outbound Left Turns Alternative. Under this plan a physical feature would be installed to preclude left turns out of the project onto eastbound Franklin Road. Theoretically, this might be a driveway island that forced all traffic leaving the site to turn right. Those motorists wishing to head east to SR 99 would then make a u-turn at the next opportunity, which is generally the Littlejohn Road intersection. Figure 7 presents Existing Plus Project with Right Turns Only at the exit.

As noted in Table 7, this measure would improve the Level of Service for motorist leaving the project site, which would be LOS B. However, the delays for northbound traffic would increase and LOS E would remain on that approach, and conditions for the northbound traffic at Littlejohn would deteriorate to LOS D. However, the project’s impact would not be significant.
**Connect to WinCo Signal Alternative.** Under this concept a connection would be made to the north leg of the WinCo Signal on Franklin Road, and outbound left turns would be prohibited at the project driveway. Traffic that is exiting the site from residential areas and headed to SR 99 would be expected to use the connection, but a portion of the exiting trips from the commercial area along Franklin Road will still turn right and make a u-turn at Littlejohn Road. Existing Plus Project traffic volumes under this alternative are presented in Figure 8.

As noted in Table 7, this measure would improve the Level of Service for motorist leaving the project site, which would be LOS B. The Franklin Road / WinCo Access signal would operate at LOS D, which satisfies the City’s minimum standard. The length of delays for northbound traffic at the existing driveway across the streets would be less that without the mitigation, and while LOS E would remain on that approach the delays would approach the LOS D threshold. The project’s impact would not be significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing Plus Project</th>
<th>Connection to WinCo Signal and Right Turn Only</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Phase 1 Only</td>
<td>Right Turn Out Only</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td>LOS Average Delay (sec/veh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Franklin Road / Walton Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin Road / Neil Drive SB Left Turn</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin Road / Littlejohn Road NB Left + Right Turn WB left turn</td>
<td>NB Stop A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Franklin Road / Project Access NB Left+ Right Turn SB Right +Right Turn</td>
<td>NB/ SB Stop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Franklin Road / WinCo Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin Road / Onstott Road SB Right Turn</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Franklin Road / SR 99</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Site Access Evaluation

Main Access. Primary access to the site will be provided via a new driveway on Franklin Road located roughly midway between the Littlejohn Road intersection and the WinCo Access signal. The access is directly opposite the WinCo Shopping Center’s westernmost existing driveway.

Three key issues have been considered with regards to sight design:

- Adequacy of driveway throat
- Relative need for acceleration / deceleration treatment on Franklin Road
- Adequacy of the Two-Way Left-Turn lane on Franklin Road.

Driveway Throat. The preliminary design indicates that a 32’ wide driveway will be provided, and the driveway will include a divided entry aisle that is 100 feet long. The approach can accommodate 4-5 waiting vehicles prior to the queue reaching the first parking access aisle.

The throat depth has been compared to forecasts of driveway queuing (95th percentile queues) under immediate and short term conditions. In the near term the maximum exiting volume occurs if only Franklin Road access is available, and the maximum queues would occur if full access is permitted. The Level of Service calculations conducted for the project indicate that in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours the 95th percentile queue is 2 vehicles or less. As this queue can be accommodated, the throat depth is adequate with full access. Under long term conditions the access is expected to be limited to right turns only, and the peak queues would be shorter.

Deceleration / Acceleration. The need for auxiliary treatments to accommodate traffic entering or exiting the site from westbound Franklin Road has also been evaluated based on the volume of traffic involved and City of Yuba City precedents. With access only to Franklin Road, a total of 46 right turns are projected to turn right into the project during the p.m. peak hour. This volume is projected to drop in the future if a connection to the WinCo SC access signal is created via Oji Way, and the forecast is for 37 right turns at that time.

Acceleration treatments are rarely provided at private driveways on urban streets, and review of recent improvements to other access to Franklin Road reveals that separate right turn lanes have not been developed elsewhere. Based on this precedent, a separate westbound right turn lane is not recommended.

TWLT lane. Left turns into the site will occur from Franklin Road’s existing TWLT lane, and the adequacy of the lane for this purpose is related to the volume of turning at the project driveway and at the adjoining driveways where the TWLT lane will need to accommodate opposing traffic streams.

The Littlejohn Road intersection and the access to St Andrews Presbyterian Church are located west of the project access and the westbound left turns at these intersections could need to share space with the motorists making eastbound left turns into the project. Measured centerline to
centerline St Andrew’s driveway is 160 feet from the project access and Littlejohn Road is 320 feet away. The CVC limits travel in the TWL lane to 200 feet it is likely that St Andrews traffic could use the same portion of the TWLT lane as the project, but Littlejohn Road is far enough away to minimize this overlap when waiting queues are short. While St Andrews may attract appreciable traffic at times on Sunday, the number of left turns occurring on a regular basis would be low. Thus, the use of the existing TWLT lane by the Yuba Crossings project should be adequate with the project as proposed.

If project access is restricted as discussed earlier, then the effects of queueing at Littlejohn Road should be considered in evaluating the TWLT lane. The Caltrans HDM includes recommendations for left turn lane storage which assume that space for a two minute accumulation of left turns is applicable. Without the access limitation, the westbound left turn lane would serve 95 vehicles in the p.m. peak hour, and 3 to 4 cars could need to be stored. Under this situation Littlejohn Road left turns could share space with the 20 vehicles making eastbound left turns into the project, and roughly 200 feet of space would be available for deceleration between the westbound and eastbound queues. With the access restriction 35 u-turns could be added at Littlejohn Road or at St Andrews Church driveway, and the storage requirements at these locations could increase. The space available between queues would decrease and the possibility of eastbound and westbound turns occupying the same deceleration area would increase. While this access alternative may address the Level of Service issues associated with the project access, it is not recommended due to the possibility of conflicts in the TWLT lane.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Long Term Cumulative Conditions

Basis for Long Term Projections. The Year 2035 travel demand forecasting model used for the City of Yuba City General Plan Update EIR and subsequently updated for the El Marguerite EIR traffic study is the basis for the long term cumulative traffic volume forecasts used for this analysis.

The technical approach employed for this analysis makes use of traffic model results and information from the El Marguerite EIR traffic study to create intersection turning movements for study area intersections in a manner that mimics the approach used for the GPU EIR. The long term Cumulative Plus Project traffic volume forecasts from the El Marguerite DEIR traffic study were assumed to remain valid as a condition that assumes site development without access to Franklin Road. These forecasts became the basis for through traffic on Franklin Road. City wide traffic model forecasts were the basis for projections on other streets, such as the Oji Way extension.

Circulation System Assumptions. The traffic volume forecasts made for this analysis include those city-wide circulation system improvements incorporated into the General Plan traffic model and CIP. These include six lanes on SR 99 and completion of Lincoln Road as a 4-lane facility between SR 99 and Garden Highway. The improvements identified in the El Marguerite DEIR traffic study at the Franklin Road / Walton Road intersection and at the SR 99 / Franklin Road intersection were again assumed. These include dual left turn lanes and separate right turn lane on each approach. Oji Way was also assumed to be extended to Franklin Road.

Because no formal design exists, for the purpose of this analysis it has been assumed that the southbound Oji Way approach to Franklin Road will be a single lane. However, it is possible that the design eventually pursued by the City when the street is extended could include auxiliary lanes regardless of whether the proposed project proceeds or not.

Traffic Volume Forecasts. Peak hour intersection turning movements were created for No Project and Plus Project cumulative conditions. Figure 9 identifies cumulative traffic volumes at study intersections without development on the project site.

Cumulative No Project Levels of Service. Table 8 identifies a.m. and p.m. peak hour Levels of Service under future conditions assuming that no changes are made to existing traffic controls at un-signalized intersections on Franklin Road. As indicated, the major signalized intersections on Franklin Road at Walton Avenue and at SR 99 are projected to operate at LOS E. The WinCo SC driveway signal is projected to operate at LOS D.

As may be expected with the anticipated growth in traffic on Franklin Road, the un-signalized intersections on Franklin Road will operate with very long delays for motorists attempting to turn onto Franklin Road. These motorists would experience LOS F conditions, and it is reasonable to
expect that the City will eventually need to act to prohibit outbound left turns onto Franklin Road at these locations.

**Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.** To evaluate project impacts the trips associated with Yuba Crossing have been superimposed onto the background cumulative condition and Levels of Service have been assessed. Because outbound left turns at the project access are already problematic under Existing Plus Project conditions, it is assumed that outbound left turns will be prohibited as noted under the evaluation of short term mitigation alternatives. In addition, under long term conditions the delays for inbound left turns may become problematic, and we have assumed that eastbound left turns into the site will be prohibited as well. Resulting peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 10.

Table 8 compares cumulative Levels of Service with and without the project. As shown, two signalized intersections (Walton Avenue / Franklin Road and SR 99 / Franklin Road) will operate at LOS E with and without Yuba Crossings. In this case the significance of the project’s impact is determined based on the incremental change in delay. Because the incremental changes in delay of 0.7 seconds and 1.5 seconds are less than the 5.0 second increment permitted under City guidelines, the project’s impact is not significant at these locations.

Level of Service F is forecast for the un-signalized intersections on Franklin Road west of the project at Neil Drive and Littlejohn Road. In this case, significance is again based on change in delay, and the changes created by the project are expected to exceed the 5.0 threshold. Thus the project’s impact is significant.

As noted under the cumulative base condition, the delays experienced by motorists waiting to left turn onto Franklin Road will eventually be resolved by prohibiting those turns. This may be accomplished by a raised median or other action. The proposed project would mitigate its impact by contributing its fair share to the cost of future traffic controls in this area.

With the project Level of Service E conditions are anticipated at the Franklin Road / WinCo SC / Oji Way intersection. As LOS E exceeds the City’s minimum standard this is a significant impact. The Level of Service at this location can be improved to the City’s LOS D minimum by providing a separate right turn lane on the new southbound approach. The proposed project would mitigate its impact by contributing its fair share to the cost of this improvement.
CUMULATIVE NO PROJECT
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CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT - TWO ACCESS
TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND LANE CONFIGURATIONS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Plus Project</td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Plus Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
<td>Average Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
<td>(sec/veh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Franklin Road / Walton Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin Road / Neil Drive</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Left Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin Road / Littlejohn Road</td>
<td>NB Stop</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>169.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left+Right Turn</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Left turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Franklin Road / Project Access</td>
<td>NB/ SB Stop</td>
<td>&gt;300</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;300</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Left+ Right Turn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Franklin Road / WinCo Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mitigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin Road / Onstott Road</td>
<td>SB Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Right Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Franklin Road / SR 99</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1. Introduction & Project Overview

Purpose and CEQA Process

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared to identify any potential environmental impacts in the City resulting from a mixed use development to create lots for future development with uses encouraged by the General Plan and zoning. The mixed use development is a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City has discretionary authority over the project.

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared in conformance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15070. The purpose of the IS/MND is to determine the potential significant impacts associated with the proposed Yuba Crossings Mixed Use Development. In addition, this document is intended to provide the basis for input from public agencies, organization, and interested members of the public for the project.

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess any anticipated environmental impacts resulting from the proposed General Plan Amendment (GP 16-07), Rezone (RZ 16-06), and Development Plan (DP 16-01) and Tentative Subdivision Map (SM 16-04). The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment (GPA 16-07) amending the City of Yuba City General Plan Diagram from Community Commercial to Low Density Residential (approximately 5.9 acres); Rezone from Community Commercial District (C-2) to One-Family Residence/Combining District (R-1 X) (approximately 5.9 acres) and Community Commercial (C-2) to Community Commercial/Combining District (C-2 X) (approximately 2.8 acres); Development Plan (DP 16-01); and Tentative Subdivision Map (SM 16-04) creating 57 lots in two phases. DP 16-01 would allow for the development of 53 zero lot line single family lots and ten three-story live-work units in Phase 1. Phase 2 consists of 26 second story apartments above approximately 15,281 square feet of retail/commercial space. The project includes internal roads, on-site amenities, parking, landscaping and public improvements to Franklin Road and Oji Way. The site is generally located on the north side of Franklin Road approximately 575 feet west of State Route 99. The project site is approximately 8.7 acres, consisting of six parcels,
and is addressed as 1345, 1349, 1353, 1363, 1371, and 1379 Franklin Road (parcels are identified as Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 58-120-004, 007, 008, 009; 58-130-024 and 025).

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 CCR §15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to use a previously prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a subsequent EIR to analyze at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of the analysis, it is recognized that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that with specific recommended mitigation measures, these impacts shall be reduced to less than significant, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

In reviewing the site specific information provided for the above referenced project, the City of Yuba City Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and a mitigated negative declaration has been prepared for this project.

**Intended Uses of this Document**

In accordance with CEQA, a good-faith effort has been made during preparation of this IS/MND to contact affected public agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in the proposed project. In reviewing the IS/MND, affected and interested parties should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the effects of the parcel map would be avoided or mitigated.

The IS/MND and associated appendices are available for review during regular business hours at the City of Yuba City Development Services Department, 1201 Civic Center Boulevard, Yuba City, California 95993 or by contacting the City.

Comments on the IS/MND must be submitted in writing during the comment period, which will commence on March 27, 2017. Written comments on the Draft IS/MND should be sent to the above address by 5:00 p.m. on April 26, 2017.
Notice of Declaration

1. **PROJECT TITLE:**

   Yuba Crossing Mix-Use Development (New Faze)

2. **LEAD AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS:**

   City of Yuba City
   Development Services Department, Planning Division
   1201 Civic Center Blvd.
   Yuba City, CA  95993

3. **CONTACT PERSON & PHONE NUMBER:**

   Ed Palmeri, Senior Planner
   (530) 822-4606
   epalmeri@yubacity.net

4. **PROJECT LOCATION:**

   The proposed project is located on approximately 8.7 acres on the side of Franklin Road approximately 575 feet west of State Route 99. The project site is addressed as 1345, 1349, 1353, 1363, 1371, and 1379 Franklin Road.

5. **ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER:**

   The subject property is identified as Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) 58-120-004, 007, 008, 009, 58-130-024, and 025.
6. **PROJECT APPLICANT:**

Lex Coffroth – Architect
1860 Howe Avenue, Suite 100A
Sacramento, CA 95825

7. **PROPERTY OWNER:**

New Faze Development
1825 Del Paso Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95814

8. **GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGNATION:**

Community Commercial

9. **ZONE DISTRICT:**

Community Commercial (C-2)

10. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project site, consisting of six parcels is a total of 8.7 acres and is located approximately 575 feet west of the intersection of State Route 99 and Franklin Road. The six parcels range in size from 0.23 acres to 6.19 acres. Two of the parcels, addressed as 1345 and 1349 Franklin Road (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 58-130-024 and 58-130-025) are developed with single family structures; the latter is occupied and the former is an abandoned derelict structure. Both single family structures will be removed as part of the project.

Access to the site is from Franklin Road. Franklin Road is an east-west arterial that extends from Sutter County in the west through Yuba City to the Franklin Road in the east. The facility is a 4-lane roadway with center turn lane through the project area from Walton Road to State Route 99. The projects easterly boundary is adjacent to the future extension of Oji Way. A portion of Oji Road will be constructed with Phase 2 of the project.

The property is relatively flat with no unique topographic features and drains to the southwest. There are no rock outcroppings or heritage-type trees on the site. There are two single family structures located on the site that will be removed prior to construction of the project. Both structures are vernacular in design and were constructed in the 1960’s. The structures do not represent a unique period or architectural style of historical value. The units are not on any historical preservation list.

The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment (GPA 16-07) amending the City of Yuba City General Plan Diagram from Community Commercial to Low Density...
Residential (approximately 5.9 acres); Rezone (RZ 16-06) from Community Commercial District (C-2) to One-Family Residence/Combining District (R-1 X) (approximately 5.9 acres) and Community Commercial (C-2) to Community Commercial/Combining District (C-2 X) (approximately 2.8 acres); Development Plan (DP 16-01); and Tentative Subdivision Map (SM 16-04) creating 57 lots in two phases. Development Plan (DP) 16-01 would allow for the development of 53 zero lot line single family lots and ten three-story live-work units in Phase 1. Phase 2 consists of 26 second story apartments above approximately 15,281 square feet of retail/commercial space. The project includes internal roads, on-site amenities, parking, landscaping and public improvements to Franklin Road and Oji Way. The site is generally located on the north side of Franklin Road approximately 575 feet west of State Route 99. The project site is approximately 8.73 acres, consisting of six parcels, and is addressed as 1345, 1349, 1353, 1363, 1371, and 1379 Franklin Road (parcels are identified as Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 58-120-004, 007, 008, and 009; 58-130-024 and 025). A solid decorative masonry wall will be constructed along the northerly property line and westerly property lines adjacent to residential areas.

The area will drain to a southwest where it will connect with existing facilities. The water will be conveyed by an existing 36” and 42” storm drain pipe located along the northerly and westerly property line. The project will provide for a series of on-site detention areas within landscaped areas. All City services are available in the streets fronting the proposed lots.

The General Plan classifies Franklin Road as a Major Arterial with an 84 foot right of way. Franklin Road is fully improved with curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both the north and south side. There is a signalized intersection at the future extension of Oji Way and Franklin Road. Oji Way is classified as a collector street and is proposed to extend from Bridge Street south to Franklin Road. A condition of approval is removal of the two existing residential structures at 1345 and 1349 Franklin Road. The residential sites are within the future Oji Way extension right-of-way. At Phase II improvements include construction of a portion of Oji Way allowing access from Phase I and II to the signalized intersection at Oji Way and Franklin Road.

11. SURROUNDING LAND USES & SETTING:

Single family homes border the north and westerly property lines. There is a mix of residential and commercial/retail uses on the east. To the south, across Franklin Road, properties are developed with a retail shopping center and church.

12. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- Feather River Air Quality Maintenance District (FRAQMD) (fugitive dust control plan)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board North Central Region 2 (for grading over 1
acre in size)

- City of Yuba City Building Department (building, electrical, and plumbing permits)
- City of Yuba City Public Works Depart. (roadways and public improvements)
Section 2. Environmental Checklist and Impact Evaluation

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture & Forestry Resources
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [x] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [x] Tribal Resources
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Written comments may be submitted to the Planning Division prior to the Planning Commission hearing, or at the Planning Commission hearing prior to the close of the public hearing.

Submit comments to: Initial Study Prepared by:

Development Services Dept. Ed Palmeri, Senior Planner, City of Yuba City
Planning Division
1201 Civic Center Blvd.
Yuba City, CA 95993
The public hearing for this item is scheduled for April 26, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. before the Planning Commission and will be held in the City Council Chambers located at 1201 Civic Center Blvd., Yuba City, California.

**Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they addressed site-specific conditions for the project.
6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

Section 3. Environmental Checklist and Impact Evaluation

The following section presents the initial study checklist recommended by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to determine potential impacts of a project. Explanations of all answers are provided following each question and mitigation is recommended, as necessary.

I. AESTHETICS

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

Response to Questions:

a,c) There are no officially designated scenic vistas in Yuba City; the project would therefore have no adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) There are no officially designated or eligible scenic highways in Sutter County by which this project would substantially damage a scenic resource.

c) The 8.7 acre project site is currently vacant. The transformation from vacant land to the proposed structures and site improvements is considered to be a substantial or permanent change in the existing visual character of the site. However, this change is not viewed as a substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, because the proposed buildings and site improvements are
required to comply with the Yuba City Zoning Regulations and the Commercial Design Guidelines.

d) The proposed project will be developed with City-approved lighting to provide lighting during the night time for safety purposes. The development of this project will not create a source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Questions:

a) The property is located on land that is fallow and overgrown with weeds, some shrubs, and non-heritage trees. The site is well within the boundaries of the urban area, surrounded by a variety of urban uses including a shopping center to the south and residential uses to the west, north and a mix of residential and commercial uses to the east. Further, the City of Yuba City and Sutter County General Plans identify this area for urban development, as compared to the vast majority of Sutter County for which agricultural land is protected from urban growth. Therefore, the project, and resulting development of this property will not create a significant impact regarding the loss of agricultural land.

b-c) The property is currently zoned Community Commercial District (C-2) for non-agricultural development; it is not zoned for agricultural uses nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. This is an urban infill project so no lands are designated or zoned for agricultural use near this property. Therefore this project will not result in the conversion of other agricultural properties to non-agricultural uses.

d) The project site has no forest land.

e) The site is currently fallow land and is zoned C-2 and is classified in the General Plan Diagram as Community Commercial. The site is in an urbanized area that is developing with residential, commercial, religious, and retail uses. There is no agricultural activity on the site or in the area.

III. Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) is the local agency charged with administering local, state, and federal air quality management programs for Yuba and Sutter Counties. The FRAQMD’s jurisdiction is located in Northern California in the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The major pollutants of concern in the Northern Sacramento Valley are ozone (O₃) and particulate matter (PM). According to the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area (NSVPA) 2015 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan, Sutter County, in which the City of Yuba City is located, was designated as a nonattainment-transitional district that does not exceed the state ozone standards more than three times at any monitoring location in a single calendar year (Sacramento Valley Air Quality Engineering and Enforcement Professionals [SVAQEEP] 2015).

In that the project involves the demolition of existing structures it may be subject to the Asbestos NESHAP.

**Response to Questions:**

a-e) The State of California and the federal government have established ambient air quality standards for numerous pollutants, which are referred to as Criteria Pollutants. These standards are categorized as primary standards, designed to safeguard public health, or as secondary standards, intended to protect crops and to mitigate such effects as visibility reduction, soiling, nuisance, and other forms of damage. Air quality is also regulated through emissions limits for individual sources of criteria pollutants, i.e., ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), suspended particulate matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5), and lead (Pb).

Pursuant to the California Clean Air Act of 1998, California has adopted air quality standards for the criteria air pollutants that are generally more stringent than the federal standards, particularly for ozone and PM-10 (particulate matter, less than 10 microns in diameter). Also, the State has adopted ambient air quality standards for some pollutants for which there are no corresponding national standards.

Under the California Clean Air Act and amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State Air Resources Board are required to classify Air Basins, or portions thereof, as either “attainment” or “non-attainment” for each criteria air pollutant, based on whether or not the national and state standards have been met. Yuba City is located in the Northern Sacramento Valley.
Air Basin (NSVAB). The NSVAB consists of the northern half of the Central Valley. Air quality monitoring has been conducted in the NSVAB for the last fifteen years and the monitoring results have shown that the principal pollutants of the NSVAB, including Yuba City, are ozone and particulate matter.

The Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) was created in 1991 to administer local, state, and federal air quality management programs for Yuba and Sutter Counties. They reviewed this project and determined that due to its small size it does not trigger any specific air quality concerns. However, in order to reduce any possible impacts even further, the FRAQMD requires through its permitting process, the following mitigations are required to be met, which reduces the impacts to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measures 3.1**

**Construction Phase Requirements**

1. Implement a Fugitive Dust Control Plan that will, at a minimum, include the following elements:

   All grading operations on the project shall be suspended as directed by the Feather River Air Quality Management District when sustained winds exceed 20 miles per hour or when winds carry dust beyond the property line despite implementation of all feasible dust control measures. An operational water truck shall be onsite at all times to assist in dust control.

   Onsite dirt piles or other stockpiled particulate matter shall be covered, wind breaks installed, and water and/or soil stabilizer employed to reduce windblown dust emissions. Incorporate the use of approved non-toxic soil stabilizer according to manufacturers’ specifications to all inactive construction areas. Contractor is required to provide the specifications to the City Inspector.

   To help contain fugitive dust, construction sites shall be watered down during the construction phase of the project or as directed by the Public Works Department. Water conservation is a priority for the City, and therefore recommends that the contractor monitor their use and obtain water from alternate sources (e.g. agricultural wells) when available.

   Temporary silt fencing shall be erected during construction and permanent fencing shall be completed prior to occupancy so that transport of construction debris can be retained on-site.

   An operational water truck should be onsite at all times. Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent visible emissions violations and offsite dust impacts.
All transfer process involving a free fall of soil or other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions.

Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers according to the manufacturer’s specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas that remain inactive for 96 hours), including unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas.

To prevent track-out, wheel washers should 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. Alternatively, a gravel bed may be installed as appropriate at vehicle/equipment site exit points to effectively remove soil buildup on tires and tracks to prevent/diminish track-out.

Paved streets shall be swept frequently (a water sweeper with reclaimed water and a wet broom is recommended) if soil material has been carried onto adjacent paved, public thoroughfares from the project site.

As deemed appropriate by the Public Works Department and/or Caltrans, provide temporary traffic control as needed during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow and to reduce vehicle dust emissions.

Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces to 15 mph or less and reduce unnecessary vehicle traffic by restricting access. Provide appropriate training, onsite enforcement, and signage.

By seeding and watering, reestablish ground cover on the construction site as soon as possible and prior to final occupancy.

No open burning of vegetative waste or other legal or illegal burn materials may be conducted at the project site. It is unlawful to haul materials offsite for disposal by open burning.

2. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed FRAQMD Regulation III, Rule 3.0, Visible Emissions Limitations (40 percent opacity or Ringlemann 2.0). Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits shall take action to repair the equipment within 72 hours or to remove the equipment from service. Failure to comply may result in a Notice of Violation.

3. The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained prior to and for the duration of onsite operation.

4. Minimize idling time to 5 minutes.
5. Use existing power sources or clean fuel generators rather than temporary generators.

6. Develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities.

**IV. Biological Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a) There have been no special status species identified on the site or within the vicinity of the project site. According to the Yuba City General Plan EIR, the only designated special status vegetation species within Yuba City and its Sphere of Influence is the Hartweg’s Golden Sunburst, a flowering plant that occurs primarily in the non-native grasslands and is threatened mostly by the conversion of habitat to urban uses. The habitat area for this particular species occurs at the extreme eastern boundary of the City’s Planning Area at the confluence of the Feather and Yuba Rivers. This property
does not fall within this area, and no adverse impacts to special status species will occur.

b) As identified in the Yuba City General Plan EIR, there are no riparian habitats or any other sensitive natural communities within the vicinity of the project.

c) There are no federally protected wetlands within the vicinity of the property.

d) Because the project is surrounded by urban development, the proposed project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) The project will have no impact on unique biological resources in that the site has been occasionally plowed for fire prevention and is currently overgrown with weeds and several trees. There are no heritage trees or trees of unique species type on the site.

f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans within the project vicinity.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy unique paleontological resources or site or unique geologic features?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Questions:

a) The proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in a historical resource, as there are no structures on the site.

b-d) There are no known archaeological resources located on the site. As part of the construction of the existing subdivision that the project is located, the site was completely graded. Prior to that the property was an orchard and had been tilled for many years. Because of the past ground disturbance, it is very unlikely that any
paleontological or archeological artifacts exist in the area. However, the following mitigation will be placed on the project to reduce environmental impacts to less than significant:

Mitigation Measure 5.1

1. Should artifacts or unusual amounts of bone or shell be uncovered during demolition or construction activity, all work shall be stopped and a qualified archeologist shall be contacted for on-site consultation. Avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be completed according to CEQA guidelines. The State Office of Historic Preservation has issued recommendations for the preparation of Archeological Resource Management Reports which shall be used for guidelines. If the bone appears to be human, California law mandates that the Sutter County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be contacted.

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Questions:

a-c) No active earthquake faults are known to exist in Sutter County, although active faults in the region could produce motion in Yuba City. However, potentially active faults do exist in the Sutter Buttes but those faults are considered small and have not exhibited activity in recent history (last 200 years).

In the event of a major regional earthquake, fault rupture or seismic ground shaking could potentially injure people and cause collapse or structural damage to existing and proposed structures. Ground shaking could potentially expose people and property to seismic-related hazards, including localized liquefaction and ground failure. All new structures are required to adhere to current California Uniform Building Code (CUBC) standards. These standards require adequate design, construction and maintenance of structures to prevent exposure of people and structures to major geologic hazards. General Plan Implementing Policies 9.2-I-1 through 9.2-I-5 reduce impacts to less than significant.

According to the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the City’s General Plan, due to the area’s flat topography, erosion, landslides, and mudflows are not considered to be a significant risk in the City limits or within the Urban Growth Boundary.

d) The extreme southwest corner of the Yuba City Growth Boundary is the only known area with expansive soils. The project site is not located within this area and therefore will not be impacted by the presence of expansive soils.

e) The project will not require the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Questions:

a-b) Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs) because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, similar to a greenhouse. The accumulation of GHGs has been implicated as a driving force for Global Climate Change. Definitions of climate change vary between and across regulatory authorities and the scientific community, but in general can be described as the changing of the earth’s climate caused by natural fluctuations and the impact of human activities that alter the composition of the global atmosphere. Both natural processes and human activities emit GHGs. Global Climate Change is a change in the average weather on earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the speed of global warming and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, the vast majority of the scientific community now agrees that there is a direct link between increased emission of GHGs and long term global temperature. Potential global warming impacts in California may include, but are not limited to, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years. Secondary effects are likely to include a global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity. GHG impacts are considered to be exclusively cumulative impacts; there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective (CAPCOA, 2008).

The proposed project would not include construction and operational activities. Construction activities would include site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coatings, and paving activities. Operation would include commuters, utility use, and activities consistent with school uses.

The project would generate what would be considered a significant amount of GHG if project-related GHG emissions were high enough to be considered a major source by CARB. However, due to the small size of this project, it would not be classified as a major source of greenhouse gas emissions by CARB (the lower reporting limit being 25,000 metric tons/year of CO2e). Therefore this impact would be considered less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a-c) The only hazardous materials associated with this project are those materials associated with construction activities such as solvents, oil and fuel. Provided that proper use and storage is utilized for these materials in accordance with adopted laws, the proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of these hazardous materials. *If any hazardous waste is encountered during the construction of this project, all work shall be immediately stopped and the Sutter County Environmental Health Department, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the City Inspector shall be notified immediately. Work shall not proceed until clearance has been issued by all of these agencies.*
d) The site is not listed on any listings of sites that are contaminated by hazardous wastes.

e) The project is located immediately 1.6 miles west of the Sutter County Airport and is not within the sphere of influence of the Sutter County Airport.

f) There are no private airstrips located within City limits or the City’s Urban Growth Boundary.

g) The proposed project will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Police and Fire Departments expressed no concern over the project’s impacts on any emergency response plans.

h) The site is in an urbanized area developed with a mix of residential, commercial, retail and religious uses. There are no wildlands in the area.

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a <a href="#">federal Flood Hazard Boundary</a> or <a href="#">Flood Insurance Rate Map</a> or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Questions:

a) The proposed project will not violate any water quality or wastewater discharge requirements. Any runoff associated with construction is addressed in part through General Plan Implementing Policies 8.5-I-1 through 8.5-I-10 which requires a wide range of developer and City actions involving coordination with the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, protecting waterways, and following Best Management Practices for new construction. The project will implement the following mitigation measures to reduce construction-related impacts to a less-than significant level:

b) The project will be served by the City water system, which primarily uses surface water. The City has concluded that it has adequate surface water entitlements from the Feather River as well as treatment/distribution capacity to accommodate any need associated with the project. The project will be required to pay all applicable fees prior to hooking up to City water. The reduced groundwater recharge that could result from the additional impermeable surfaces associated with this project will not be significant due to the small size of the project.

c) The project will drain into an established drainage system that serves the area and is eventually pumped into the Feather River. Drainage within the project site will be diverted to an existing 36” and 42” storm drainage pipe location along the northerly and westerly Phase 1 parameter. As noted above, all construction must involve use of Best Management Practices and site improvements to collect storm water runoff from the site and help reduce any off-site drainage from occurring other than into the City’s.

d) The existing drainage system was designed and improved to accommodate storm water drainage from the entire area, including this property. Therefore, the proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the existing
storm water drainage system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water. The drainage facilities within this area were designed with the assumption that this property would be developed with impermeable surfaces.

e) The proposed project will not substantially degrade water quality. As noted under item a) above, site development will be required to adhere to the General Plan Implementing Policies cited to ensure that water quality degradation does not occur.

f-h) According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the City is considered to be outside of the 100-year flood plain. It is classified as such because of an extensive series of levees and dams along the Feather and Yuba Rivers which protect the city from potential flooding. Local drainage improvements, principally the Gilsizer Slough, Live Oak Canal, and detention ponds provide storm water relief within the urban area. The project is proposing a 2.78 acre on-site detention pond designed to meter water into the existing storm drainage system at a rate which will not exceed existing capacities.

i) There are 10 dams located outside Sutter County that could cause significant flooding should failure occur, among which there are six dams that are located on the Feather River and Yuba River. Failure of any one of these dams could cause significant flooding in Yuba City. These dams are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Yuba County Water Agency, Pacific Gas & Electric, and the Corps of Engineers. However, all new development must be in compliance with General Plan policies to conduct hydrologic studies before construction and to provide information to property owners about the availability of flood insurance, as detailed in Policy 9.3-1-3 and 9.3-1-5. These policies would minimize the effects of prospective growth from flooding hazards and the impact would be less than significant.

j) A seiche is the periodic oscillation of a body of water resulting from seismic shaking. The City is not close to any big lakes so seiche is unlikely to happen to the City. A tsunami is a very large ocean wave caused by an underwater earthquake or volcanic eruption. The City is located inland from the Pacific Ocean, so people or structures in the City would not be exposed to inundation by tsunami. Mudflows are shallow water-saturated landslides that travel rapidly down slopes carrying rocks, brush, and other debris. Landslides are unlikely to happen due to the relatively flat topography within the project area. Thus, it is unlikely that the project site would be subject to inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation Measures 9.1

Temporary silt fencing shall be erected during construction so that transport of construction debris can be retained on-site.

To prevent track-out, wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment exit onto paved street from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment
shall be washed prior to each trip. Alternatively, a gravel bed may be installed as appropriate at vehicle/equipment site exit points to effectively remove soil buildup on tires and tracks to prevent/diminish track-out.

Paved streets shall be swept frequently (water sweeper with reclaimed water recommended; wet broom) if soil material has been carried onto adjacent paved, public thoroughfares from the project site.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Questions:

a) The project, by its nature, will not physically divide an established community. Instead, it is an infill project that will provide for a mix of residential, retail and commercial uses in an area developed with similar uses.

b) The City General Plan Diagram designates the site as Community Commercial. Zoning for the property is Community Commercial District (C-2) which is consistent with the General Plan designation. The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment (GPA 16-07) amending the City of Yuba City General Plan Diagram from Community Commercial to Low Density Residential (approximately 5.9 acres); Rezone (RZ 16-06) from Community Commercial District to One-Family Residence/Combining District (R-1 X)(approximately 5.9 acres) and Community Commercial/Combining District (C-2 X)(approximately 2.8 acres); Development Plan (DP 16-01); and Tentative Subdivision Map (SM 16-04) creating 57 lots in two phases. The project will create lots, access, and infrastructure that support the allowed and permitted uses (please refer to the Project Description of this report).

c) There are currently no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservations plans within City limits or the Urban Growth Boundary.
### XI. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a-b) The proposed project is not expected to impact mineral resources. The project site has no known mineral resource value nor is there opportunity for mineral resource extraction.

### XII. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Questions:

a-d) The project does not propose any development other than public improvements. Future development will consist of uses consistent with the General Plan and City of Yuba City Ordinance Title 8 Planning and Zoning. An EIR for the General Plan contemplated development of the site with single family residences. The proposed amendments will allow for a mix of residential, retail, commercial uses which are addressed in this mitigated negative declaration. In addition, a solid wall to mitigate noise and light impacts will be constructed in that portion of the project adjacent to residential units to the north and west.

Short-term noise impacts (and possibly some ground borne vibrations if site compaction is required prior to construction) can be expected resulting from site grading and home construction activities. Construction-related noise impacts will be less than significant because adherence to City Noise standards is required. These standards limit the hours of operation for construction and use of heavy machinery to daytime hours. Further the construction noise is of limited duration, further limiting any adverse impacts.

e) The project is located immediately 1.6 miles west of the Sutter County Airport. The Sutter County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (April 1994) indicates the site is not within the sphere of influence of the Sutter County Airport.

f) There are no private airstrips in Yuba City.

### XIII. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Questions

a) The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area, since the area is already designated by the General Plan for residential development. City services have already been extended throughout the area, including this property, to serve neighboring urban uses. Further, the surrounding properties are already built-out with a mix of residential, commercial, retail, and religious uses.

b-c) There are no structures on the site; therefore, the project will not cause any existing housing to be removed that will necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Questions:

a i-ii) The project site is located in the City and is served by Yuba City Police and Fire Departments as well as other City departments. Both Yuba City Police Department and Fire Department received project plans and indicated the project would not significantly impact their ability to respond or provide service to the project. Other providing for additional jobs the project will not result in any additional need for police or fire protection. The City development impact fees mitigate the incremental change.

a iii) This project may result in additional need for educational services. School impact fees will be collected at the time of building permits to off-set additional costs of educational services.
a) This project will not result in any direct additional need for parks or other public facilities.

### XV. Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a-b) The proposed project will not increase the use of existing parks such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur. The proposed project is a commercial project that will not result in impacts upon any existing or planned recreational facilities.

### XVI Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the city congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a.b) A traffic study has been completed for the project (Anderson and Associates, Inc. 2016). The study found that the proposed project is projected to generate a total of 1,533 daily external trips with 73 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 114 trips in the p.m. peak hour. At full build out of the project would not impact existing public road intersections on Franklin Road, but if only access to Franklin Road is available then LOS E conditions are forecast at the project’s Franklin Road driveway in the p.m. peak hour. LOS E exceeds the City’s LOS D minimum. Several mitigation measures were recommended. The City has opted to require the installation of the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road/WinCo SC signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate with this fourth leg. Satisfactory Level of Service would occur. With the creation of access to the Franklin Road/WinCo SC/Oji Way signal, the project’s cumulative impacts are not significant.

**Mitigation Measure 16.1**

Install the portion of Oji Way from the Franklin Road/WinCo signal to the project site and modify the traffic signal to operate with this fourth leg. Installation of Oji Way and modification of the traffic signal will reduce significant impacts to less than significant.

c) The project site is not within the Sutter County Airport CLUP.

d) Circulation within the project area are designed to accommodate anticipated traffic and do not contain sharp curves or dangerous intersections. In that the site is in an urbanized area it is anticipated there will be no conflict with incompatible uses such as farm equipment.

e) The Fire Department and Police Departments have reviewed the project plans and did not express concerns about emergency access to the property.

f) Improvements include sidewalks throughout the project. Bus service is provided along
Franklin Road and will not be impacted by the project. There are no changes proposed that would adversely impact bus, pedestrian, or bicycle movements.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions:**

a i-ii) The proposed project site is not identified as eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1. The project has been circulated for tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 protocol. No tribal comments were received for the proposed project.

Yuba City General Plan, 2004 Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2001072105) did not identify the site as having tribal cultural significance. There is a possibility that an unidentified site of cultural importance may be found on the project site. Therefore, the City is requiring implementation of mitigation in the event that artifacts or unusual amounts of bone or shell are discovered on the site (see Mitigation Measure 5.1)
**Response to Questions:**

a-e) The proposed subdivision has been evaluated by the City’s utility departments who have concluded that the City has adequate water entitlements and treatment/distribution capacity in its plants to serve the proposed project. The project applicant will be required to pay all applicable connection fees prior to hooking up to City utilities.

f-g) Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. provides solid waste disposal for the area. There is adequate collection and landfill capacity to accommodate the proposed uses High.
## XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important example of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response to Questions:

a) The project site is in an urbanized area with little biological value. The proposed project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate an important example of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) The project site is identified in the 2004 General Plan for residential use. Specific mitigation has been incorporated into the project to mitigate significant impacts to less than significant.

c) The proposed project would create no adverse impacts, either directly or indirectly, to residents in the project area.
Documents Referenced in the Initial Study and/or Incorporated by Reference

The following documents were used to determine the potential for impacts from the proposed project. Compliance with federal, state and local laws is assumed in all projects.


Yuba City General Plan, 2004.

Yuba City Ordinance Title 8. PLANNING AND ZONING.

Sutter County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (April 1994).

Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) CEQA Significance Thresholds.

Yuba Sutter Transit Route Map.


California Department of Toxic Substances Control – 2013 database.


Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

City of Yuba City Water Master Plan.

City of Yuba City Wastewater Master Plan.