

City of Wheatland  
Community Development Department



**City of Wheatland  
4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update and  
Associated General Plan Amendments and Zoning  
Amendments**

**Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

**March 2020**

Prepared by



1501 Sports Drive, Suite A, Sacramento, CA 95834

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**A. BACKGROUND ..... 1**

**B. SOURCES ..... 2**

**C. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED ..... 3**

**D. DETERMINATION..... 4**

**E. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION ..... 5**

**F. PROJECT DESCRIPTION ..... 7**

**G. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST ..... 15**

*I. AESTHETICS. .... 16*

*II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. .... 18*

*III. AIR QUALITY. .... 20*

*IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES..... 22*

*V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. .... 24*

*VI. ENERGY. .... 27*

*VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. .... 30*

*VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. .... 34*

*IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. .... 36*

*X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY..... 39*

*XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. .... 43*

*XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. .... 44*

*XIII. NOISE. .... 45*

*XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING..... 47*

*XV. PUBLIC SERVICES..... 48*

*XVI. RECREATION. .... 49*

*XVII. TRANSPORTATION..... 50*

*XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. .... 53*

*XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. .... 55*

*XX. WILDFIRE..... 59*

*XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. .... 60*

**APPENDIX:**

Draft City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update

**INITIAL STUDY**

**March 2020**

**A. BACKGROUND**

1. Project Title: City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Wheatland  
Community Development Department  
111 C Street  
Wheatland, CA 95692
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Tim Raney  
Community Development Director  
(916) 372-6100
4. Project Location: Wheatland, CA
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Wheatland  
Community Development Department  
111 C Street  
Wheatland, CA 95692  
(916) 372-6100
6. Existing General Plan Designation: N/A
7. Existing Zoning: N/A
8. Required Approvals from Other Public Agencies: None
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: N/A
10. Project Description Summary:

The City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update sets forth a number of specific goals as well as policies and programs describing how the City aims to reach them. The approval of the 4-Year Housing Element Update would enable the City to preserve, improve and develop housing for all incoming segments of the community and show how the City intends to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers assigned by SACOG. The proposed project includes the adoption of the City's 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update and implementation of associated programs. In addition, in order for the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to certify the 4-Year Housing Element Update, the City needs to process various General Plan Amendments (GPAs) and Zoning Amendments associated with the 4-Year Housing Element Update programs.

11. Status of Native American Consultation Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1:

In compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 18, project notification letters were distributed on March 5, 2020 to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria, the Tsi Akim Maidu, the Strawberry Rancheria, the Esttom Yumeka Maidu tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria, and the Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians. In addition, in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1), a project notification letter was distributed to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. Responses requesting formal consultation have not been received at this time.

## **B. SOURCES**

The following documents are referenced information sources used for the purpose of this Initial Study:

1. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. *Yuba County, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*. October 5, 2007.
2. California Energy Commission. *Title 24 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards FAQ*. November 2018.
3. CalRecycle. *SWIS Facility Detail, Recology Ostrom Road LF Inf. (58-AA-0011)*. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/58-AA-0011/Detail/>. Accessed March 2020.
4. Caltrans. *Scenic Highways*. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed March 2020.
5. City of Wheatland. *Draft City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update*. March 2020.
6. City of Wheatland. *City of Wheatland Community Vision*. July 2008.
7. City of Wheatland. *City of Wheatland General Plan Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report*. July 11, 2006.
8. City of Wheatland. *General Plan Policy Document*. Adopted July 11, 2006.
9. City of Wheatland. *Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation, SCH# 2008082127*. Certified August 14, 2012.
10. Cordua Irrigation District, Yuba Water Agency, City of Marysville. *Yuba Subbasins Water Management Plan: A Groundwater Sustainability Plan*. December 2019.
11. Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed February 2020.
12. Department of Toxic Substances Control *EnviroStor*. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=wheatland%2C+ca>. Accessed March 2020.

13. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address*. Available at: [https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=wheatland%2C%20ca#searchresults\\_anchor](https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=wheatland%2C%20ca#searchresults_anchor). Accessed March 2020.
14. Native American Heritage Commission. *City of Wheatland Housing Element Update Project, Yuba County*. December 13, 2016.
15. Office of Planning and Research. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA*. December 2018.
16. Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *Beale Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Approved March 2011.

### **C. 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.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils           | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions         | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning            | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing           | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems          | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance   |

**D. DETERMINATION**

---

On the basis of this initial study:

- 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 applicant. 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” 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
  
Tim Raney, Community Development Director  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
  
City of Wheatland  
For

## **E. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

The following document is an Initial Study resulting in a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for the City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element Update (4-Year Housing Element Update). This IS/MND has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The Draft 4-Year Housing Element Update is included as an Appendix to this IS/MND.

The City of Wheatland is located in Northern California's Central Valley along State Route 65 (SR 65) in Yuba County, and has a land area of 8.19 square miles. SR 65 runs northwest to southeast and divides the City into eastern and western sections (see Figure 1). The individual setting for each impact analysis area is described in the respective analysis section.


State Housing Element law (Government Code Section 65583) requires each local government entity to adopt a comprehensive long-term general plan for the physical development of their City or County. The Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements composing the General Plan. State law, through the Housing Element, addresses the existing and projected housing needs within all economic segments of the State's various communities, including the City of Wheatland. On June 27, 2017, the City of Wheatland approved the 2013-2021 Housing Element, along with an associated IS/MND (2017 IS/MND).

The 2013-2021 Housing Element was intended to serve the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle (2013-2021); however, the 2013-2021 Housing Element did not receive certification from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD); therefore, pursuant to State law, this 4-Year Housing Element Update to address years 2017-2021 has been prepared. City of Wheatland staff have determined that a majority of the goals, policies, and implementation measures in the 2013-2021 Housing Element are appropriate and effective in providing sound housing and community development planning on a regional basis and for the City of Wheatland. Such goals, policies, and implementation measures would continue to be utilized by the City in an effective and efficient manner during the planning period for the 4-Year Housing Element Update. In a select few occasions, goals, policies, and implementation measures provided in the 2013-2021 Housing Element were modified or removed for the 4-Year Housing Element Update.

An important component of the 4-Year Housing Element Update is the identification of sites for future housing development and an evaluation of the adequacy of these sites in fulfilling the City's share of the RHNA, as determined by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The intent of the RHNA is to assure that every community provides an opportunity for a mix of affordable housing to all economic segments of its population.

Construction needs are derived from SACOG population and household growth projections. The income group proportions are then applied toward the construction need, which results in a goal for the number of housing units by income group within the City of Wheatland. The RHNA housing requirements applicable to the 4-Year Housing Element Update are described further below.

**Figure 1**  
**Regional Project Location**



**2006-2013 (4th Cycle) SACOG Regional Housing Needs**

The City of Wheatland had a 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle (2006-2013) RHNA of 916 total units (see Table 1). Due to limited funding, the City of Wheatland was unable to prepare a Housing Element update for the 2006-2013 planning period; therefore, pursuant to State law, the RHNA from the 2006-2013 planning period (4<sup>th</sup> Cycle) results in an unaccommodated need and must be addressed in the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle (2013-2021) Housing Element Update.

<b>Table 1</b>				
<b>City of Wheatland Unaccommodated Need</b>				
	<b>Income Level</b>			
	<b>Very</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Above</b>
2006-2013 RHNA	192	151	194	379
Units constructed (2006-2013)	0	0	44	45
Sites rezoned pursuant to housing element program <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	0
<b>2017-2013 Remaining Need</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>334</b>

<sup>1</sup> State law requires sites designated to meet the unaccommodated need must have a minimum allowable density of 20 du/ac.

As seen in the above table, the City of Wheatland has an unaccommodated need from 2006-2013 of 343 Low and Very Low income housing units in the City.

**2013-2021 (5th Cycle) SACOG Regional Housing Needs**

As shown in Table 2 below, the SACOG RHNA allocated 483 new housing units to Wheatland for the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle. Of the 483 housing units, 55 units are to be for Extremely Low income households, 55 units for Very Low income households, 76 for Low income households, 90 units for Moderate income households, and 208 for Above Moderate income households.

<b>Table 2</b>		
<b>City of Wheatland Regional Housing Needs Determination by Income (2013-2021)</b>		
<b>Income Level</b>	<b>RHNA</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Extremely Low	55	11.3%
Very Low	55	11.3%
Low	76	15.7%
Moderate	90	18.6%
Above Moderate	208	43.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*Source: SACOG, 2013.*

**F. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The 4-Year Housing Element Update identifies the goals, policies, and programs that the City will implement to ensure that housing in Wheatland is affordable, safe, and decent. The Housing Element addresses housing needs by encouraging the provision of an adequate number of potential building sites designated for multi-family housing, by assisting in affordable housing development, and through the preservation and maintenance of existing affordable housing stock.

## **Project Components**

The 4-Year Housing Element Update consists of the following components:

- Review of the Previous Housing Element: includes an evaluation of the effectiveness and progress of the implementation of the 2013-2021 Wheatland Housing Element, as well as an examination of the appropriateness of housing goals.
- Summary of Existing Conditions: includes current demographic information, an inventory of resources, housing cost and affordability, at-risk units, suitable land for development.
- Constraints, Efforts and Opportunities: includes a discussion of governmental and non-governmental constraints on the production of affordable housing, the City's efforts to remove constraints, and opportunities for energy conservation.
- Housing Program: identifies housing goals, policies and programs. Funding sources are identified and schedules for implementation are set forth. In addition, a quantified objectives summary is provided.


Pursuant to State law, and direction from HCD, due to the City's 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need, in order for HCD to certify the 4-Year Housing Element Update, the City needs to process the following GPAs and Zoning Amendments:

- Amend the General Plan to allow a maximum dwelling units per acre (du/ac) increase from 16 du/ac to a maximum of 30 du/ac in the High-Density Residential Land Use Designation (*Housing Element Program 2*).
- Amend the General Plan Map for three properties totaling 21.75 acres (Sites D, E, and F) to High-Density Residential (*Housing Element Program 12*);
- Amend the Zoning Code to allow a maximum du/ac increase from 18 du/ac to a maximum of 30 du/ac in the (Multi-family) R-3 Zoning District (*Housing Element Program 3*); and
- Rezone three properties totaling 21.75 acres (Sites D, E, and F) to the R-3 Zoning District (*Housing Element Program 11*);
- Amend the Zoning Code to create an Emergency Shelter Overlay District, which would permit emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in accordance with SB 745 (*Housing Element Program 4*); and
- Rezone one property (Site A) to add the Emergency Shelter Overlay District designation.

The 4-Year Housing Element Update, along with implementation of the Housing Element Programs listed above, are referred to hereafter as the proposed project.

The City of Wheatland contains three existing vacant sites (Sites A, B, and C) that currently have General Plan land use designations of High-Density Residential and are zoned R-3 (see Figure 2). In addition, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties include 30 acres of multi-family designated lands (density consistent with High-Density Residential land use designation) and 500 mixed-use units (see Figure 3). As seen in Table 3 below, the City of Wheatland currently has more than enough vacant residential land to meet SACOG's affordable housing allocation for the City. However, as discussed previously, in order for the City to meet the unaccommodated need requirements from the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle (2006-2013), additional available sites need to be rezoned for multi-family development. Therefore, the City has identified three additional vacant sites within the city limits (Sites D, E, and F) that are currently zoned Single Family (R-1) and Two-Family (R-2), but with implementation of Programs 2, 3, 11, and 12, described above, would meet the unaccommodated need requirements from the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle (2006-2013) (see Figure 4 and Table 4).

**Figure 2**  
**Available R-3 Sites**



**Table 3**  
**Affordable Housing Buildout Potential: Existing R-3 Sites**

Site	Assessor Parcel Number	Zone	Allowable Density (Current Zoning)	General Plan Designation	Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity <sup>3</sup>	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity
Site A	015-500-018-000	R-3	18 du/ac <sup>1</sup>	High-Density Residential	2.24	38	Vacant	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>4</sup>
Site B	015-490-018-000	R-3	18 du/ac <sup>1</sup>	High-Density Residential	1.85	32	Vacant	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>4</sup>
Site C	016-660-12	PD	18 du/ac <sup>1</sup>	High-Density Residential	6.3	108	Vacant	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>4</sup>
Johnson Rancho	<i>Multiple</i> <sup>2</sup>	PD	18 du/ac <sup>1</sup>	High-Density Residential	30.0	1,010	Vacant and Agricultural Production	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>4</sup>
<b>Total</b>					<b>40.39</b>	<b>1,188</b>	-	-
<b>2000-2021 RHNA</b>					-	<b>826</b>	-	-
<b>Excess Potential</b>					-	<b>362</b>	-	-


<sup>1</sup>. The City of Wheatland has included Program No. 3 requiring the City to amend its Zoning Ordinance to allow a maximum du/ac increase from 18 du/ac to a maximum of 30 du/ac in the R-3 District.

<sup>2</sup>. Johnson Rancho APNs: 015-160-029 (540.6 acres), 015-160-098 (266.5 acres), 015-036-024 (70.2 acres), 015-036-025 (14.2 acres), 015-037-001 (576.3 acres), 015-080-020 (581.7 acres), 015-360-038 (353.5 acres), 015-160-095 (40 acres), 015-160-096 (44 acres), 015-360-026 (50 acres), 015-360-028 (125.2 acres), 015-360-029 (101.4 acres), 015-360-030 (404.7 acres), 015-360-031 (134 acres), 015-360-032 (21.2 acres), 015-057-006 (13.7 acres), 015-056-005 (95.6 acres), 015-360-033 (22.5 acres), 015-360-052 (159 acres), 015-360-053 (2695 acres), and 015-360-051 (146.6 acres). 4,031 total acres.


<sup>3</sup>. The realistic unit capacity is based on 20 du/ac, as result of Program No. 3 increasing the maximum allowable density for the R-3 zone from 18 du/ac to 30 du/ac.

<sup>4</sup>. Due to existing conservation measures, the City's existing wastewater treatment plant now has additional capacity for future affordable housing development. The City of Wheatland will continue to practice existing conservation measures and provide affordable housing development with priority wastewater services.

**Figure 3**  
**Johnson Rancho Multi-Family Sites**



**Figure 4**  
**Sites to be Rezoned R-3**



**Table 4**  
**Affordable Housing Buildout Potential: Sites to be Rezoned R-3**

Site	Assessor Parcel Number	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Minimum Density	Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity
Site D	015-500-008-000	R-1	R-3	20 du/ac	11.75	235	Vacant	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>2</sup>
Site E	015-360-001-000	R-2	R-3	20 du/ac	9.0	180	Vacant/Single-Family Residence	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>2</sup>
Site F	015-350-012-000	R-1	R-3	20 du/ac	2.0	40	Vacant	Wastewater Treatment – Limited Capacity <sup>2</sup>
<b>Total</b>					<b>22.75</b>	<b>455</b>	-	-
<b>2006-2013 Unaccommodated Need</b>					-	<b>343</b>	-	-

<sup>1</sup>. The realistic unit capacity is based on 20 du/ac, as result of Program No. 3 increasing the maximum allowable density for the R-3 zone from 18 du/ac to 30 du/ac.  
<sup>2</sup>. Due to existing conservation measures, the City’s existing wastewater treatment plant now has additional capacity for future affordable housing development. The City of Wheatland will continue to practice existing conservation measures and provide affordable housing development with priority wastewater services.

### **Sites Analyzed in this IS/MND**

The proposed GPA and Rezone would be limited to Sites D, E, and F, while the proposed Zoning Amendment to allow for up to 30 du/ac in the R-3 Zoning District would affect the development potential of Sites A, B, C, D, E, and F, as well as possibly the future development associated with the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation Project. In addition, Site A would be rezoned to include a new Emergency Shelter Overlay District to allow emergency shelters by-right, without a discretionary approval, pursuant to State law. Each of the aforementioned sites is described below.

#### **Site A**

Site A is a 2.24-acre vacant site, identified as APN 015-500-018-000, located at the northern end of C Street. Site A has a General Plan land use designation of High-Density Residential and is zoned R-3.

#### **Site B**

Site B is a 1.85-acre vacant site, identified as APN 015-490-018-000, located on SR 65 south of the SR 65 and Main Street intersection. Site B has a General Plan land use designation of High-Density Residential and is zoned R-3.

#### **Site C**

Site C is a 6.3-acre vacant multi-family site located on SR 65 near the City of Wheatland's southern boundary. Site C is a portion of the approved Heritage Oaks Estates East subdivision, and has a General Plan land use designation of High-Density Residential and zoned Planned Development (PD).

#### **Site D**

Site D is an 11.75-acre vacant site, identified as APN 015-500-008-000, located north of the Meadow Way and B Street intersection. Site D currently has a General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential and is zoned R-1.

#### **Site E**

Site E is an 9.0-acre site, identified as APN 015-360-001-000, located along Spenceville Road east of Main Street. Site E has a General Plan land use designation of Low-Medium Density Residential and is zoned R-2.

#### **Site F**

Site F is a 2.0-acre vacant site, identified as APN 015-350-012-000, located southwest of the First Street and E Street intersection. Site E currently has a General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential and is zoned R-1.

### **Johnson Rancho Multi-Family Potential**

The Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties include approved General Plan land uses, pre-zoning of PD, and Stage One design guidelines, which contains 30 acres of multi-family designated lands (density consistent with High-Density Residential land use designation) and 500 mixed-use units (see Figure 3). Using a reasonable buildout density potential of 17 du/ac, based on approximately 80 percent increase to 30 du/ac, Johnson Rancho could potentially provide up to 510 multi-family units with 500 more mixed-use units, totaling 1,010 units.

### **Project Implementation and Framework of the IS/MND Analysis**

The 4-Year Housing Element Update sets forth a number of specific goals as well as policies and programs describing how the City aims to reach them. The approval of the 4-Year Housing Element Update would enable the City to preserve, improve and develop housing for all incoming segments of the community and show how the City intends to meet the RHNA numbers assigned by SACOG.

The proposed project includes the adoption of the City's 4-Year Housing Element Update and implementation of associated programs that are necessary in order for HCD to certify the Housing Element. The proposed project does not include the development of multi-family housing identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update. Nonetheless, the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would increase the maximum allowable development potential of Sites A through F, as well as multi-family designated land within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation Project. While future buildout of the aforementioned sites may include market-rate residences, which could be subject to additional review by the City, State law requires that affordable housing is permitted by-right on the sites.

Thus, this IS/MND includes a program-level analysis of the environmental impacts associated with future development of such sites under the amended General Plan land use and zoning designations. It should be noted that this IS/MND does not include analysis of future development for which additional discretionary entitlements (i.e., conditional use permits) would be required; rather, such development would be subject to future CEQA analysis when project-level information is available.

**PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS OR MAY BE REQUIRED:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

- City of Wheatland City Council.

It should be noted that HCD will review the 4-Year Housing Element Update to determine whether the Update complies with State law; however, HCD approval is not required for the City's adoption of the 4-Year Housing Element Update and implementation of associated programs.

### **G. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

The following checklist contains the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. For this checklist, the following designations are used:

**Potentially Significant Impact:** An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared.

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Less-Than-Significant Impact:** Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA relative to existing standards.

**No Impact:** The project would not have any impact.

**I. AESTHETICS.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-d. Wheatland is located in Northern California’s Central Valley along SR 65 in Yuba County. The City is located approximately one mile north of the Bear River and the tri-county boundary of Sutter, Placer, and Yuba Counties. The City is surrounded on all sides by agricultural parcels. Per the Caltrans State Scenic Highways Program, the City of Wheatland is not located near any officially designated State scenic highways.<sup>1</sup>

The City of Wheatland’s 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document intended to assist the City of Wheatland in meeting the housing needs established by the State of California, and would include development or redevelopment of specific projects within the City. While the 4-Year Housing Element would not directly induce new residential development, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City’s 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties. However, such sites have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City and analyzed in the General Plan EIR and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR. In addition, Sites A through F are surrounded by existing development and are generally located within urbanized areas. Future buildout of Sites A through F, as well as the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, would be required to comply with all applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, including the area and lot coverage restrictions established for the R-3 zone district per Section 18.27.060 of the City’s Municipal Code. Future development would also be required to comply with the City’s Community Design Standards document, which includes goals, objectives, and standards to guide the design of new residential projects within the City.

The 4-Year Housing Element Update is consistent with the City’s General Plan and therefore, specific goals and policies that have been identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be consistent with General Plan policies related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, historic buildings, and the visual character of the City. Furthermore, because the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document, site-specific

<sup>1</sup> Caltrans. *Scenic Highways*. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed March 2020.

designs or proposals are not included; therefore, an assessment of potential site-specific visual impacts resulting from future development proposals is not possible at this time.

Based on the above, impacts to aesthetics and visual character associated with the proposed project would be ***less than significant***.

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a,e. According to the Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the City of Wheatland contains Urban and Built-Up Land, Other Land, Unique Farmland, and Prime Farmland.<sup>2</sup> Sites A through F are currently designated Other Land and Urban and Built-Up Land.

The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document intended to assist the City of Wheatland in meeting the housing needs established by the State of California; therefore, the Housing Element Update would not convert any of the existing agricultural lands within the City of Wheatland to non-agricultural uses. While the proposed project would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City and analyzed in the General Plan EIR. In addition, conversion of agricultural land associated with future residential development within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties has been previously analyzed in the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use or 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. A **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

b. The City of Wheatland is surrounded by agricultural uses; however, the City does not contain any land under a Williamson Act contract. The proposed project would not involve changes to agricultural zoning districts. As such, the proposed project would not conflict

<sup>2</sup> Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed February 2020.

<sup>3</sup> City of Wheatland. *Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation, SCH# 2008082127*. Certified August 14, 2012.

with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and **no impact** would occur.

- c,d The City does not include lands designated as forest land or timberland. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** on forest land or timberland resources.

**III. AIR QUALITY.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-c. Wheatland is located within the Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD). The FRAQMD is part of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) that includes Butte, Colusa, Glen, Tehama, Shasta, Yolo, Sacramento, Yuba, Sutter, and parts of Placer and Solano counties. California and the federal government have established air quality standards for various pollutants. The standards are used to determine attainment of State and federal air quality goals and plans. Generally, State regulations are more strict standards than federal regulations. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. FRAQMD has adopted thresholds of significance for various pollutants intended to maintain attainment of federal and State air quality standards.

The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document intended to assist the City of Wheatland in meeting the housing needs established by the State of California. Although implementation of a successful Housing Element could be expected to facilitate residential development in the City, the lack of site-specific development applications, including the design and location of specific improvements, makes evaluation of the project’s air quality impacts highly speculative. In addition, while the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for development with residential uses by the City. Increasing the allowable density on the aforementioned sites would also further the State’s goals of reducing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and, thus, decrease criteria pollutant emissions associated with vehicle travel. All new residential development would be required to comply with the latest California Building Standards Code (CBSC) Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which would help to further reduce criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-site operations (e.g., heating and cooling, lighting, irrigation).

Future residential development would be required to adhere to General Plan goals and policies related to air quality, as well as federal, State, and regional air quality plans. Furthermore, future residential development identified within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation area would be subject to additional environmental review when Stage Two Zoning occurs. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact would result.

- d. Typical sources of objectionable odors include industrial or intensive agricultural uses. The proposed project does not involve any industrial or intensive agricultural development, and therefore would not include any odor-producing uses. Thus, and **no impact** related to resulting in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people would occur.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-d. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document intended to assist the City of Wheatland in meeting the housing needs established by the State of California. Although implementation of a successful Housing Element could be expected to facilitate residential development in the City, new residential development would not impact local rivers or streams. Principles from the City of Wheatland’s Community Vision document establishes controls on creekside development which seek to preserve and enhance riparian vegetation and habitat. Residential development proposed near local rivers or streams, would be subject to Policies 8.C.2 and 8.D.3 from the General Plan establish controls on creekside development to preserve and enhance riparian vegetation and habitat. Consequently, the Housing Element Update would not interfere with fish or wildlife movement or adversely affect wildlife corridors. It should be noted that while the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for development with residential uses by the City, and associated impacts to biological resources have been evaluated in the General Plan EIR, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR, and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR. The proposed project would not result in a substantially increased disturbance area relative to what has been anticipated.

Successful implementation of the City of Wheatland 4-Year Housing Element Update would require improvements in the area, which could adversely impact known and unknown biological resources in the area. Future residential development identified within

the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation and Site C have been previously analyzed in the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR, respectively. In addition, future projects would be subject to federal, State, and local regulations, such as the Federal Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and Policies 8.C.2 and 8.D.3 found in the General Plan. However, future residential development of Sites A, B, D, E, and F could impact special-status species found on-site. Therefore, a **potentially significant** impact could occur.

### **Mitigation Measure(s)**

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the above potential impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

*Sites A, B, D, E, and F*

*IV-1. Prior to any ground disturbance related activities, a USFWS/CDFW-approved biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of Sites A, B, D, E, and F as identified in the City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element. The surveys shall establish the presence or absence of on-site special status-species. Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted within 30 days of ground disturbance. The survey results shall be submitted to the City of Wheatland Community Development Department. If no special-status species are discovered, further mitigation is not required.*

*If special-status species are discovered, appropriate mitigation shall be applied, as determined by the approved biologist and the City of Wheatland Community Development Department. Mitigation would include, but would not be limited to, the following:*

- Avoid construction activities during breeding seasons;*
- Establish appropriate buffers; and*
- Relocate special-status species, pending consultation with appropriate agencies.*

e-f. Future buildout of Sites A through F, as well as other multi-family sites identified in the City of Wheatland 4-Year Housing Element, would comply with all applicable ordinances of the City related to the preservation of sensitive biological resources. The City of Wheatland is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Furthermore, future residential development within the City, including buildout of Sites A through F and multifamily development within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, would be required to comply with the City's applicable development standards. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a. Historical resources are features that are associated with the lives of historically-important persons and/or historically-significant events, that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the pre-history or history of the local area, California, or the nation. Examples of typical historical resources include, but are not limited to, buildings, farmsteads, rail lines, bridges, and trash scatters containing objects such as colored glass and ceramics.

As stated in the Wheatland General Plan EIR, a number of historical resources have either been formally designated as properties listed on the National Register of Historical Places (NRHP), State Historic Landmark (SHL), California Points of Historical Interest, and/or California Historical Resources Inventory. However, a comprehensive historic resources inventory has not been prepared for either the City of Wheatland or the surrounding planning area and a high probability of additional unrecorded historic properties exists. The City has a formal review process to evaluate proposed demolition or alteration of historic buildings.

Currently, the multi-family development sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update are vacant and undeveloped. Thus, the sites do not contain any existing structures or other features which would be considered historical. In addition, buildout of the sites with residential uses has been previously anticipated by the City and analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR, and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR. The proposed project would not result in a substantially increased disturbance area relative to what has been anticipated. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

- b,c. As stated in the City’s General Plan, little of the General Plan planning area has been surveyed for the presence of archaeological resources. Nevertheless, prehistoric sites have been found in the Wheatland Planning Area to date. Future residential development identified within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties and Site C have been previously analyzed in the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR, respectively. In addition, future projects would be required to adhere to federal and State regulations associated with protection of cultural resources and implement General Plan goals and policies associated with cultural resources. However, future ground-disturbing activities may have the potential to uncover buried cultural deposits for Sites A, B, D, E, and F.

Therefore, the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic or archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and/or disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during construction. Consequently, impacts could be considered **potentially significant**.

### **Mitigation Measure(s)**

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the above potential impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

*Sites A, B, D, E, and F*

V-1 *In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains on Sites A, B, D, E, and F as identified in the City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element, the City shall be notified and further excavation or disturbance of the find or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall not occur until compliance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e)(1) and (2) has occurred. The Guidelines specify that in the event of the discovery of human remains other than in a dedicated cemetery, no further excavation at the site or any nearby area suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the Yuba County Coroner has been notified to determine if an investigation into the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American, then, within 24 hours, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will notify the most likely descendants who may recommend treatment of the remains and any grave goods. The potential exists that the Native American Heritage Commission may be unable to identify a most likely descendant, the most likely descendant fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after notification by the Native American Heritage Commission, or the landowner or his authorized agent rejects the recommendation by the most likely descendant and mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide a measure acceptable to the landowner. In such a case, the landowner or their authorized representative shall rebury the human remains and grave goods with appropriate dignity at a location on the property not subject to further disturbances. Should human remains be encountered, a copy of the resulting County Coroner report noting any written consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission shall be submitted as proof of compliance to the City's Community Development Department. The language of this mitigation measure shall be included on final improvement plans and/or building plans, subject to review and approval by the City.*

V-2 *In the event a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities on Sites A, B, D, E, and F as identified in the City of Wheatland 4-Year (2017-2021) Housing Element, the City shall be notified and all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease and workers should avoid altering the materials until an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology has evaluated the find. The project*

*applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The qualified archeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to, culturally appropriate temporary and permanent treatment, which may include avoidance of cultural resources, in-place preservation, and/or re-burial on project property so the resource(s) are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. If necessary, excavation and evaluation of the finds shall comply with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.*

*Potentially significant cultural resources include, but are not limited to, stone, bone, glass, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project site shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and will be submitted to the City of Wheatland, the North Central Information Center, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), as required.*

*The language of this mitigation measure shall be included on final improvement plans and/or building plans, subject to review and approval by the City.*

**VI. ENERGY.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a,b. While the 4-Year Housing Element would not directly result in increased energy use relative to existing conditions, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City’s 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties. The main forms of available energy supply are electricity, natural gas, and oil. A description of the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code and the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, with which future multi-family development identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be required to comply, as well as discussions regarding potential effects related to energy demand during construction and operations are provided below.

**California Green Building Standards Code**

The 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, otherwise known as the CALGreen Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11), is a portion of the CBSC, which became effective with the rest of the CBSC on January 1, 2020. The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices. The provisions of the code apply to the planning, design, operation, construction, use, and occupancy of every newly constructed building or structure throughout California. Requirements of the CALGreen Code include, but are not limited to, the following measures:

- Compliance with relevant regulations related to future installation of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure in residential and non-residential structures;
- Indoor water use consumption is reduced through the establishment of maximum fixture water use rates;
- Outdoor landscaping must comply with the California Department of Water Resources’ Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO), or a local ordinance, whichever is more stringent, to reduce outdoor water use;
- Diversion of 65 percent of construction and demolition waste from landfills;
- Mandatory periodic inspections of energy systems (i.e., heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies;
- Mandatory use of low-pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring, and particle board; and
- For some single-family and low-rise residential development developed after January 1, 2020, mandatory on-site solar energy systems capable of producing

100 percent of the electricity demand created by the residence(s). Certain residential developments, including those developments that are subject to substantial shading, rendering the use of on-site solar photovoltaic systems infeasible, are exempted from the foregoing requirement.

### **Building Energy Efficiency Standards**

The 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards is a portion of the CBSC, which expands upon energy-efficiency measures from the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards are in effect for building permit applications submitted after January 1, 2020.

The 2019 standards provide for additional efficiency improvements beyond the current 2016 standards. Non-residential buildings built in compliance with the 2019 standards are anticipated to use approximately 30 percent less energy compared to the 2016 standards, primarily due to lighting upgrades.<sup>4</sup>

For residential buildings, compliance with the 2019 standards will use approximately seven percent energy due to energy efficiency measures compared to homes built under the 2016 standards. Once rooftop solar electricity generation is factored in, homes built under the 2019 standards will use approximately 53 percent less energy than those under the 2016 standards.

### **Construction Energy Use**

Construction activities associated with future multi-family development identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would involve energy demand and consumption related to the use of oil in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel for construction worker vehicle trips, hauling and material delivery truck trips, and operation of off-road construction equipment. In addition, diesel-fueled portable generators may be necessary to provide additional electricity demands for temporary on-site lighting, welding, and for supplying energy to areas of the site where energy supply cannot be met via a hookup to the existing electricity grid. Use of natural gas appliances or equipment would not be required.

The CARB has prepared the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan), which builds upon previous efforts to reduce GHG emissions and is designed to continue to shift the California economy away from dependence on fossil fuels. Appendix B of the 2017 Scoping Plan includes examples of local actions (municipal code changes, zoning changes, policy directions, and mitigation measures) that would support the State's climate goals. The examples provided include, but are not limited to, enforcing idling time restrictions for construction vehicles, utilizing existing grid power for electric energy rather than operating temporary gasoline/diesel-powered generators, and increasing use of electric and renewable fuel-powered construction equipment. All construction equipment used for future construction activities on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties would be required to comply with the CARB's In-Use Off Road regulation, which is consistent with the intention of the 2017 Scoping Plan and the recommended actions included in Appendix B of the 2017 Scoping Plan.

Based on the above, temporary energy use associated with future construction of multi-family development identified in the 4-Year Housing Element would not result in a

---

<sup>4</sup> California Energy Commission. *Title 24 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards FAQ*. November 2018.

significant increase in peak or base demands or require additional capacity from local or regional energy supplies. Construction activities would be required to comply with all applicable regulations related to energy conservation and fuel efficiency, which would help to reduce the temporary increase in demand.

### **Operational Energy Use**

Energy use associated with operation of future multi-family development identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be typical of residential uses, requiring electricity for interior and exterior building lighting, operation of stoves, kitchen and cleaning appliances, security systems, and more. Maintenance activities during operations, such as landscape maintenance, could involve the use of electric or gas-powered equipment. In addition to on-site energy uses, the proposed project could result in transportation energy use associated with vehicle trips generated by the future multi-family residences

Future development would be subject to all relevant provisions of the most recent update of the CBSC, including the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Adherence to the most recent CALGreen Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards would ensure that future multi-family development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties would consume energy efficiently. Required compliance with the CBSC would ensure that the building energy use associated with such future development would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. In addition, electricity supplied to the residences by PG&E would comply with the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), which requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total procurement by 2020 and to 60 percent by 2030. Thus, a portion of the energy consumed during operations would originate from renewable sources.

Based on the above, compliance with the State's latest Energy Efficiency Standards would ensure that future multi-family residential development identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would implement all necessary energy efficiency regulations.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Thus, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a.i-iv. According to the Wheatland General Plan EIR, the City of Wheatland lies within a moderately seismic region. The City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone (AP Zone) nor is any active fault near the City. The closest AP Zone is the Bangor Quadrangle, including the AP Zone for the Cleveland Hill Fault to which the 1975 Oroville earthquake is attributed. The Bangor Quadrangle zone is located 27 miles north of the City. The next nearest active fault is the Dunnigan Hills fault, located 35 miles southwest of the City. The closest branches of the seismically active San Andreas Fault system are the Green Valley and Rodgers Creek faults located approximately 60 to 70 miles southwest of the City. The San Andreas Fault is located approximately 100 miles to the west. Given that the City does not contain any known faults or trace lines, fault rupture hazard is not a significant geologic hazard for development within the City.

Liquefaction, settlement, ground lurching, ground displacement along the fault line, and landslides are often the secondary effects of earthquakes. Areas found throughout the City of Wheatland may be more susceptible to liquefaction during seismic events if perched ground water conditions are present. The degree of liquefaction would in part depend on groundwater conditions at specific sites. In addition, the Wheatland General Plan Background Report states that a portion of the County, which includes the Wheatland area, is potentially susceptible to liquefaction because the area underlain by unconsolidated sands and finer grained materials. Water-saturated, clay-free sediments

in the most recent Holocene unit are generally expected to have a high susceptibility to liquefaction.

The 4-Year Housing Element does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals that would impact geology or soils of the City. While the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required per State law would allow for future multi-family residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, all future development would be required to comply with the goals and policies set forth in the City's General Plan relating to seismic and geologic hazards, including liquefaction, as well as all other applicable federal and State policies and standards, including the CBSC. The CBSC provides minimum standards to ensure that future structures would be designed using sound engineering practices and appropriate engineering standards for the seismic area in which the multi-family sites are located. Projects designed in accordance with the CBSC should be able to: 1) resist minor earthquakes without damage; 2) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage, but with some non-structural damage; and 3) resist major earthquakes without collapse, but with some structural, as well as non-structural, damage. Although conformance with the CBSC does not guarantee that substantial structural damage would not occur in the event of a maximum magnitude earthquake, conformance with the CBSC can reasonably be assumed to ensure that the future multi-family structures would be survivable, allowing occupants to safely evacuate in the event of a major earthquake. Furthermore, none of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update contain steep slopes that would be subject to substantial landslide hazards.

Based on the above, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur related to seismic rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and landslides.

- b. Issues related to erosion are discussed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this IS/MND. As noted therein, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Thus, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.
- c. As noted above, the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update are relatively level, and the sites are not located on or near any slopes. In addition, all future development would be required to comply with applicable standards included in the CBSC related to seismic and geologic safety. Therefore, future multi-family development occurring on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties would not be subject to risk from landslide, liquefaction, or seismic settlement.

Lateral spreading is horizontal/lateral ground movement of relatively flat-lying soil deposits towards a free face such as an excavation, channel, or open body of water; typically, lateral spreading is associated with liquefaction of one or more subsurface layers near the bottom of the exposed slope. The amount of movement depends on the soil strength, duration and intensity of seismic shaking, topography, and free face geometry. Given that the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update do not contain any free faces, the potential for lateral spreading to pose a risk to future development on such sites is negligible.

Based on the above, the proposed project would result in a ***less-than-significant*** impact related to being 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. Expansive soils can undergo significant volume change with changes in moisture content. Specifically, such soils shrink and harden when dried and expand and soften when wetted. Expansive soils can shrink or swell and cause heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements, and structures founded on shallow foundation. Building damage due to volume changes associated with expansive soil can be reduced by a variety of solutions. If structures are underlain by expansive soils, foundation systems must be capable of tolerating or resisting any potentially damaging soil movements, and building foundation areas must be properly drained. Exposed soils must be kept moist prior to placement of concrete for foundation construction.

As stated in the City's General Plan EIR, impacts related to expansive soils in parts of the planning area may be eliminated when specific development projects are proposed by conducting engineering tests to determine the proper design criteria. Roadways and sidewalks can be designed in areas of clayey soils to accept the estimated degree of soil contraction, expansion, and settlement potential determined from on-site soils testing, according to standards provided by the CBSC.

While the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required per State law would allow for future multi-family residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, development of such sites with residential uses has been previously anticipated by the City and risks related to expansive soils were analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR, and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR. Future development of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would not result in an increased disturbance area relative to what has been anticipated by the City. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur related to proposed structures being located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code, thereby creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

- e. Future multi-family development related to the 4-Year Housing Element Update would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, **no impact** would result.
- f. The potential exists for unknown paleontological resources to exist within the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update. The potential for such resources to be impacted by residential development within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties and Site C have been previously analyzed in the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR, respectively. Furthermore, development within the remaining sites has been generally anticipated by the City's General Plan and potential impacts have been analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR concluded that buildout of the General Plan could result in the destruction or damage of paleontological resources, but with implementation of applicable General Plan policies, impacts would be less than significant. Development of the identified sites at a higher density than previously anticipated would not result in an increase in the likelihood that paleontological resources would be disturbed because the area of disturbance within each site would generally remain the same, despite the increased allowable density.

Although the proposed project would not be anticipated to increase the likelihood that paleontological resources would be disturbed because paleontological resources may exist within the City's Planning Area, future development within the identified sites would have the potential to result in the direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource, and a ***potentially significant*** impact could occur.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the above potential impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

VII-1            *Implement Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2.*

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a,b. Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on Earth. An individual project’s GHG emissions are at a micro-scale level relative to global emissions and effects to global climate change; however, an individual project could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact. As such, impacts related to emissions of GHG are inherently considered cumulative impacts.

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr).

On December 11, 2018 the City of Wheatland City Council adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The City’s CAP provides a planning framework that ensures that emissions within the City are controlled in compliance with the legislative goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32. The CAP includes Emissions Reduction Strategies that target emissions from specific sectors, such as transportation, energy consumption, water use, and solid waste disposal.

The proposed project would aid the City in achieving several of the measures included within the CAP. For example, Land Use Measure 2 directs the City to comply with existing state laws related to the provision of affordable housing within the City. The proposed project is specifically intended to meet State housing laws, and would aid the City in fulfilling Land Use Measure 2. In addition, Land Use Measure 1 and Land Use Measure 3 encourage the reuse of underutilized lots, as well as the implementation of sustainable growth principles. The proposed project would support both measures by allowing development at higher densities in locations that are in proximity to existing services within the City.

In addition to the measures highlighted above, future developments within the City would be required to complete the Sustainability Checklist mandated by the City’s CAP. The CAP

intended that Sustainability Checklists be integrated into the City's development review process. Consequently, as development proposals for the identified sites are brought forward, the proposed developments would be required to demonstrate consistency with the City's CAP. By maintaining consistency with the City's CAP, development within the identified sites would comply with all existing regulations related to the reduction of GHG emissions.

In conclusion, implementation of the proposed project would aid implementation of the City's CAP, and future development within the identified sites would be further required to comply with all relevant standards within the City's CAP and Sustainability Checklist. Consequently, the project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-d. The 4-Year Housing Element Update would not directly involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. While the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City’s 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, residential uses are not typically associated with typically associated with the routine transport, use, disposal, or generation of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Maintenance and operation of the proposed hotel may use common household cleaning products, fertilizers, and herbicides on-site, any of which could contain potentially hazardous chemicals; however, such products would be expected to be used in accordance with label instructions. Due to the regulations governing use of such products and the amount anticipated to be used in conjunction with future multi-family development, routine use of such products would not represent a substantial risk to public health or the environment.

Construction activities associated with future development of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would involve the use of heavy equipment, which would contain fuels and oils, and various other products such as concrete, paints, and adhesives. Small quantities of potentially toxic substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site and transported to and from the site during construction. However, the contractors would be required to comply with all California Health and Safety Codes and local City ordinances regulating the handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials. Thus, future construction activities on the multi-family sites

would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment.

In addition, per the EnviroStor database, Sites A through F are not located on or adjacent to any sites included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>5</sup> The Envirostor Database includes information provided by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and included in the State's Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List, which is compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In the event that currently unknown hazardous materials are discovered during construction on the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update, construction would cease until such materials have been remediated in accordance with State and local requirements. Such standards have been designed to eliminate or minimize to an acceptable level the potential health impacts associated with human exposure to hazardous materials.

Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment. In addition, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

- e. Beale Air Force Base is located approximately eight miles northeast of the City of Wheatland. The airport land use zones for Beale Air Force Base are located approximately six miles north of the city limits.

The Wheatland study area is located at the edge of the Beale Air Force Base Overflight Zone; therefore, the City is subject to some development restrictions under the Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Safety. According to the Beale Air Force Base Overflight Guidelines, the following types of development should be restricted: chemical and allied products manufacturing; petroleum refining; rubber and plastics manufacturing; regional shopping centers; colleges and universities; hospitals; jails and detention centers; motion picture theater complexes; professional sport developments; stadiums and arenas; auditoriums; concert halls and amphitheaters; fairgrounds and expositions; racetracks; and theme parks. Adoption of the 4-Year Housing Element Update and implementation of associated programs would not directly result in the development of any of the aforementioned uses. In addition, future buildout of Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation multi-family properties would adhere to federal and State regulations, as well as General Plan goals and policies, related to airport land use plans. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact related to a conflict with airport land use plans.

- f. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include site-specific development proposals, and any future residential development projects within the City would be required to adhere to City regulations regarding emergency access. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with an emergency evacuation or response plan, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

---

<sup>5</sup> Department of Toxic Substances Control *EnviroStor*. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=wheatland%2C+ca>. Accessed March 2020.

- g. Issues related to wildfire hazards are discussed in Section XX, Wildfire, of this Initial Study. As noted therein, the multi-family sites identified for future multi-family development in the 4-Year Housing Element Update are not located within or adjacent to any Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.<sup>6</sup> In addition, according to the City's General Plan EIR, the agricultural areas on the valley floor are the least fire-prone areas of the County, due to the presence of croplands, orchards, and irrigation. The relatively flat terrain of the proposed study area also makes the danger of wildland fires less hazardous. As wildland fires resulting from either natural or manmade causes occur in forest, brush, or grasslands, Wheatland is among the most fire secure areas in Yuba County. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands, and a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. *Yuba County, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*. October 5, 2007.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a. Construction of future residential development on Sites A through F, as well as the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, would likely include grading and vegetation removal activities that may increase soil erosion rates on the sites. Grading operations may impact the surface runoff by increasing the amount of silt and debris carried by runoff. In addition, refueling and parking of construction equipment and other vehicles on-site during construction may result in oil, grease, or related pollutant leaks and spills that may discharge into the City’s storm drains. Improper handling, storage, or disposal of fuels and materials or improper cleaning of machinery close to area waterways could cause water quality degradation. Measures included in subsequent grading plans for future residential development projects requiring grading would be required to comply with the City’s Site Development Code, drainage requirements, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program, as well as employ best management practices for the prevention of erosion and the control of loose soil and sediment, to ensure that construction does not result in the movement of unwanted material into waters within or outside that particular project site. Implementation of Policy 5.E.5 would ensure that future drainage system requirements would comply with applicable State and federal pollutant discharge requirements.

Although construction of the future residential development associated with implementation of the 4-Year Housing Element Update could result in impacts associated with water quality, the proposed project does not involve any proposals for physical development. In addition, while the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to

meet the City's 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments would not result in an increased disturbance area relative to what has been previously anticipated by the City, and future development would be required to implement General Plan goals and policies related to hydrology, water quality, and drainage, as well as comply with all applicable federal, State, and local water quality regulations.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in the violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality, and a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

- b,e The City of Wheatland is situated within the South Yuba Sub-basin which lies within the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin. The South Yuba Sub-basin is bounded on the north by the Yuba River, which separates the South Yuba Sub-basin from the North Yuba Subbasin, on the west by the Feather River, on the south by the Bear River, and on the east by the Sierra Nevada. The *California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118-80* documents that the South Yuba Sub-basin is not considered to be in overdraft and that groundwater levels within the sub-basin are continuing to increase to near historic high elevations due to increasing surface water irrigation supplies and reduced groundwater pumping.

Groundwater within the South Yuba Subbasin is managed by the *Yuba Subbasins Water Management Plan: A Groundwater Sustainability Plan* (Yuba Subbasins GSP), a product of three Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs): the Cordua Irrigation District, the Yuba Water Agency, and the City of Marysville.<sup>7</sup> Per the Yuba Subbasins GSP, regional groundwater quality in the Yuba Subbasins is considered good to excellent for municipal, domestic, and agricultural uses and does not have a significant adverse impact on the beneficial uses of groundwater in the subbasins. In addition, groundwater extraction in the Yuba Subbasins does not exceed sustainable yield.

While the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City's 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments would not result in an increased disturbance area relative to what has been previously anticipated by the City, and, thus, the proposed project would not substantially impede groundwater recharge. In addition, although future buildout of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would result in a slight increase in demand for water supplies relative to what has been previously anticipated by the City, such increases would be relatively minor and would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater management efforts for the South Yuba Subbasin. Per the Yuba Subbasins GSP, while groundwater pumping may exceed sustainable yield during certain years, balanced by other years with reduced pumping generally ensures that the long-term average remains at or below the sustainable yield.

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the South Yuba Subbasin. In addition, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Yuba Subbasins GSP. Thus, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cordua Irrigation District, Yuba Water Agency, City of Marysville. *Yuba Subbasins Water Management Plan: A Groundwater Sustainability Plan*. December 2019.

- c.i-iii. The proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City's 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties. Such development would involve the creation of new impervious surfaces, which would alter the existing drainage patterns of the sites. However, the proposed project does not involve any proposals for physical development. In addition, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments would not result in an increased disturbance area relative to what has been previously anticipated by the City; thus, the proposed project would not result in increased stormwater runoff volumes relative to what has been analyzed in prior environmental documents. All future residential development associated with the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be subject to the General Plan policies and municipal regulations related to runoff management and low impact design, and would be subject to payment of the City's storm drainage development impact fee. Therefore, adoption of the 4-Year Housing Element Update and implementation of associated programs would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the City, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site, 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. Consequently, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.
- c.iv. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map the identified sites are located in a variety of flood hazard areas.<sup>8</sup> Sites F and B, as well as portions of Site E and D are located in areas that are not classified as a Special Flood Hazard Area or otherwise located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. The remaining portion of Site E, all of Site C, and all of the sites within the Johnson Rancho are located in sites zoned X due to the presence of levees. A portion of Site D and all of Site A are located in Special Flood Hazard Area Zone A.<sup>9</sup>

Based on the above, Sites B, C, D, E, and all of the sites within the Johnson Rancho would not be subject to flood hazards. However, portions of Site D and all of Site A are within a Special Flood Hazard Area A, and, thus, future development within either site could be exposed to risks from flood hazards. Chapter 15.20, Floodplain Management, of the City of Wheatland Municipal Code establishes standards for developments within floodplains. Thus, development within Sites D and A would be subject to all relevant restrictions within the City's Municipal Code.

Despite the required compliance of future development within Sites D and A with the City's Municipal Code requirements related to development within floodplains, due to the location of a portion of Site D and all of Site A within a flood hazard zone, a **potentially significant** impact could occur due to implementation of the proposed project.

#### Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the above potential impact to a **less-than-significant** level.

---

<sup>8</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency. *FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address*. Available at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=wheatland%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed March 2020.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

X-1 *Prior to Improvement Plan approval or issuance of building permits for Sites D and A, a Hydrology Study must be submitted to the City Engineer demonstrating the project's compliance with all relevant sections of the City's Municipal Code and applicable federal standards (such as those established by FEMA). Compliance with FEMA standards may include obtaining a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) or Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) for fill within a Special Flood Hazard Area, if required. A copy of the letter shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Division. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), or a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA shall be submitted to the City's Engineer prior to acceptance of project improvements as complete.*

- d. As discussed under question 'c.iv' above, a portion of Site D and all of Site A are located within flood hazard zones. Consequently, future development at both sites could be subject to flooding. Although future development at the foregoing sites could be subject to flooding, residential developments do not typically involve the use or storage of substantial amounts of pollutants that could result in impacts to water quality should flooding occur. Moreover, both sites were previously anticipated for residential development, and any pollutant related risks related to flooding would not be made more severe by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not pose a risk related to the release of pollutants due to project inundation due to flooding, tsunami, or seiche, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a. The future multi-family development sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element update are currently anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City. In addition, Sites A, B, D, E, and F are bordered by existing residential development. Site C, as well as the Johnson Rancho Hop Farm Annexation multi-family properties, have been previously analyzed for development with residential uses per the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR. Thus, buildout of Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho Hop Farm Annexation multi-family properties consistent with the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments would represent a continuation of existing development trends, and would not divide an established community. In addition, the 4-Year Housing Element Update does not include any specific development proposals. As such, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.
  
- b. The 4-Year Housing Element Update has been designed to ensure fulfillment of the City’s share of the RHNA, as determined by SACOG, and to meet applicable HCD requirements related to provision of affordable housing within the City. While the proposed project is required to include GPAs and Zoning Amendments in order to meet the unaccommodated need requirements from the 4th Cycle (2006-2013), such entitlements, if approved, would not result in conflicts with the City’s General Plan or Zoning Code.

As discussed throughout this IS/MND, the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental effects that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by the mitigation measures provided herein. In addition, future residential development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be required to be consistent with all applicable development standards established in the City’s Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact in excess of what has already been analyzed and anticipated in the General Plan EIR, and would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. Thus, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>

**Discussion**

a,b. According to the Yuba County General Plan Environmental Setting and Background Report (ESBR), mineral resources present in the County include precious metals, copper, zinc, Fullers earth, sand and gravel, and crushed stone. However, the City of Wheatland is located outside of the recognized Mineral Land Classification Area as identified in the Yuba County General Plan ESBR. In addition, the 4-Year Housing Element is a policy-level document that does include any development proposals. Therefore, **no impact** to mineral resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

**XIII. NOISE.**

*Would the project result in:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✗</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✗</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✗</b>

**Discussion**

a,b. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others, and, thus, are referred to as sensitive noise receptors. Land uses often associated with sensitive noise receptors generally include residences, schools, libraries, hospitals, and passive recreational areas. Noise sensitive land uses are typically given special attention in order to achieve protection from excessive noise.

Generally, the primary noise source associated with residential development is traffic noise; residential uses do not typically involve generation of substantial on-site noise level increases. Given that the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy level document, implementation of the proposed project would not directly result in the generation of increased noise levels within the City, and would not expose sensitive receptors to excess noise levels. As discussed previously, while the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City’s 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, such sites have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City, and associated environmental effects related to noise and vibration have been evaluated in the General Plan EIR, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR, and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR. Future development of the multi-family sites under the updated General Plan land use and zoning standards proposed as part of the 4-Year Housing Element Update would not result in substantial traffic noise level increases relative to what has been considered in previous environmental documents. In addition, given that the overall disturbance area associated with future construction activities on the multi-family sites would not increase as a result of the proposed project, construction noise and vibration associated with future buildout would not be altered from what has been previously anticipated.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the City’s General Plan and the Municipal Code. Thus, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

c. The nearest airport to the City of Wheatland is the Beale Air Force Base, located approximately eight miles northeast of the city limits. Per the Beale Air Force Base Land

Use Compatibility Plan (LUCP), the City is located within the Airport Influence Area associated with the airstrip, within Review Area 2.<sup>10</sup> Review Area 2 encompasses the airspace protection surfaces and Recorded Overflight Notification Area. However, the City is located outside of the 60 decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour designated in the LUCP. Therefore, future residential development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update and associated programs would not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive airport noise levels. Thus, **no impact** would occur.

---

<sup>10</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *Beale Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Approved March 2011.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>

**Discussion**

a. The 4-Year Housing Element Update contains housing goals and programs intended to help meet the City’s affordable housing needs. Generally, the proposed project is intended to accommodate existing growth trends within the area, rather than induce growth. Accounting for both the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle and 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle planning periods, the RHNA accommodated by the 4-Year Housing Element is 826 units. As discussed in Chapter 2, Existing Conditions and Demographic Data, of the 4-Year Housing Element Update, the City of Wheatland is projected to have a population of 3,645 persons and a housing stock of 1,276 units by 2021, resulting in an average household size of approximately 2.86. Based on an average household size of 2.86 and an RHNA of 826, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to increase the City’s population by 2,362 persons.

However, as stated previously, the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals. Future housing development occurring within the City, including future buildout of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update, would occur in response to market demand, and is not a direct result of the proposed project. In addition, Sites A, B, D, E, and F are bordered by existing residential development. Site C, as well as the Johnson Rancho Hop Farm Annexation multi-family properties, have been previously analyzed for development with residential uses per the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR. Thus, future development of such sites is unlikely to require the extension of major infrastructure.

Furthermore, while the proposed project includes GPAs and Zoning Amendments that would increase the development potential of Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation multi-family properties, such entitlements are required by the State in order for HCD to consider certification of the 4-Year Housing Element Update. Given that the growth allowed under the 4-Year Housing Element is consistent with regional housing needs projections, and such growth would be guided by the goals, policies, and programs included in the Housing Element, the proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

b. The future multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update are currently vacant and do not include existing housing or other habitable structures. As such, the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

*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:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-e. The 4-Year Housing Element Update includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet Wheatland’s affordable housing needs. Subsequent residential development projects occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update, including potential construction of affordable housing on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, could result in an increase in demand for public services. However, the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals.

While the proposed project would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City and analyzed in the General Plan EIR and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR.<sup>11</sup> Any future development on such sites would be subject to payment of applicable development impact fees at the time of building permit issuance, including the City’s Law Enforcement Facilities Fee, Fire Protection Facilities Fee, General Government Facilities Fee, and Parkland Facilities Fee. In addition, future development would be subject to payment of school impact fees collected by the Wheatland Elementary School District and the Wheatland High School District.. Proposition 1A/SB 50 prohibits local agencies from using the inadequacy of school facilities as a basis for denying or conditioning approvals of any “[...] legislative or adjudicative act...involving ...the planning, use, or development of real property” (Government Code 65996(b)). Satisfaction of the Proposition 1A/SB 50 statutory requirements by a developer is deemed to be “full and complete mitigation.”

Payment of applicable fees by future developers would help to fund ongoing provision of public services within the City. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

<sup>11</sup> City of Wheatland. *Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation, SCH# 2008082127*. Certified August 14, 2012.

**XVI. RECREATION.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a,b. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document, which encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, but does not include any specific development proposals. Future residential development consistent with the 4-Year Housing Element Update could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, as discussed previously, future development would be subject to payment of the City’s Parkland Facilities Fee, which is used to fund the construction of new park and recreation facilities within the City. In addition, all future residential development involving subdivision of land is subject to compliance with Section 17.09.090 of the City’s Municipal Code. Thus, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur with regard to recreation facilities.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a. A discussion of potential impacts related to roadway facilities, transit facilities and services, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities is provided below.

**Roadway Facilities**

The Policy 2.A.2 of the City’s General Plan establishes Level of Service (LOS) C or better as the roadway standard for all roadways, except within one-quarter mile of state highways. In such areas, the operations standard is LOS D or better or better. LOS is a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions as they relate to the traffic stream and perceptions by motorists and passengers. The LOS generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, delays, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, convenience and safety. The operational LOS are given letter designations from A to F, with A representing the best operating conditions (free-flow) and F the worst (severely congested flow with high delays). Intersections generally are the capacity-controlling locations with respect to traffic operations on arterial and collector streets.

The 4-Year Housing Element Update includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet Wheatland’s affordable housing needs. Subsequent residential development projects could result in an increase in traffic on City roadways and a decrease in level of service on those roadways. However, the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals. While the 4-Year Housing Element would not directly induce new residential development, the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments required to meet the City’s 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle unaccommodated need could allow for increased future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties. Future buildout of such sites with multi-family residential uses would result in increased vehicle traffic on local roadways. However, given that the multi-family sites are distributed throughout the City, vehicle traffic would not be concentrated in any one area. In addition, the multi-family sites have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses per the City and analyzed in the General Plan EIR and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR. Thus, relative to what has been analyzed in such previous EIRs, the proposed project would be unlikely to result in new or more severe impacts related to conflicts with the City’s LOS goals.

Furthermore, since the establishment of the City’s LOS standards, the Third Appellate District court published an opinion (December 18, 2019) regarding *Citizens for Positive Growth & Preservation v. City of Sacramento* (2019). Among other points, Citizens

challenged the City of Sacramento's adoption of its General Plan based on its use of the LOS metric instead of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric in the transportation impacts section. In 2018, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency promulgated and certified CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 to implement Public Resources Code section 21099(b)(2). The Court held that the plain language of Public Resources Code section 21099(b)(2) provides that "[u]pon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion *shall not be considered a significant impact* on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any." On this basis, the Court concluded that the General Plan's LOS determinations could not constitute a significant environmental impact. Based on the above, the analysis presented within this IS/MND focuses primarily on VMT effects associated with implementation of the 4-Year Housing Element and associated programs, as opposed to LOS. Impacts related to VMT are evaluated under question 'b' below.

### **Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities**

Transit services are provided to the Wheatland area by Yuba-Sutter Transit. Yuba-Sutter Transit offers regular fixed route service to the communities of Yuba City, Marysville, Olivehurst, and Linda. Limited route deviation service is provided to the Yuba County foothills and to the cities of Live Oak and Wheatland. The Wheatland Route offers two roundtrips into Marysville and Linda on Tuesdays and Thursdays under a reimbursable contract to the City. Transfers to routes serving Sacramento and Yuba City are available.

Currently the following five designated stops exist on the Wheatland Route:

- Spruce Avenue/Evergreen Drive;
- SR 65/3<sup>rd</sup> Street;
- Main Street/C Street;
- Anderson Way/McCurry Street; and
- Donner Trail Manor (121 C Street).

Future development occurring consistent with the 4-Year Housing Element Update has the potential to increase demand for transit services within the City. However, Yuba-Sutter Transit would likely scale up services within the City in response to such increases in demand. In addition, the proposed project does not include any specific development proposals that would conflict with existing transit services. With regard to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the multi-family development sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update have been previously anticipated for buildout with residential uses by the City. As such, the City has previously anticipated bicycle and pedestrian improvements necessary to serve such sites. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any existing or planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in new conflicts with applicable City standards related to roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Thus, a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.

- b. Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. Per Section 15064.3, analysis of VMT attributable to a project is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Except as provided in Section 15064.3 (b)(2) regarding roadway capacity, a project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. It should be noted that currently, the provisions of Section 15064.3 apply only prospectively; determination of impacts based on VMT is not required Statewide until July 1, 2020.

Per Section 15064.3(3), a lead agency may analyze a project's VMT qualitatively based on the availability of transit, proximity to destinations, etc. As discussed previously, while the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for development with residential uses by the City. Per the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), higher density residential uses are generally associated with lower per capita VMT compared to low-density uses.<sup>12</sup> In addition, as noted previously, Sites A, B, D, E, and F are surrounded by existing development, thereby potentially reducing distances between future housing and workplaces, retail businesses, and other amenities and destinations. Accordingly, adding affordable housing to infill locations generally shortens commutes and reduces VMT.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, future residents would have access to Yuba-Sutter Transit services within the City. Thus, the proposed project would help to further the State's goals of reducing VMT.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

- c,d. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does the Housing Element grant any entitlements for development that would result in design hazards or affect emergency access within the City of Wheatland. While the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for development with residential uses by the City, and the proposed project would not alter future access to such sites. Future residential development projects would be required to comply with applicable City engineering standards related to access and roadway design.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses, or result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

---

<sup>12</sup> Office of Planning and Research. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA* [pg. 12]. December 2018.

<sup>13</sup> Office of Planning and Research. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA* [pg. 14]. December 2018.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

*Would the project 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:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a,b. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this IS/MND, the future multi-family sites identified by the 4-Year Housing Element Update within the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation properties and Site C have been previously analyzed in the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR, respectively; both EIRs evaluated potential impacts related to tribal cultural resources. In addition, a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File did not identify any known tribal cultural resources within the City’s Sphere of Influence, which includes all sites anticipated for future development in the 4-Year Housing Element Update.<sup>14</sup>

While the proposed GPAs and Zoning Amendments could increase the future development intensity of such sites, the proposed project would not increase the overall disturbance area relative to what has been previously anticipated in prior environmental documents. In addition, future projects would be required to adhere to federal and State regulations associated with protection of cultural resources and implement General Plan goals and policies associated with cultural resources. However, future ground-disturbing activities may have the potential to uncover buried cultural deposits, including tribal cultural resources, at Sites A, B, D, E, and F.

In compliance with SB 18, project notification letters were distributed on March 5, 2020 to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria, the Tsi Akim Maidu, the Strawberry Rancheria, the Esttom Yumeka Maidu tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria, and the Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians. In addition, in compliance with AB 52 (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1), a project notification letter was distributed to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. Responses requesting formal consultation have not been received at this time.

<sup>14</sup> Native American Heritage Commission. *City of Wheatland Housing Element Update Project, Yuba County.* December 13, 2016.

Based on the above, the possibility exists that construction of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource if previously unknown tribal cultural resources are uncovered during grading or other ground-disturbing activities at Sites A, B, D, E, and F. Thus, a ***potentially significant*** impact to tribal cultural resources could occur.

**Mitigation Measure(s)**

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the above potential impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

XVIII-1        *Implement Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2.*

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.**

*Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals and, thus, the proposed project would not directly result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities. Future development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be subject to payment of applicable City fees used to fund new utility connections and necessary utility improvements.

While the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho properties, as required by State law, such sites have been previously anticipated for development with residential uses by the City, and associated impacts related to water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities have been evaluated in the General Plan EIR, the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation EIR, and the Heritage Oaks Estates Project EIR. Given that City has previously anticipated extension of utility infrastructure to the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update, the proposed project would not require substantial utility improvements relative to buildout of such sites under the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations. Furthermore, future development proposals would be reviewed by the appropriate service agencies as part of the development application review process in order to ensure that sufficient capacity in all utilities would be available to maintain desired service levels.

Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact related to 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.

- b. As discussed previously, water supplies within the City of Wheatland are provided solely through groundwater sources; specifically, the South Yuba Subbasin. Per the Yuba Subbasins GSP, regional groundwater quality in the Yuba Subbasins is considered good to excellent for municipal, domestic, and agricultural uses and does not have a significant adverse impact on the beneficial uses of groundwater in the subbasins. In addition, groundwater extraction in the Yuba Subbasins does not exceed sustainable yield. Although future buildout of the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update would result in a slight increase in demand for water supplies relative to what has been previously anticipated by the City, such increases would be relatively minor and would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater management efforts for the South Yuba Subbasin. Per the Yuba Subbasins GSP, while groundwater pumping may exceed sustainable yield during certain years, balanced by other years with reduced pumping generally ensures that the long-term average remains at or below the sustainable yield. Generally, the City has found that water supply is not a limiting factor for new residential development. Therefore, the City would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the future development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update during normal, dry, and multiple dry years, and a ***less-than-significant*** impact would occur.
- c. The Public Works Department operates the City's sanitary sewer collection and Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) system. The WWTP is situated on a 2.1-acre parcel at the southern edge of the community adjacent to the Bear River levee, with an area on the south side of the levee for infiltration of treated water. The WWTP was originally constructed in 1969 and was upgraded in 1990 and 2008. The plant consists of a headworks facility with sewage combination grinder/screen/screenings compactor unit, an oxidation ditch, a secondary clarifier, an effluent pump station, a return-activated-sludge (RAS) and waste-activated-sludge (WAS) pump station, an aerated sludge storage basin and three sludge drying beds. In 2004, CH<sub>2</sub>MHill concluded that the capacity of the WWTP was limited by the organic load treatment capacity.

Improvements to the WWTP in 2008 included a new grinder/screen/screenings compactor unit, new oxidation ditch disc aerators, new RAS, WAS and effluent pumps, and a new supervisor-control-data-acquisition (SCADA) system. However, the improvements in 2008 did not increase the capacity of the facility.

Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board-Central Valley Region (RWQCB) permit the WWTP to discharge an average dry weather flow (ADWF) of 0.62 mgd. The WWTP currently discharges treated wastewater to percolation and evaporation ponds located within the Bear River floodplain. RWQCB staff has indicated that the future WDRs would unlikely permit the continued use of these basins unless (1) the elevations of levees surrounding the basins are raised above the 100-year flood elevation; and (2) the City demonstrates that hydraulic connection does not exist between the infiltration basins and the Bear River. A review of data obtained from monitoring wells near the existing infiltration basins indicates that such a hydraulic separation could exist.

As mentioned above, the existing WWTP has a permitted design treatment capacity of 0.62 mgd ADWF. The ADWF for the existing WWTP for 2008-2009 was 0.29 mgd; therefore, the existing WWTP is adequate to meet the current demands of the City.

However, the current capacity of 0.62 mgd ADWF is not adequate to meet the WWTP demands within the existing City limits when full buildout occurs, which includes serving the Heritage Oaks Estates, Jones Ranch, and the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Projects should these projects ultimately be constructed. According to the Wheatland General Plan Update Sewer Collection System Master Plan, prepared by TLA Engineers and updated by Au Clair Consulting for the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Annexation Project in May 2010, the projected ADWF from the entire City limits, including the recently annexed Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm Project, is 8.98 mgd.

As a result, in order for adequate wastewater service to be provided for buildout of the entire City, including the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update, either a new WWTP would need to be constructed or the existing WWTP would need to be improved. However, in accordance with the requirements of SB 1087, the City would give priority in the sewer connection pool to affordable housing development projects. The City, upon adoption of the 4-Year Housing Element Update, would coordinate with service providers to establish written procedures to make sewer and water connections available to affordable housing projects on a priority basis. Further, the 4-Year Housing Element Update would be forwarded to the wastewater treatment manager, upon adoption by the City.

It should be noted that with the City's recent conservation measures, the current ADWF for the existing WWTP has been reduced, which allows for additional capacity to meet the City's RHNA. The City will continue implementing conservation measures to allow for increased capacity and to give affordable housing development projects priority for services.

Based on the above, the City would have adequate capacity to serve the wastewater demand associated with future construction of affordable housing on the multi-family sites identified in the 4-Year Housing Element Update, in addition to the City's existing commitments, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

- d,e. The City of Wheatland is served by the Recology Ostrom Road Landfill. The Recology Ostrom Road Landfill has a maximum permitted daily throughput of 3,000 tons, with a remaining capacity of 39,223,000 cubic yards (approximately 90 percent of the maximum permitted capacity). The anticipated closure date for the landfill is 2066.<sup>15</sup>

As discussed previously, the 4-Year Housing Element Update includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet Wheatland's affordable housing needs, but does not include any specific development proposals. While the proposed GPA and Zoning Amendments would allow for an increased amount of future residential development on Sites A through F and the Johnson Rancho properties, as required by State law, any increases in solid waste generation associated with future development of such sites would be accommodated by the substantial remaining capacity at the Recology Ostrom Road Landfill. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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 and would comply with federal, State, and local management and

---

<sup>15</sup> CalRecycle. *SWIS Facility Detail, Recology Ostrom Road LF Inf. (58-AA-0011)*. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/58-AA-0011/Detail/>. Accessed March 2020.

reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Thus, a ***less-than-significant*** impact related to solid waste would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**XX. WILDFIRE.**

*If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a-d. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Fire and Resource Assessment Program, the multi-family sites identified for future multi-family development in the 4-Year Housing Element Update are not located within or adjacent to any Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or State Responsibility Areas.<sup>16</sup> In addition, according to the City’s General Plan EIR, the agricultural areas on the valley floor are the least fire-prone areas of the County, due to the presence of croplands, orchards, and irrigation. The relatively flat terrain of the proposed study area also makes the danger of wildland fires less hazardous. As wildland fires resulting from either natural or manmade causes occur in forest, brush, or grasslands, Wheatland is among the most fire secure areas in Yuba County. Furthermore, while not located in an area of high wildfire risk, future multi-family development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update would include fire sprinklers, as required by State law. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to be subject to or result in substantial adverse effects related to wildfires, and a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

---

<sup>16</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. *Yuba County, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*. October 5, 2007.

<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>✘</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a. As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of this IS/MND, while the potential exists for special-status species to occur on of Sites A, B, D, E, and F, Mitigation Measure IV-1 would ensure that impacts to special-status species would be less than significant. In addition, while the potential exists for Sites A, B, D, E, and F to contain previously undiscovered archaeological resources, Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 would ensure that in the event that historic or prehistoric resources are discovered within the sites during construction activities, such resources are protected in compliance with the requirements of CEQA.

Generally, the 4-Year Housing Element Update is a policy-level document, which encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, and does not include specific development proposals that would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. Considering the above, the proposed project would not: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce or impact the habitat of fish or wildlife species; 3) cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

b. The 4-Year Housing Element Update is intended to guide future residential development throughout the City of Wheatland; thus, the analysis presented within this IS/MND is inherently cumulative. As demonstrated in this IS/MND, all potential environmental impacts that could occur as a result of project implementation would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with the mitigation measures included in this IS/MND, as well as applicable General Plan policies, Municipal Code standards, and other applicable local and State regulations. Thus, the proposed project would not contribute any new or additional unmitigable impacts not previously analyzed in prior environmental documents. When viewed in conjunction with other closely related past, present, or

reasonably foreseeable future projects, adoption of the 4-Year Housing Element Update and associated programs would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts in the City of Wheatland, and the project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be ***less than significant***.

- c. As described in this IS/MND, future development occurring pursuant to the 4-Year Housing Element Update would comply with all applicable General Plan policies, Municipal Code standards, other applicable local and State regulations, and mitigation measures included herein. In addition, as discussed in the Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Noise sections of this IS/MND, the proposed project would not cause substantial effects to human beings, which cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, including effects related to exposure to air pollutants, geologic hazards, GHG emissions, hazardous materials, and excessive noise. Therefore, the proposed project's impact would be ***less than significant***.

## **APPENDIX**

### **DRAFT CITY OF WHEATLAND 4-YEAR (2017-2021) HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE**