Notice of Determination

To: Office of Planning and Research
   For U.S. Mail: PO Box 3044
  Sacramento, CA 95811-3044

Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

OR

County Clerk
County of Amador
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

From: City of Jackson
33 Broadway
Jackson, CA 95642

Contact: Susan Peters
Phone: (209)223-1646

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the public Resources Code.

Project Title: North Main Street Water Line Relocation
Applicant(s) Name & Mailing Address: City of Jackson, 33 Broadway, Jackson, CA 95642
Phone Number: (209)223-1646 ex. 111

State Clearinghouse Number (if applicable): n/a

Lead Agency Contact Person: Susan Peters
Phone: (209)223-1646

Project Location: North Main Street East of the County Library (APN 020-171-014)
Project Description: Relocate the existing water line the transects the property to the south property line.

This is to advise that the City of Jackson has approved the above-described project on April 27, 2020 and has made the following determination regarding the above described project:

1. The project [ ]will ( X ) will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ( ) An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   (X) A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation Measures [ ]were ( X )were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A statement of Overriding Considerations [ ] was (X) was not adopted for this project
5. Findings [X] were ( ) were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify the Negative Declaration is available to the General Public at: ci.jackson.ca.us

Jackson City Hall, 33 Broadway, Jackson, CA 95642

Susan Peters, AICP
Date
City Planner
Title

File No: 0305002020017
Posted On MAY 20, 2020
Posting Removed
CITY OF JACKSON
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
City of Jackson
North Main Street Water Line Relocation
APN 020-171-014

This Negative Declaration has been prepared for the City of Jackson North Main Street Water Line Relocation located on North Main Street east of the County Library in the City of Jackson (APN 20-171-014). This Negative Declaration provides a description of the potential adverse impacts resulting from the proposed project and provides the reasons why those impacts will have no significant impact on the environment. When a Negative Declaration is issued, it indicates that no substantial changes to the physical environment will result from the proposed project when mitigation is applied.

Pursuant to provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Jackson has determined that the above-referenced project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment and, therefore, does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

Documentation supporting this finding is included in the attached Initial Study.

Susan Peters, City Planner
March 3, 2020
Resolution No. 2020-12

A Resolution Approving the North Main Street Water Line Relocation Project Negative Declaration

WHEREAS, the City is proposing to relocate the existing three (3) inch water line that transects the property located at APN 020-171-014 on North Main Street on the east side of the North Fork Jackson Creek behind the Amador County Public Library; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15063 (Initial Study); and

WHEREAS, the on the basis of the evaluation in the Initial Study it has been determined that the proposed water line relocation will not have a significant effect on the environment and thus qualifies for a Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the City Council had held a duly noticed Public Hearing to solicit public comment on the proposed Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council finds that the proposed project is in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and hereby approves a Negative Declaration for the North Main Street Water Line Relocation Project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of April, 2020 by the following vote:

AYES: Stimpson, Gonsalves, Garibaldi, Lewis, Sweet
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

CITY OF JACKSON

Bob Stimpson, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Georgette, City Clerk
CITY OF JACKSON
INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15063 (Initial Study), this Initial Study has been prepared for the proposed City of Jackson North Main Water Line Relocation Project located at APN 020-171-014 on North Main Street on the east side of the North Fork Jackson Creek behind the Amador County Public Library.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Jackson
Planning Department
33 Broadway
Jackson, CA 95642

PREPARED BY: Susan M. Peters, AICP
City Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The existing 3 inch steel water line is fed from a 10 inch AC water main on North Main Street. It crosses down the middle of APN 020-171-014-000 then crosses the North Fork of Jackson Creek and dead ends where it serves 3 meters. The City is proposing to increase the size of this line to an 8-inch C900 and move the location of the water line 25 feet north of the southeast corner marker of parcel 020-171-014-000 then will follow the property boundary to the southwest corner marker of parcel 02-0171-014-000. This places the line closer to the property boundary as well as avoids mature trees adjacent to the property line. At this point a tee will be installed with a 6 inch gate valve and a 6 inch C900 line will extend south approximately 170 feet to serve a steamer hydrant located between the County Library and Ace Hardware. At the western most portion of the tee a 2 or 3 inch gate valve will be installed and a 2 or 3 inch HDPE service lateral will extend to the library where it will be attach to the building along with conduit and span over the creek. The line will then continue underground to the location of the existing meter boxes. The existing 3 inch steel line will be cut and capped at the valve on North Main Street.

The property located on North Main Street (APN 020-171-014) is currently vacant and zoned and General Plan designated Commercial. The proposed water line will traverse APN 020-171-014 and cross on to APN 020-070-041-000 owned by the County of Amador and zoned and General Plan designated Public/Institutional to support the Public Library Use. Surrounding land uses include Commercial to the south and Residential and Recreation to the north.

California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project are were notified of the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3. No Tribes requested consultation however the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria, the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians and the Jackson Band of Mi-Wuk Indians all requested the opportunity to review CEQA documents associated with the proposed project.
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

### DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

**Signature:** [Signature]

**Printed name:** Susan M. Peters

**Date:** March 3, 2020

**For:** City of Jackson
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**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:**

Following each section will be a discussion of the findings with the exception of the "No Impact" category.

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

1. **AESTHETICS** -- Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

   a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

   b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

   c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

   d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

**Discussion of Impacts:**

*Improvements associated with the proposed water line relocation will occur underground or attached to an existing non-historic structure. No aesthetic impacts.*
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES—In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

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

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?  

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

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

[ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

Discussion of Impacts:

The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area. No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance occur in the project area. The project area is not located in an area of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact.
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

b) 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?

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Background:

The project site is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the Amador Air District. The Amador Air District has established rules and regulations which are designed to limit emissions generated by various activities and which identify specific pollution reduction measures that are to be implemented in association with various activities. Specifically, the Air District has promulgated Rule 218 for control of fugitive dust emissions during a variety of activities including construction. The rule defines fugitive dust as follows: "Fugitive dust for the purposes of this rule is also defined as the particulate matter entrained into the air which is caused from man-made and natural activities which is emitted into the air without first passing through a stack or duct designed to control flow, including, but not limited to, emissions caused by movement of soil, vehicles, equipment, and windblown dust." The intent of the rule is to control dust by water application, pavement, vegetation, etc. so that no visible dust is created. Violation of the rule could result in issuance of a notice of violation and assessment of penalties.

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Amador County has not formally adopted an air quality management plan. While it is typical for the local air district to develop regional thresholds of significance for projects, in terms of criteria air pollutants the Amador Air District has not formally adopted recommended thresholds of significance for the evaluation of proposed projects that are subject to CEQA review. The Air District relies on its adopted rules and regulations to guide the analysis of air quality impacts.
associated with criteria pollutants that could be generated during construction and operation of projects such as that proposed. **No impact.**

b) Would the project 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?

Earthmoving activities that have the potential to generate air pollutants will occur for a short period only during construction. No significant long-term emissions of air pollutants are anticipated from post-construction activities; therefore, the project’s emissions potential is not considered to be cumulatively considerable. **Less than significant impact.**

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Amador Air District Rule 218 for control of fugitive dust emissions will be applied to those portions of the Site that will be disturbed by grading and construction equipment. Areas scheduled for disturbance will be thoroughly wetted in advance of ground disturbing activities, and during grading and construction additional water will be applied to control dust. Implementation of Amador Air District Rule 218 during construction will effectively reduce or eliminate the exposure of sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations. **Less than significant impact.**

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

*Neither the state nor federal governments have adopted rules or regulations for the control of odor sources. The Amador Air District (AAD) does not have an individual rule or regulation that specifically addresses odors; however, odors would be applicable to AAD Rule 205, Nuisance. Any actions related to odors would be based on citizen complaints to local governments and to the Amador Air District. The AAD has not identified recommended significance thresholds for the evaluation of odor impacts associated with proposed projects that are subject to CEQA.*

Activities associated with the project are primarily associated with earthmoving, including the importation of synthetic materials or asphalt for the parking area. With the exception of short-term odor generating potential associated with construction equipment and haul trucks, long-term odor generation is not anticipated from the project. Odor complaints, if any, will be addressed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with AAD Rule 205 and local ordinances. **Less than significant impact.**
IV. BIOLOGICAL -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With 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>
</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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Impacts:

The project site is disturbed due to the placement of the existing water line and surrounding construction. Minimal vegetation exists on the site which consists of grasses and pine and oak trees on the southern border of APN020-171-014-000. The location of the proposed water line will avoid the trees on the southern border of the property as well as the nearby Jackson Creek. Additionally, the City of Jackson does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? 
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

The site has been disturbed by prior construction activities and there are no known historical, archaeological or paleontological resources on the site. Additionally the site has no known human remains. Interested tribes were contacted as part of the AB 52 consultation requirements. No consultations were requested. No impact.

VI. ENERGY -- Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? 
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? 
☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion of Impacts:

Relocation of the water line will require minimal use of construction equipment for a short duration (two weeks). Additionally, relocation of the water line does not conflict with the City of Jackson Energy Action Plan policies. No impact.
VII. GEOLGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

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

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

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, or landslides?

The project site is located in a seismically inactive area, therefore the potential for risk associated with earthquakes, ground shaking or seismic-related failure is minimal. No impact.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Construction on the site may result in soil erosion however the placement and maintenance of Best Management Practices (BMPs) will ensure erosion and sedimentation are reduced or eliminated. Less than significant impact.

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

None of the proposed improvements are occurring in an area of instability nor do the improvements have the potential to cause the instability or failure of existing soils. No impact.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil?

The project area is located on soils of the Auburn soil series and is not considered to be an expansive soil by the California Building Code. No impact.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The proposed water line replacement does not require use of the City’s wastewater collection and treatment system. No impact.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

There are no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features on the project site. No impact.
## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Construction of the proposed project will comply with applicable Amador Air District rules and best management practices. Additionally, other than short-term construction related traffic the relocation of the water line will not generate additional traffic. **No impact.**

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?

The City of Jackson does not have regulations regarding the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. **No impact.**
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --
Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

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

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

*The project will not emit or cause the movement of hazardous materials from the site and the proposed uses at the site will not cause the transportation, use or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact.*

d) Is the project located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

*The project site is not listed on the State's designated list of hazardous waste substances sites (the Cortese list). No impact.*

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

*According to the Airport Land Use Plan for Westover Field, Adopted October 1987 and amended July 1990, the project site is outside all Airport Safety Areas. No impact.*

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

*Because the proposed relocated water line will be buried or attached to a building it will not interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. No impact.*

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

*The site is in an urbanized area with no interface with wildlands. No impact.*
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Project contractors will be required to implement erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with City of Jackson codes and standards and as approved by the City Engineer. In addition, construction, ground disturbing and other covered
activities will be regulated by the State’s General Permit for Storm Water Discharge Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (the Construction General Permit). Compliance with the Construction General Permit must be maintained throughout project construction and evidence of compliance will be implemented by the City. Erosion and sediment control BMPs will include permanent post-construction BMPs designed to minimize or eliminate post-construction impacts to storm water runoff quality. Less than significant impact.

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

None of the project area will be covered with synthetic materials or asphalt concrete/concrete pavement which impedes the vertical movement of water, therefore there will be no impact to local and regional groundwater recharge. No impact.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces?

Because the proposed water line will be underground or attached to a building there will be no alterations to existing drainage patterns. No impact.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The site is not located near lakes or reservoirs; therefore, the site is not subject to flooding, seiche hazards. The site is approximately 95 miles from the Pacific Ocean, well outside of the Tsunami Hazard Zone. Project-related activities are not expected to increase or affect mudflow potential at the site. No impact.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The City of Jackson does not have a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Relocation of the water line is not anticipated to have any impact to water or groundwater quality. No impact.
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Relocation of the water line will have no effect on any established community. No impact.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Relocation of the water line is consistent with the General Plan. No impact.
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

The project does not propose to remove from the site or affect any known mineral resources. In addition, extraction of mineral resources may still occur beneath the project site without interference from or to the proposed activities or improvements. **No impact.**

---

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

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

|                                | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | With Mitigation Incorporated | No Impact |
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion of Impacts:**

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
In accordance with the City's noise ordinance, all site work will be completed between the hours of 7:00 am and 9:00 pm on any day except Sunday, and between 9:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sunday. Construction activities during site development have the potential to generate short-term increases in noise, however based upon historic experience with construction-related traffic and noise, the City does not anticipate objectionable levels to be associated with this project. There will be no post-construction noise associated with the relocated water line. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance will minimize the significance of noise impacts. Less than significant.

b) Would the project result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Neither the project's construction nor post-construction activities will include activities likely to produce significant or excessive groundborne vibration or noise (e.g. blasting, impact pile driving, etc.) that would produce excessive ground-borne vibration at excessive levels. Conventional construction and event activities will not produce excessive groundborne vibration or noise. No impact.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels?

According to the Airport Land Use Plan for Westover Field, Adopted October 1987 and amended July 1990, noise contours associated with airport operations are oriented northeasterly and parallel with the runway. The 60db noise contour associated with airport operations is modeled to lie several miles south west of the project site, so airport noise levels at the project site will be significantly lower, and perhaps not detectable above ambient particularly during on-site activities. No Impact.
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

Relocation of the water line will have no effect on the population of the City. No impact.
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Without Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Police protection? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Schools? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Parks? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Other public facilities? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

Discussion of Impacts:

Relocation of the water line will have no effect on public services. Because this project includes the installation of a new fire hydrant, fire protection will be increase in the vicinity. **No impact.**
XVI. RECREATION --

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

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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

Discussion of Impacts:

Relocation of the water line will not affect the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or require new park facilities. **No Impact.**

XVII. TRANSPORTATION -- Would the project:

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

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp cures or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Discussion of Impacts:

Other than short-term construction related traffic relocation of the water line will not any impact on transportation in the City of Jackson. **No impact.**
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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:

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

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.

Discussion of Impacts:

There is no known historic significance to the site therefore it is not considered eligible for listing in the California or local Register of Historical Resources. The project site is currently vacant but has been previously disturbed by construction of the existing water line. The project description was sent to interested Tribes however no consultation was requested. This Initial Study will be sent to those Tribes that requested CEQA documentation and those Tribes will also be notified should any resources are discovered during construction. **No Impact.**
### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

Relocation of the water line will not require use of any utilities or service systems. **No impact.**
**XX. WILDFIRE** – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

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

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

| ☐                             | ☐                                                | ☐                             | ☒          |

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

| ☐                             | ☐                                                | ☐                             | ☒          |

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes? ☐

**Discussion of Impacts:**

The project site is not located near state responsibility areas or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. **No impact.**
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project 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>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the proposed water line relocation will be constructed in a previously disturbed area with no known archaeological, historic and biological resources the project will not require mitigation to minimize impacts.