

Jada Windows – Whispering Pines  
Expanded Grading Development Review

**Attachment List**

1. Previously Adopted Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration
  - a. with Mitigation Monitoring a le
2. Vicinity/Aerial Map
3. CEQA Addendum to the tiered Initial Study/  
Mitigated Negative Deceleration
4. Modified Grading Plan
5. Jada Windows Conditions of Approval as modified
6. Agency Comments (Environmental Health, NSAQMD,  
Engineering, Geocon)

**Technical Studies available this link:**

- Biological Resources Assessment
- Preliminary Geotechnical  
Investigation
- Transportation Impact Study



**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Tiered Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Jada Windows Development and Use Permit Application**

**(24PLN-46)**

**SCH Number 2025010265**

**November 2024**

# TIERED INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

## Tiered Initial Study

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.), an Initial Study is a preliminary environmental analysis that is used by the lead agency as a basis for determining whether an EIR, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration is required for a project. The CEQA Guidelines require that an Initial Study contain a project description, description of environmental setting, identification of environmental effects by checklist or other similar form, explanation of environmental effects, discussion of mitigation for significant environmental effects, evaluation of the project's consistency with existing, applicable land use controls, and the name of persons who prepared the study.

## Tiering Process

This environmental analysis is a Tiered Initial Study for the proposed Jada Windows manufacturing development review and Use Permit application to reduce parking requirements (referred to as the "proposed project" or "project" throughout this document). Pursuant to Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines this environmental analysis is tiered from a previous Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted for a 2010 project that involved a General Plan Amendment, Annexation, and Rezone of this project site (10PLN-19). A prior development project was approved at that time and evaluated under the same MND, but it never developed. The CEQA concept of "tiering" refers to the evaluation of general environmental matters in a broader environmental document, with subsequent focused environmental documents for individual projects that implement the program. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered environmental documents to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. This is accomplished in tiered documents by eliminating repetitive analyses of issues that were adequately addressed in the prior environmental review and by incorporating those analyses by reference. This Tiered IS/MND is limited to effects that were not analyzed as significant in the prior environmental document or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d]). mitigation has been identified where required.

## Background Summary:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15063 (Initial Study), the City of Grass Valley has prepared this Initial Study to assess the potential environmental impacts of a proposed Development Review project for Jada Windows for the development of a 70,458 sq ft manufacturing building at an undeveloped parcel located on Whispering Pines Lane (APNs 009-680-056, & -050). The application also includes a Use Permit application for a requested reduction in parking standards along with a Lot Line Adjustment in order to accommodate development needs of the project. On the basis of the Initial Study, the City finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared as the

appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15063 and 15070 et. seq.

**Public and Agency Review:**

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative was circulated for a 30-day public and agency review commencing January 11, 2025. Copies of this Initial Study and cited references may be obtained at the City of Grass Valley Community Development Department at the address noted below. Written comments on this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration may also be addressed as noted below.

**Project title:** Jada Windows Manufacturing Building (24PLN-046)

**Lead agency name and address:**

City of Grass Valley Community Development Department  
125 E. Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

**Contact person, phone number, and e-mail:**

Amy Wolfson, City Planner  
125 E. Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945  
530-274-4711  
awolfson@cityofgrassvalley.com

**Project Location and Site Description:**

The general topography of the Project area is characterized as relatively flat along the northern section where the access into the Project area is proposed to be located and slight to moderate sloping from the northeast to the southwestern section of the Project area. Drainage is also along the eastern border of the Project area that runs north to south in a swale like area before connecting south into the drainage area along the southeastern section of the Project area. Average elevation in the Project area is approximately 2,625 feet above mean sea level (MSL) with the highest elevation of 2,650 feet above MSL within the northeastern section of the Project area and the lowest elevation of 2,590 feet above MSL within the southwestern section of the Project area. A seasonal drainage enters the Project site from the east and then runs along the southeastern border of the Project area until it enters into an existing culvert and heads to the southwest into the large, adjacent pond area to the southwest of the Project area on the neighboring parcel. Overall, the Project area is surrounded by private commercial and industrial land use and zoning.

**Surrounding Land Uses:**

The Project area is located along Whispering Pines Lane on the northern boundary and is located to the east of the downtown areas of the City of Grass Valley. Peaceful Valley Farm and Garden Supply is located immediately east of the Project area and Ferguson Plumbing Supply is located to the west of the Project area. To the south of the Project area is Stamp Mill Storage, Palmer Enterprises Truck Repair, Mountain F. Enterprises Grinding Yard, and a Waste Management storage yard.

**Project Objective:**

The project is a light industrial infill site located just outside the Whispering Pines Specific Plan area. Jada Windows is proposing to construct a 70,458 sq ft manufacturing building that would be used in conjunction with their existing facility at 179 Clydesdale Court. The proposed manufacturing building will be used to assemble custom steel doors and windows. The use is permitted in the M-1 zoning designation as a use categorized as “Manufacturing /Processing Medium Intensity,” which accommodates processes that involve and/or produce building materials,” including fabricated metal products.

**Project sponsor's name and address:**

Kevin Nelson, Nelson Engineering  
14028 Camas Court  
Penn Valley, CA 95946

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Development Review application including a proposed 70,458 square-foot manufacturing building with a parking lot and associated infrastructure. The proposed structure is adjacent to the existing Jada Windows business on Clydesdale Court which consists of multiple parcels and structures also owned by Jada Windows. The purpose of the proposed building is to consolidate the Jada Windows operations into one site and allow the manufacturing business to operate more efficiently, moving some of the manufacturing operations from the Clydesdale site to the new project site. The site will provide fire truck circulation around the entire building and provide a total of 50 parking spaces for employees and customers. The site has direct access from Whispering Pines Lane, a City-maintained road, at the existing left-turn openings in Whispering Pines Lane. A secondary driveway access would be provided to the existing Jada Windows building located at 179 Clydesdale Court (APN 009-690-016). The proposed buildings will be metal structures with natural architectural features as shown in the attached building elevations. A Use Permit is being requested in order to accommodate a reduction of parking standards pursuant to Section 17.36.080 of the City Municipal Code, based on quantitative information provided by the applicant.

*Access, Parking & Circulation* – Primary ingress/egress is proposed via Whispering Pines Lane, a city-maintained roadway constructed to city standards. A secondary, private access is proposed through adjacent properties at the southeastern portion of the project site that connects with the internal circulation drive. The secondary access is proposed within an offsite, existing access easement that goes through a privately-owned property within the County’s jurisdiction (APN 009-680-052) and through the existing Jada Windows facility on Clydesdale Court (APN 009-690-016). The internal drive aisles are 25-feet wide, which exceeds the city’s standard requiring a 24 ft drive aisle width for two-way drive aisles.

*Landscaping* – The preliminary landscape plan includes perimeter landscaping along with internal parking lot landscaping. The proposed plan is characterized by a variety of vegetation forms including shade trees, large shrubs/small trees, medium shrubs, and understory planting that are predominantly California natives. Landscaping shall also be installed in the common areas and surrounding the parking lot. The landscaping shall be in accordance with the City and State Model Water Efficiency Landscape requirements.

~~*Lighting* – Lighting consists of 14 wall-mounted lights at a 14-foot height, which is consistent with city standards. Lighting consists of 14 pole lights on 20-foot poles situated along the perimeter of the building. Section 17.30.060 of the City Municipal Code provides standards for outdoor lighting. Subsection A states that a fixture shall not exceed fourteen feet, though the development review committee can allow fixtures to reach up to twenty feet in height where it determines the additional height will comply with all other standards~~

*Tree Removal* – According to the site plan a total of 21 trees ranging in size from 8 to 24 inches DBH, and consisting primarily of pines and cedars, are proposed to be removed from the site in order to accommodate the development. The City of Grass Valley acknowledges the importance of trees to the community's health, safety, welfare, and tranquility. Chapter 12.36 of the Municipal Code outlines standards for tree removal and for obtaining a tree removal permit to ensure that community trees would be prudently protected and managed so as to ensure these multiple civic benefits.

*Grading* – Earthwork grading was previously performed at the site in 2013 by C&D Contractors. The Preliminary Site Plan prepared for the proposed project by Nelson Engineering (September 26, 2024) includes 70,458 square feet (sf) of proposed building coverage; 77,438 sf of pavement area; and 12,000 cubic yards of earthwork cut and fill. Based on the grades depicted on the Preliminary Site Plan, the preliminary geotechnical report prepared by Geocon, anticipates that 5 to 7 feet of cut are proposed in the building areas and up to approximately 15 feet of fill is proposed. It is anticipated that the existing native soil and engineered fill will be suitable for support of the proposed lightly loaded structure with conventional shallow foundations and interior concrete slabs-on-grade will be suitable for support of the proposed, lightly loaded structure. There is a retaining wall located along the northwestern portion of the parking lot that spans approximately 100-feet and ranges in height between four and six feet.

*Drainage* – On-site drainage will be collected, treated, and detained to pre-development flows through an onsite storm drain system, bioswale and detention pond. Sewer, water, and electrical utilities will be served from existing main lines in Whispering Pines Lane. A Resource Management Plan pursuant to Section 17.50.040 (2.c) of the City Municipal Code, has been prepared to address the activities associated with development within the 30-foot setback of the seasonal drainage located in the southeastern portion of the site.

*Utilities – Water Supply:* The subject property will be connected to Nevada Irrigation District water lines along Whispering Pines Lane.

*Sanitary Sewer:* The nearest sanitary sewer connection is located on whispering Pines Lane, adjacent to the site.

*Dry Utilities:* The project will connect to dry utilities (i.e., natural gas, electrical supply, telephone, cable) that are located along Whispering Pines Lane.

## **General Plan Land Use Designation**

The project area has a General Plan land use designation of Manufacturing-Industrial (M-I), according to the *City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan*. This designation is intended to accommodate a variety of industrial and service commercial uses. Although occupied by free-standing businesses without any overall internal plan or restrictions, M-I districts benefit from some clustering of compatible industrial or service commercial uses. Typical uses in M-I designated areas are: light manufacturing; automotive services, warehousing/distribution; and wholesale-retail outlets. The potential for adverse



## Exhibit B - Aerial Photograph

Jada Windows - Aerial Map




**Exhibit C - Site Photographs**



**Exhibit C - Site Photographs**



### Exhibit D - Jada Windows Site Plan





## **Regulatory Setting and Required Agency Approvals**

The following City of Grass Valley, Responsible and/or Trustee Agency permits are required prior to construction of the Jada Windows Manufacturing Building Development

City of Grass Valley Department of Public Works - Improvement Plan, Grading Plan, Encroachment Permit and Tree Removal Permit approvals.

City of Grass Valley Community Development Department - Site Plan and Building Plan Approvals and Conditions of Approval/Mitigation Measure compliance verification.

City of Grass Valley Building Department - Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Permits in accordance with the California Codes.

City of Grass Valley Fire Department - Site Plan, Improvement Plan and Building Plan Approvals.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in accordance with the Clean Water Act.

A Dust Mitigation Plan shall be approved by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District.

## Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “NO Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to a project like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) **“Potentially Significant Impact”** is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4) **“Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated”** applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- 5) **“Less-Than-significant Impact:”** Any impact that is expected to occur with implementation of the project, but to a less than significant level because it would not violate existing standards.
- 6) **“No Impact:”** The project would not have an impact to the environment.
- 7) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to Tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.
- 8) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist reference to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amy Wolfson, City Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

**I. AESTHETICS –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <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"/> |

**SETTING**

The aesthetic value of an area is a measure of its visual character and quality, combined with the viewer response to the area (*Federal Highway Administration, 1983*). The visual quality component can best be described as the overall impression that an individual viewer retains from residing in, driving through, walking through, or flying over an area. Viewer response is a combination of viewer exposure and viewer sensitivity. Viewer exposure is a function of the number of viewers, the number of views seen, the distance of the viewers, and the viewing duration. Viewer sensitivity relates to the extent of the public’s concern for a particular view shed (*U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 1980*).

The *City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan* notes that the City does not contain any designated scenic highways or vistas, but generally acknowledges the City and its surroundings as having a wide range of landscapes, scenic vistas and visual resources.

The project site has ±280 feet of frontage along Whispering Pines Lane that is partially shielded by trees and vegetation.

No scenic resources, including, but not limited to: trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings are located on the subject ±7.74-acre project site.

Sources of existing light in the project area are streetlights, commercial lighting and parking lot lighting. Other sources of light and glare include vehicles traveling along Whispering Pines Lane.

**Impacts**

The 2011 Milco Development Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/ MND) did not include any recommended mitigation measures related to aesthetics.

- a)&b) As compared to its undeveloped state, the development of a 70,458 sq ft manufacturing building and related improvements would alter the views from Whispering Pines Lane.

A project would normally have a substantial adverse aesthetic effect through removal of natural features or addition of man-made features or structures which degrades the visual intactness and unity of a designate scenic vista or highway, neither of which exist on or adjacent to the site.

Considering scenic vistas or scenic highways are not within the project vicinity, the project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The 2011 Milco Development Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration IS/ MND) similarly found a less than significant impact to scenic vistas and scenic resources. These potential impacts are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

- c) Generally, new development, if not carefully designed, can result in adverse impacts on sites open to public view. This property has been designated for industrial development in the City's 2020 General Plan. Additionally, policies of the City's General Plan Community Design Element (Chapter 10 of the 2020 General Plan) aim to preserve the desirable physical and design features in Grass Valley and carry them over into new development so that old and new development appear compatible. The City's Community Design element states that new infill development within established areas will be consistent in terms of scale, design, and materials.

The project area has a light industrial character with industrial and commercial uses surrounding the project site to the north, south, east, and west. As such, the proposed infill industrial project is not anticipated to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Further, the proposed project is required to be reviewed by the city's Development Review Committee and Planning Commission, which can require design alterations to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and compliance with Design Guidelines. Required landscaping will soften the appearance of the industrial development on neighboring properties, passing motorists along Whispering Pines Lane with perimeter landscaping. The 2011 Milco Development MND similarly found a less than significant impact related to degradation of the area's visual character. These impacts are considered less than significant.

- d) Excessive or inappropriately directed lighting can adversely affect nighttime views by reducing the ability to see the night sky and stars. Glare can be derived from unshielded or misdirected lighting sources. Reflective surfaces (i.e., polished metal) can also cause glare. Impacts associated with glare range from simple nuisance to potentially dangerous situations (i.e., if glare is directed into the eyes of motorists). There are no residential uses within the vicinity of the project. The project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain existing sources of light and glare. The area surrounding the project site has existing sources of light and glare, including headlight from vehicles traveling on Whispering Pines Lane, streetlights, and existing development such as the industrial uses surrounding the project site. The proposed project would create new sources of light and glare resulting from indoor and outdoor lighting as well as vehicles circulating the site.

Lights to be installed on the Jada Windows project site consists of 14 pole lights on 20-foot poles situated along the perimeter of the building. Section 17.30.060 of the City Municipal Code provides standards for outdoor lighting. Subsection A states that a fixture shall not exceed fourteen feet, though the review authority can allow fixtures to reach up to twenty feet

in height where it determines the additional height will comply with all other standards. The commercial lights are required to be directed downward so as not to spill light onto neighboring properties. The proposed project is required to undergo Design Review prior to approval to ensure consistency with the Grass Valley Municipal Code and Design Guidelines. The 2011 Milco Development MND similarly found a less than significant impact related substantial sources of new light and glare. Impacts related to new sources of substantial light or glare are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to aesthetics.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES &amp; FOREST RESOURCES-</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

The proposed project is situated in an area that has been designated and zoned for Commercial and Industrial uses by the *City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan and Development Code*. The area surrounding the project site has been largely built out in accordance with the City’s commercial and industrial land use designations.

“Agricultural Land” is defined as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or unique farmland, as defined by the *United States Department of Agriculture land inventory* and monitoring criteria, as modified for California. The subject site is designated as “other land” according to the The state Department of Conservation describes “Other Land” as “Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or

aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.”

The site is not zoned for forestry or timberland activities and is not zoned as a timberland production zone pursuant to Government Code Section 51104(g).

**IMPACTS**

The 2011 Milco Development Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/ MND) did not include any recommended mitigation measures related to agricultural and forest resources.

a)&b) The site is an infill site designated as “Other Land” as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. “Other Land” is defined as “Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.”.”

The California Resources Agency farmland mapping program does not identify the project site or vicinity as having Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site has been zoned for industrial uses and is surrounded by similar developed commercial and residential uses. Considering no farmland, as defined, exists within the project area, the proposed project will not involve conversion of farmland or zoning for agricultural use, including any farmlands under Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, *no impact* will occur.

c)-e) As noted in the project setting above, the project will not conflict with existing zoning or cause the 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)). The project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses as defined.

The project site does not have a forest land zoning designation and does not contain forestland or timberland as defined above. The project site is zoned as M-1, designated for light-industrial uses. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Removal Permit from the City in accordance with Chapter 12.36 of the City’s Municipal Code for all trees 10 inches DBH and over. *No impact* will occur.

**III. AIR QUALITY –**

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## SETTING

Nevada County is located in the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). The MCAB includes the central and northern Sierra Nevada mountain range with elevations ranging from several hundred feet in the foothills to over 6,000 feet above mean sea level along the Sierra Crest. The MCAB generally experiences warm, dry summers and wet winters. Ambient air quality in the air basin is generally determined by climatological conditions, the topography of the air basin, and the type and amount of pollutants emitted. The Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) has responsibility for controlling air pollution emissions including “criteria air pollutants” and “toxic air pollutants” from direct sources (such as factories) and indirect sources (such as land-use projects) to improve air quality within Nevada County. To do so, the District adopts rules, regulations, policies, and programs to manage the air pollutant emissions from various sources, and also must enforce certain statewide and federal rules, regulations and laws.

Western Nevada County is non-attainment for the federal 8-hour ozone standard and all of Nevada County is non-attainment for the State 1-hour ozone standard. Ozone exceedances in Nevada County are primarily due to transport from the Broader Sacramento Area and the San Francisco Bay Area. As a federal non-attainment area, the District is preparing a federally enforceable State Implementation Plan (SIP) for western Nevada County in accordance with the Clean Air Act. The SIP is an air quality attainment plan designed to reduce emissions of ozone precursors enough to reattain the federal ozone standard by the earliest practicable date. This will include various pollution control strategies. Overall emissions of ozone precursors must be reduced in western Nevada County (consistent with Reasonable Further Progress requirements specified in the Clean Air Act) until attainment is reached. Most of these reductions are expected to come from motor vehicles becoming cleaner and from State regulations. Failure to submit and implement the SIP in a timely manner could result in federal sanctions, including the loss of federal highway funds, greater emission offset ratios for new sources, and other requirements EPA may deem necessary. As western Nevada County’s population, industry and motor vehicle travel grow, the pollution transport fraction will decrease if local emissions are insufficiently mitigated.

The NSAQMD has adopted standard regulations and conditions of approval for projects that exceed

certain air quality threshold levels to address and mitigate both short-and long-term emissions. The Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) has established the below thresholds of significance for PM-10 and the precursors to ozone, which are reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). The NSAQMD has developed a tiered approach to significance levels: A project with emissions meeting Level A thresholds will require the most basic mitigations; projects with projected emissions in the Level B range will require more extensive mitigations; and those projects which exceed Level C thresholds, will require an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared, which may result in even more extensive mitigations.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/ MND) required similar mitigation as the current recommended mitigation related to air quality.

- a, b, c) In consultation with NSAQMD, the project is required to comply with standard air quality measures for construction as noted below. These measures are consistent with the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management’s Air Quality Plan for the district. By assessing air pollution and emissions associated with the proposed project and recommending mitigation measures based on thresholds of significance established by the NSAQMD, the project as proposed would comply with NSAQMD regulations.

According to NSAQMD, a preliminary investigation of the property shows the possibility of ultramafic rock, which is an indicator of naturally occurring asbestos. As such state asbestos regulations apply to this property and require the applicant to either hire a registered geologist to analyze the site to determine whether NOA occurs, or prepare a dust mitigation plan that is approved by NSAQMD prior to ground disturbance. This mitigation measure is outlined in *Mitigation Measure AQ 1*.

The California Emissions Estimation Model (CalEEMod) provides a means to estimate potential emissions associated for both construction and operation of land use projects. The overall pollutant impact is expected to remain at a level that is less than significant with the incorporation of standard mitigation measures recommended by the modeling program and outlined in *Mitigation Measure AQ3*.

Cumulative impacts, evaluated by NSAQMD thresholds, are daily rather than cumulative. When construction occurs over longer periods of time, the impacts for criteria pollutants are distributed over a longer time and are generally less impactful. Pursuant to the NSAQMD “Guidelines for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts of Land Use Projects,” NOx, ROG and PM10 emissions must be mitigated to a level below significant for both construction and operational phases of the project. If emissions for NOx, ROG or PM10 exceed 136 pounds per day (Level C), then there is a significant impact; Level B is significant if two or more pollutants fall into this category.

According to the CalEEMod modeling outputs for the proposed project, short-term construction-related impacts for the project will trigger Level B mitigation measures for ROG pollution (see Tables 1 and 2). According to the CalEEMod modeling outputs for the proposed project, Air Quality impacts related to Nox and PM<sub>10</sub> pollution from project construction, as well as all three criteria pollutants from operational project impacts are anticipated to be less than significant when compared to the NSAQMD thresholds outlined in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1  
*Estimated Daily Construction Emissions*

Construction Phase	ROG lb/day	NOx lb/day	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/day
Maximum daily emissions	130.84	14.099	7.7999
Level A Thresholds	<24	<24	<79
Level B Thresholds	24-136	24-136	79-136
Level C Thresholds	>136	>136	>136

Table 2  
*Estimated Daily Operational Emissions*

Operational Phase	ROG lb/day	NOx lb/day	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/day
Maximum daily emissions	3.011	1.804	0.049
Level A Thresholds	<24	<24	<79
Level B Thresholds	24-136	24-136	79-136
Level C Thresholds	>136	>136	>136

Operational emissions are anticipated be in accordance with accepted thresholds and construction-related emissions are anticipated to be less than significant with incorporation of Level B mitigation measures, as outlined in *Mitigation Measure AQ 2*. With implementation of NSAQMD’s recommended conditions of approval, the proposed project’s emissions are not anticipated to violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, impacts are anticipated to remain less than significant with mitigation.

- d) Emissions associated with the proposed project would be greatest during construction activities, specifically when diesel-powered construction vehicles are used for earth-moving operations. The nearest sensitive receptor (i.e. residential use) is located approximately ±900 feet from the proposed Jada manufacturing site, where grading will occur. The emissions associated with the project would be short-term and are not anticipated to result in a substantial elevation of pollutant concentrations in the area.

The proposed project’s operational emissions would be typical of those produced by commercial development. Operational emissions would consist of PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, and ozone precursors (ROG and NOx). These pollutants would be generated by gas-fired water heaters, as well as from engine emissions associated with vehicle trips to/from the project and gasoline-powered landscape maintenance devices. Based upon the *CalEEMod* analysis, operational emissions are not anticipated to exceed Level A thresholds. These potential impacts are considered less than significant.

- e) The project is not anticipated to produce any objectionable odors in its finished condition that would affect a substantial number of people. Construction activities associated with the proposed development, such as paving and painting, are likely to temporarily generate objectionable odors. However, odor-generating construction activities would be temporary, and are only likely to be detected by a small number of residents nearest the project site. Therefore, impacts from temporary project-related odors would be less than significant.

The following are standard NSAQMD air quality conditions that will be imposed on the project via conditions of approval:

**AQ 1 - Mitigation Measures:**

Due to the possibility of Naturally Occurring Asbestos at the project site, one of the following two options shall be submitted and approved by the Northern Sierra AirQuality Management District NSAQMD prior to ground disturbance:

- 1) Option 1: The applicant can engage a registered geologist to conduct an evaluation of the property. If this evaluation determines that no serpentine or ultramafic rock is likely to be found in the disturbed area, the applicant can request an exemption from the Air Pollution Control Officer of the NSAQMD. (See Tit. 17 Section 93105 (c)(1)(A) for report requirements.)

OR

- 2) Option 2: The applicant can proceed as if all soils contain asbestos and incorporate the required asbestos dust mitigation measures into the project documents and practices. As more than one acre will be disturbed, the regulations found in CCR Title 17 Section 93105(e)(2) and (4) apply. This includes submitting and acquiring NSAQMD approval of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) before moving forward. The approved ADMP shall be referenced as notes on all grading and construction plans and shall include the following:

- a. Soil track-out prevention and control
- b. Dust prevention measures for active construction areas and storage piles
- c. Dust minimization from unpaved roads, parking lots, or staging areas, including limit on vehicles speeds to 15 mph or less.
- d. Offsite material transport control
- e. Methods of post construction stabilization (in perpetuity)

- 3) There may be additional OSHA requirements for employee safety throughout improvements, landscaping, and final use phases. Please contact Cal OSHA for additional information on personal protective equipment and signage requirements. The Consultation Office can be reached at (800) 963-9424.
- 4) If dust or asbestos exposure appears to be an issue at any time, air monitoring may be required.
- 5) Also note that under regulations of the California Department of Real Estate, the presence of environmental hazards, including asbestos, must be disclosed by a property seller during any future real estate transactions

**AQ 2 - Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project and shall be made notes on grading and construction plans:
  - a) Alternatives to open burning of vegetative material will be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the District. Among suitable alternatives are chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel.
  - b) Grid power shall be used (as opposed to diesel generators) for jobsite power needs where feasible during construction.

- c) Temporary traffic controls shall be provided during all phases of the construction to improve traffic flow as deemed appropriate by the City Engineer and /or Caltrans.
- d) Construction activities shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to off-peak hours as much as practicable.

**AQ 3 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures are standard measures relied on by the CalEEMod modeling system to determine emissions results and shall be included as notes on all grading and construction plans:
  - a) Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 25 mph on unpaved roads.
  - b) Paved roads shall be swept regularly during construction to achieve dust suppression.
  - c) The project shall use zero or low-VOC paints during construction. The VOC content must be lower than 50 g/L for interior coatings and 150 g/L for parking VOC coatings.
  - d) Diesel-fueled, heavy-duty vehicles of more than 10,000 pounds shall not idle the vehicle’s primary engine for 5 minutes or more at a single location pursuant to 13 CCR Section 2485. Exceptions include idling for the purposes of positioning or providing a power source for equipment operation, such as a lift, crane, pump, drill, hoist, or other auxiliary equipment.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES –**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES –**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

ordinance?

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**SETTING**

The Project area is located in Nevada County, CA in the northern-central Sierra Nevada foothills, specifically to the east of the downtown of the City of Grass Valley. The Sierra Nevada foothills lie between the western edge of the Sierra Nevada and the eastern border of the Central Valley. The foothills form a belt 10 to 30 miles wide that ranges from 500 to 5,000 feet in elevation in a series of northwest to north-northwest aligned ridges that decline in elevation from northeast to southwest. Many rapidly flowing rivers and streams run westerly in deeply incised canyons with bedrock channels to the Central Valley and eventually to the Pacific Ocean. Alluvial fans, floodplains, and terraces are not extensive; and all but the largest streams are generally dry during the summer. Dominant vegetation communities include grasslands, oak woodlands, and chaparral.

Vegetation communities within the Project area are typical of the lower Sierra Nevada foothills. However, the terrain within the Project area is not typical of the lower Sierra Nevada foothills that normally vary between flat ridges and valleys to gently and moderately sloping hillsides. The Project area elevation ranges from approximately 2,650 to 2,590 feet above mean sea level (MSL) and much of the Project area has been impacted due to historical adjacent industrial practices and disturbance within the site.

The Project area is likely a midpoint on the gradient between hardwood forest and conifer forest containing both hardwood and conifer tree species, often in a mosaic pattern with small pure stands of conifers interspersed with small stands of hardwoods. Species associated with montane hardwood-conifer within the Project area includes ponderosa pine, foothill pine, California black oak, and Pacific madrone. Mixed chaparral is identified within the Project area along the southern frontage with East Bennett Road. This vegetation type is relatively intact and is characterized by whiteleaf manzanita, buck brush (*Ceanothus cuneatus*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), chaparral pea (*Pickeringia montana*), and occasionally scattered foothill pine.

Natural hydrological sources for the Project area include precipitation and surface runoff from adjacent lands. Mean annual rainfall in the area is 53.74 inches (NRCS, 2024). During sporadic rain events over the previous month prior to the field surveys, no surface water was identified. However, evidence of surface moisture was still present in some areas. The Project area does not contain any surface waters, including streams, ponds, wetlands, etc.

The greater Project area has been disturbed by historic industrial practices, public access, and ongoing management for many years, which is now considered normal for the Project area. Within the Project area, the dumping of soils, landscape materials, and other miscellaneous items has also

occurred for many years and the current circumstances are now considered normal. Areas not subject to this regular type of disturbance are dominated by native habitat and, therefore, are also the normal circumstance.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND required similar mitigation as the current recommended mitigation related to biological resources.

- a) A Biological Resources Inventory was prepared by *Greg Matuzak, Biological Consultant dated September 2024*. The purpose of the Biological Resources Inventory is to identify the location and extent of sensitive biological resources within the project area, including special-status plant and wildlife species, and the presence of drainage/stream/wetland features that could potentially meet the *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers* criteria as “Waters of the United States,” including wetlands, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Little Wolf Creek and the small, intermittent drainage entering the northwestern section of the project area would be subject to such regulations. In addition, the Biological Resources Inventory included an assessment of streams within the Project area that could be under the jurisdiction of *California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code 1600 et. seq.*

A reconnaissance-level biological resources field survey was conducted on foot for the entirety of the Project area (approximately 7.74-acres) by Greg Matuzak, Principal Biologist and owner of Greg Matuzak Environmental Consulting LLC on July 30th, 2024. The purpose of the survey completed in July 2024 was to identify habitat and vegetation types and to determine the potential for any CNPS ranked plants and special-status plant and wildlife species identified in the desktop analysis and background research to occur within the Project area and to identify the potential special-status plant and wildlife species that have the potential to occur within the Project area.

There is a low to moderate potential for nesting raptors and other protected nesting bird species protected under the CDFG Codes 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 to occur within the Project area. The Project area contains suitable nesting habitat for bird species protected under those CDFG Codes, such as tree nesting species (raptors) and ground nesting species like the spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus*) and dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*).

CNPS ranked plants and special-status plant surveys were conducted in July 2024, which is within the blooming period for most CNPS ranked plants and special-status plant species that have been previously identified within 3 miles of the Project area. However, the single CNPS ranked plant species with the potential to occur within the Project area ranges between April to May. Therefore, the dubious pea should be a focus species included in a single follow up survey during April to May prior to any proposed disturbance within an area containing natural vegetation in order to ensure that these species have been surveyed during their blooming periods and will be avoided, if present. No other CNPS ranked plants and special-status plant species have the potential to occur within the Project area and thus, the dubious pea is the focus species for the follow up survey between April and May. Therefore impacts to special status plant or animal species are anticipated to *be less than significant with mitigation* as outlined in BIO1 and BIO 2 *Mitigation Measures*.

- b) Based on the background data review and the site visit and reconnaissance-level biological resources survey of the entirety of the Project area, no “waters of the U.S.”, including wetlands, or “waters of the State of California”, were identified or mapped within the Project Area The

seasonal drainage area and its 30-foot stream setback (per the City of Grass Valley Development Code 17.50 for Creek and Riparian Resource Protection) will be encroached upon by the proposed Project and therefore, a Resources Management Plan is attached in Section 6.0. The Resources Management Plan includes measures such as the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to provide long-term protection of the water quality within the seasonal drainage and to downstream aquatic resources.

No CWA or CDFW permitting will be required for the proposed Project given the lack of perennial streams, ponds, and wetlands within the Project area and the existing seasonal drainage within the southeastern section of the Project area does not contain a direct connection with a navigable waterway. Additionally, the seasonal drainage does not contain a defined bed and bank and ordinary high water mark so it would not meet the state or federal definition of a regulated stream. Though given the proposed Project is located within the existing seasonal drainage and its 30-foot stream setback, this Resources Management Plan was developed to ensure compliance within the City of Grass Valley Development Code covering creek and riparian resources. The resource management plan includes mitigation measures pursuant to Grass Valley municipal code standards that require protection of riparian resources. Therefore, the Project is anticipated to have *a less than significant impact with mitigation* on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community with incorporation of **BIO 3 Mitigation Measures**.

- c) Little Natural hydrological sources for the Project area include precipitation and surface runoff from adjacent lands. Mean annual rainfall in the area is 53.74 inches (NRCS, 2024). During sporadic rain events over the previous month prior to the field surveys, no surface water was identified. However, evidence of surface moisture was still present in some areas. The Project area does not contain any surface waters, including streams, ponds, wetlands, etc. (see Appendix C of the Biological Inventory for a National Wetland Inventory and National Hydrography Dataset figure). Impacts of the project related to federally protected wetlands are anticipated to be *less than significant*.
- d) Known migratory deer ranges outlined in the Nevada County General Plan were reviewed for deer migration corridors, critical range, and critical fawning areas. The Project area is not located in any known major deer corridors, known deer holding areas, or critical deer fawning areas. Per the migratory *Deer Ranges Nevada County General Plan map*, the Project area is located in an area of potential Deer Winter Range. This field survey did not record any observations of deer while walking the Project area. The Project area does not contain any known major deer migration corridors, known deer holding areas, nor critical deer fawning areas. This impact is *less than significant*.
- e) The Biological Resources Inventory also evaluated the City of Grass Valley General Plan and Development Code requirements for any parcels subject to land use changes. Grass Valley Development Code requires a Resource Management Plan for encroachment into a 30-foot stream setback to identify potential impacts to a stream due to any development within the setback. The Resource Management Plan identifies minimization and mitigation measures to limit the potential impact to the stream proposed for developmental disturbance. This includes Best Management Practices (BMPs), including erosion control and sedimentation measures to avoid water quality impacts. As proposed, the project impacts are expected to be *less than significant with mitigation* incorporated pursuant to **BIO 3 Mitigation Measures**.

- f) The project area is slated for development and will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. *No impact will occur.*

**BIO 1 - Mitigation Measures:**

1. A follow up survey of CNPS special status plants, with particular focus on dubious pea, shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist between April through May prior to any ground disturbing activity. If the Project will not include the removal of native vegetation or grading within the larger, open area within the Project area, then no additional special-status plant surveys would be required.
  - a) If any special-status plant species is documented within or directly adjacent to areas proposed for disturbance, as determined by the survey, and are within areas proposed for disturbance within the Project area that contain native vegetation and that are CNPS list 1A, 1B, 2A, or 2B per CEQA Guidelines Section 15380, or are listed under the ESA and/or CESA, protection of such plants shall be ensured with one of the following methods in consultation and recommendation by a qualified wildlife biologist: 1) complete avoidance, 2)transplantation, and/or 3) on- or offsite restoration.
  - b) If an ESA listed special-status plant species is identified within the Project area and would be impacted by disturbance within the Project area, then a consultation with USFWS would be required as part of any future project permitting within the Project area and therefore, additional avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and monitoring requirements may be included as part of the development of a Biological Assessment (BA) to be submitted to the USFWS and a Biological Opinion (BO) developed by the USFWS through the ESA consultation process, whether Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA.

**BIO 2 - Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) Prior to disturbance of any riparian and/or forested woodlands within the Project area and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction bat roosting survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify the presence or absence of roosting bats, particularly the hoary bat and the pallid bat. The pre-construction bat surveys should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the riparian and forested woodland habitats along and adjacent to the seasonal drainage within the Project area. Any woodland or riparian associated trees have the potential to contain roosting bats and therefore, the trunk diameter of trees to be disturbed, removed, or within 100 feet of proposed disturbance would not preclude the preconstruction survey requirement.
  - a) If any species of bat, including the hoary and pallid bat are identified during roosting surveys, passive removal of the roosting bats prior to disturbance to structures and forested woodlands should be implemented to avoid impacts to this species. Passive removal includes allowing roosting bats to freely leave the roost site. Once the roosting bats have been passively removed from the structure(s) and/or forested woodlands, the structure(s) shall be closed off from recurring bat roosting within the structure and the proposed work within the structure(s) would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species. For forested woodlands containing bat roosts, the removal of trees associated with such woodlands would only occur once the bats leave the day roosts. Furthermore, if a maternal (breeding) roost is documented, no disturbance will occur until the breeding roost has dispersed from the structure or forested woodlands they are found in.

- 2) Prior to disturbance within the areas of the Project area that contain disturbed surfaces and/or annual grassland vegetation community, and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction survey for the species shall be conducted prior to any disturbance within those disturbed and developed areas of the Project area in order to avoid direct impacts to the species. The pre-construction survey should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the disturbed and annual grassland habitats within the Project area.
  - i) If the species is documented during pre-construction surveys, a qualified wildlife biologist (approved by CDFW) would have the authority to move individual coast horned lizards outside of the proposed disturbance area(s) in order to avoid an impact to this species. Once the coast horned lizard(s) have been removed from the disturbance area(s) and out of harms way, the proposed work would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species.
- 3) Construction or disturbance activities during the breeding season, February 1 through August 30, could disturb or remove occupied nests of raptors and/or protected bird species and shall require the implementation of a pre-construction survey, conducted by a qualified biologist, within and adjacent to any proposed disturbance area within the Project area along with a 250-foot buffer for nesting raptors and other protected bird species within seven (7) days prior to disturbance. The nesting survey radius around the proposed disturbance would be identified prior to the implementation of the protected bird nesting surveys by a CDFW qualified biologist and would be based on the habitat type, habitat quality, and type of disturbance proposed within or adjacent to nesting habitat.
  - a) If any nesting raptors or protected birds are identified during such pre-construction surveys, trees or shrubs or grasslands with active nests should be not be removed or disturbed and a no-disturbance buffer should be established around the nesting site to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site until after the breeding season or after a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged. The extent of these buffers would be determined by a CDFW qualified wildlife biologist and would depend on the special-status species present, the level of noise or construction disturbance, line of sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. These factors should be analyzed by a qualified wildlife biologist to make an appropriate decision on buffer distances based on the species and level of disturbance proposed in the vicinity of an active nest.

### **BIO 3 - Mitigation Measures:**

1. Pursuant to the Management Plan within the Biological Inventory Report, which covers the proposed disturbance within the 30-foot stream setback, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
  - a. The following measures to minimize potential impacts to the seasonal drainage and downstream aquatic resources are required during construction and shall be made notes or reflected graphically on all grading and construction plans. These measures are intended for inclusion into the proposed development and/or disturbances within the stream setback during and after construction to minimize direct and indirect

impacts to water quality during and following construction. This will be accomplished by implementing the following during and following construction:

- i. Limit construction to periods of dry weather;
  - ii. Establish the area around the outside edge of the seasonal drainage as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) where those areas will not be impacted by construction;
  - iii. No fill or dredge material will enter or be removed from the seasonal drainage during construction and thereafter;
  - iv. Use appropriate machinery and equipment to limit disturbance in these areas;
  - v. Placement of soil erosion control devices (such as wattles, hay bales, etc.) between the seasonal drainage and the areas to be developed to limit potential runoff and sedimentation into the seasonal drainage and potentially into downstream aquatic resources;
  - vi. No dewatering of seasonal drainage will occur as part of the proposed construction;
  - vii. Implement Best Management Practices during and following construction; and
  - viii. The project shall adhere to the City of Grass Valley stormwater drainage requirements and State water quality control board regulations for stormwater in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board region (Region 5) shall be followed and implemented as part of the proposed Project and within the seasonal drainage and its 30-foot stream setback requirement.
- b. To protect the seasonal drainage and the stream setback buffer areas, as well as water quality and downstream water resources, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures should include, but are not limited to:
- i. Minimize the number and size of work areas for equipment and spoil storage sites in the vicinity of the seasonal drainage. Place staging areas and other work areas outside of the 30-foot stream setback buffers.
  - ii. The contractor shall exercise reasonable precaution to protect the seasonal drainage as well as adjacent stream setback buffers from pollution with fuels, oils, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and wash water shall be prevented from discharging into or near these resources and shall be collected for removal off the site. All construction debris and associated materials and litter shall be removed from the work site immediately upon completion.
  - iii. No equipment for vehicle maintenance or refueling shall occur within the 30-foot stream setback buffers. The contractor shall immediately contain and

clean up any petroleum or other chemical spills with absorbent materials such as sawdust or kitty litter. For other hazardous materials, follow the cleanup instruction on the label.

- c. Exposed bare soil within the 30-foot stream setback buffers to the seasonal drainage should be protected against loss from erosion by the seeding of an erosion control mixture and restored with native grasses and mulching. Non-native species that are known to invade wild lands, such as orchard grass, velvet grass, rose clover, winter and spring vetch, and wild oats should not be used as they displace native species.
- d. To ensure the proper and timely implementation of all mitigation measures contained in this Resources Management Plan, as well as the terms and conditions of any other required permits, the applicant shall distribute copies of these mitigation measures and permit requirements to the contractors prior to grading and construction within the stream setback buffers. All contractors shall be completely familiar with the mitigation measures contained above and with the terms and conditions of all permits.

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES –</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES –**

Would the project:

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:

d) 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"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

e) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set for the 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.

## SETTING

The study area is situated in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the Sierra Nevada physiographic province (Norris and Webb 1976) at an elevation of approximately 2,580–2,860 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The Sierra Nevada Range is approximately 50 miles wide and extends for 400 miles, paralleling California’s eastern border south from the Cascade Range to the central Transverse Ranges.

The surrounding terrain includes steep drainages south and east with gently sloped hills north and west. Summers in the region are dry and warm; winters are wet and cool. Average precipitation ranges 35-70 inches with average annual snow fall of 10 inches. The wet season extends from October through May.

The Project is located in the Bear/Yuba River watershed. The nearest water source is the South Fork of Wolf Creek, approximately 125 meter south of the Project Area. The climate fosters a diverse array of vegetation typical of the Yellow Pine Belt community, including Jeffrey and Ponderosa pines, incense cedar, black oak, manzanita, western azalea, wild rose, Scotch broom, poison oak, wild iris, ferns, and California dogwood (Storer and Usinger 1963).

The study area is considered to be part of the northern portion of the Mother Lode, which is a north/south trending vein where gold is embedded in host rock. This region’s geology is unlike the rest of the Mother Lode belt in that it lacks large-scale faulting and the primary veins run at mild rather than steep angles (Jenkins 1948). During the historic period, the rich quartz and gold deposits of the region made it both attractive and productive for placer and lode mining operations (Clark 1970). The ready availability of granitic rock in the project vicinity provided raw material for grinding tools used by pre-contact Native American peoples to process plant foods, such as acorns and seeds.

The study area is recognized as the ancestral homeland of the Nisenan, who are also known as the Valley Maidu (Golla 2011; Heizer and Elsasser; Wilson and Towne 1978). The following ethnographic summary is not intended as a thorough description of Nisenan culture but instead is meant to provide a background to the present cultural resource investigation with specific references to the project area. In this section, the past tense is sometimes used when referring to native peoples because this is a historical study. This convention is not intended to suggest that Nisenan people only existed in the past. To the contrary, the Nisenan have strong cultural and social identities today

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND required similar mitigation as the current recommended mitigation related to cultural resource impacts, although it should be noted that the Tribal Cultural Resources checklist item was not a requirement under CEQA at that time and so was not specifically evaluated in 2011. Mitigation pertaining to Tribal Cultural Resources have been included to this report’s recommendation.

- a, b) The project site is located outside of the City's 1872 Historic Townsite. There are no structures on the property that are considered a historic resource. An Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) was prepared for this Project by Kevin Dalton, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) to document the adequacy of identification efforts and presents the results of the Cultural Resource Inventory (CRI) investigations within the project area. The study was designed to identify any archaeological, historical, cultural resources or traditional properties located within the project area. Fieldwork was conducted on 22-23 August 2024 by Dalton. This CRI covers the project area (approximately 7.75 acres).

Approximately 80% of the project area was previously surveyed for cultural resources in 2008 (Jensen 2008). During 2008, one isolated prehistoric resource and one isolated historic-era resource were recorded within the project area. These isolated resources were considered fully documented at the time of the 2008 recording, and therefore, not afforded further protection under cultural resource regulations (Jensen 2008: 6-7). During the 2024 field effort, the project area was surveyed using intensive survey coverage with transects spaced at 20-meter intervals. The location of each of previously recorded isolate was intensively and systematically investigated. No physical evidence of either isolate was observed. It is concluded that both resources were removed during land grading activities that occurred in the project area during 2013. These resources were evaluated, within this report, and determined to be ineligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR).

A substantial adverse change includes demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration that would impair the historical significance of a resource (PRC Section 5020.1). PRC Section 21084.1 stipulates that any resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the CRHR is presumed to be historically or culturally significant. If a resource is determined ineligible for listing on the CRHR, the resource is released from management responsibilities and a project can proceed without further cultural resource considerations.

Two previously undocumented historic-era cultural resources were discovered and fully documented as a result of the 2024 effort. These resources were evaluated and determined to be ineligible for listing on the CRHR. The project, as currently designed is not expected to adversely affect a cultural resource. Given that an isolated prehistoric resource has been previously documented within the project area, it is recommended that construction personnel working in the area be made aware of the potential for prehistoric resources and that a cultural resources training be provided to supervisors, construction foreman, crew members, and any additional key construction personnel by a professional archaeologist. It is also recommended that construction activities be observed by a qualified archaeological monitor. Therefore the project impact is anticipated to be *less than significant with mitigation* as it relates to historical or archeological resources with the incorporation of *CUL 1 mitigation measures*.

- c) No human remains or cemeteries are known to exist within the project site. Although human remains within the project site are unlikely, there is always the possibility that earthmoving activities associated with project construction could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. This would be a potentially significant impact. Therefore, the project impact is anticipated to be *less than significant with mitigation* as it relates to inadvertent discovery of human remains with the incorporation of *CUL 1 mitigation measures*.
- e,f) Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which went into effect in July 2015, is an amendment to CEQA Section

5097.94 of the Public Resources Code. AB52 established a proactive consultation process with all California Native American tribes identified by the NAHC with cultural ties to an area. This process is implemented on projects that file a notice of preparation for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or notice of intent to adopt a negative or mitigated negative declaration. Under AB52, the Lead Agency is required to consult with tribes at tribal request. The bill further created a new class of resources under CEQA known as Tribal Cultural Properties (TCPs).

On July 25, 2024, the project archeologist sent a request to the NAHC in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites are listed on its Sacred Lands File for the project site. A response was received on August 8, 2024, indicating that the Sacred Lands File was negative for the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The NAHC included a list of 16 tribal representatives available for consultation. To ensure that all Native American knowledge and concerns over potential Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) that may be affected by the project are addressed, a letter containing project information was sent from the city to each tribal representative on October 22, 2024. The United Auburn Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Department indicated in an email sent to the City Planner on December 4, 2024 that they have identified a Tribal Cultural Resource in the project vicinity and requested a tribal survey to verify the TCR.

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) is a federally recognized Tribe comprised of both Miwok and Maidu (Nisenan) Tribal members who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The Tribe has a deep spiritual, cultural, and physical ties to their ancestral land and are contemporary stewards of their culture and landscapes. The Tribal community represents a continuity and endurance of their ancestors by maintaining their connection to their history and culture. It is the Tribe's goal to ensure the preservation and continuance of their cultural heritage for current and future generations.

UAIC conducted background research for the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources for this project, which included a review of pertinent literature, historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the California Historic Resources Information System Center (CHRIS) as well as historic resources and survey data. UAIC's registry indicates that one TCR, a bedrock mortar (BRM) site, is present on the parcel. On December 9<sup>th</sup>, UAIC representative Rene Guererro conducted a survey for the identification of TCRs and to confirm the presence of the cultural site. According to the archaeological report, the BRM was destroyed or buried during previous grading activities and was not able to be relocated. The TCR survey shows the parcel having steep alluvial drainages with brown to dark brown loamy soil, granite stone, and sedimentary rock. The central and eastern portion of the project area was filled with imported soils. The vegetation identified included manzanita, gray pine, oak, cedar, wild rose, and dogwood. No new TCRs were identified by UAIC and the previously recorded TCR was not relocated.

The UAIC indicated their previous consultation during the 2013 proposal and provided updated mitigation measure language regarding unanticipated discoveries and tribal monitoring during ground disturbance. The project impact is anticipated to be *less than*

*significant with mitigation* as it relates to California Register of Historical Resources or a California Native Tribe, with the incorporation of *CUL 1 and CUL 2 mitigation measures*.

**CUL 1 - Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures shall be required as notes on all grading and construction documents:
  - a) *Cultural Resources* – The presence of the isolated prehistoric find from 2008 raises the potential for buried cultural resources within the project area. This site (P-29-003133) was documented as an isolated find and was subsequently removed (likely in 2013) by grading activities within the project area, therefore it does not constitute an archaeological site. Construction personnel should be made aware of the potential for prehistoric and historic resources within the Project Area, and construction activities should be observed by a qualified archaeological monitor. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications.
  - b) *Cultural Resources Awareness Training* – Prior to the initiation of the project it is recommended that a cultural resources training be provided to supervisors, construction foreman, crew members, and any additional key construction personnel. A professional archaeologist shall administer the training. The purpose of the training is to increase awareness and knowledge of cultural resources and appropriate protocols in the event of an inadvertent discovery. The training will include a discussion on the procedures for stopping work and notification of key personnel. Upon completion of the training, participants will be able to define cultural resources, describe the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, know how to locate and receive assistance from the professional archaeologist and coordinate with other sources, and describe steps to be taken when cultural resources are encountered during project implementation. Documentation of the training, signed by the professional archeologist who conducted the training, shall be submitted to the City Planner prior to any ground disturbing activities.
  - c) *Archaeological Monitoring* – Cultural resource monitoring of construction activities is designed to ensure that known archaeological resources associated are protected and that previously undocumented cultural resources are identified, recorded and properly treated. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications. Monitoring shall include observation of excavations to their maximum depths, documentation of soil stratigraphy, and inspection of stockpiled soil sediments. The Archaeological Monitor will be responsible for documenting monitoring activities in a daily log. At a minimum, documentation should include location of archaeological monitoring, activities for the reporting period and periodic digital photographs of the project work. Most importantly, if cultural resource remains are encountered, the Archaeological Monitor will have the authority to temporarily halt or re-direct construction activities. The amount and duration of archaeological monitoring will be determined by the Professional Archaeologist.
  - d) *Inadvertent Discoveries* – If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, are discovered work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources) and a qualified cultural

resources specialist and UAIC representative will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The Tribe does not consider curation of TCR's to be appropriate or respectful and request materials not be permanently curated, unless requested by the Tribe.

- e) *Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains* – Any person who, in the process of project activities, discovers any cultural resources, tribal cultural resources including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits, and/or human remains within the project area, shall cease from all project activities within at least 200 feet of the discovery. A qualified professional, the Lead agency and a Tribal Representative shall be immediately notified to assess any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for cultural resource treatment.. In the event that human remains are encountered, the sheriff-coroner shall be notified immediately upon discovery. In the event that Native American human remains are encountered, the Native American Heritage Commission or the most likely descendants of the buried individual(s) who are qualified to represent Native American interests shall be contacted. Specific treatment of Native American human remains shall occur consistent with State law. If adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, unique archaeology, or other cultural resources occurs, then consultation with UAIC and other traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribes regarding mitigation contained in Public Resources Code sections 21084.3(a) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15370 should occur.
- f) If the find is determined to be a TCR, the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary:
  - i) The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the City to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.
  - ii) The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a temporary conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.
  - iii) The construction contractor(s) and the City shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.

- iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.
- v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the City in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.
- vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the City/County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the City/County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

CUL 2 – Mitigation Measure:

- a) If any suspected Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) of cultural significance to UAIC, including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archeologist.
- b) A tribal Representative and the City of Grass Valley shall be immediately notified, and the Tribal Representative in coordination with the City of Grass Valley shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.
  - i) The culturally affiliated tribe shall consult with the City of Grass Valley to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.
  - ii) The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.
  - iii) The construction contractor(s) and City of Grass Valley shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.

- iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.
- v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the City of Grass Valley in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.
- vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials

**VI. ENERGY –**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

Energy use, especially through fossil fuel consumption and combustion, related directly to environmental quality since it can adversely affect air quality and generate GHG emissions that contribute to climate change. Electrical power is generated through a variety of sources, including fossil fuel combustion, hydropower, wind, solar, biofuels, and others. Natural gas is widely used to heat buildings, prepare food in restaurants and residences, and fuel vehicles, among other uses. Fuel use for transportation is related to the fuel efficiency of cars, trucks, and public transportation; choice of different travel modes such as auto, carpool, and public transit; and miles traveled by these modes, and generally based on petroleum-based fuels such as diesel and gasoline. Electric vehicles (EVs) may not have any direct emissions but do have indirect emissions via the source of electricity generated to power the vehicle. Construction and routine operation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure also consume energy. PG&E provides electricity and natural gas to the project site.

The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, as specified in Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations (Title 24), was established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California’s energy consumption. Title 24 is updated approximately every three years. Compliance with Title 24 is mandatory at the time new building permits are issued by the city.

CALgreen establishes mandatory green building standards for buildings in California. CALgreen was developed to reduce GHG emissions from buildings, promote environmentally responsible and healthier places to live and work, reduce energy and water consumption, and respond to state environmental directives. Calgreen covers five categories: planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material and resource efficiency, and indoor environmental quality.

## Impacts

The Energy checklist item was not required to be evaluated under the 2011 Milco Development IS/MND and so it did not provide any comparable analysis.

- a) The project construction schedule was assumed to begin in May 2025 and conclude within 12 months. If the construction schedule moves to later years, construction emissions would likely decrease because of improvements in technology and more stringent regulatory requirements as older, less efficient equipment is replaced by newer and cleaner equipment. The proposed project would require demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coating, and paving.

The construction phase would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of building materials, preparation of the site (e.g., site clearing, and grading), and the actual construction of the building. Petroleum-based fuels such as diesel fuel and gasoline would be the primary sources of energy for these tasks. The types of on-site equipment used during construction of the proposed project could include gasoline- and diesel-powered construction and transportation equipment, including trucks, graders, tractors, and cranes. Project construction would consume energy during grading, excavation, trenching, and paving; however, the project would not waste or use energy inefficiently. Construction processes are generally designed to be efficient in order to save money. That is, equipment and fuel are not typically used wastefully on the site because of the added expense associated with renting the equipment, as well as maintenance and fuel. Compared to construction in outlying, undeveloped areas, the proposed project would save energy by constructing in a semi-urbanized area that is proximate to roadways, construction supplies, and workers. In addition, construction of the proposed project includes several measures to improve the efficiency of the construction process, including, restricting equipment idling times to five minutes or less, and requiring the project to post signs onsite reminding workers to shut off idling equipment (see discussion under Air Quality checklist question c). Construction-related energy impacts are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

PG&E will provide electricity and natural gas for the project. According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), total electricity consumption in Nevada County in 2022 was 697.188838 GWh (697,188,838 kWh). Operation of the proposed Project would increase the annual electricity consumption in Nevada County by approximately 0.1 percent. The project would not represent a wasteful or inefficient use of energy resources because it would be required to comply with Title 24 and CALGreen requirements to reduce energy consumption, and include on-site electric vehicle charging stations. For these reasons, the project would not result in a wasteful use of energy. Therefore, electrical demand associated with the operational phase of the project is anticipated to be *less than significant*.

- a) The Grass Valley City Council adopted an Energy Action Plan on November 13, 2018 with a goal of reducing the city’s utility-supplied energy consumption by 36% by the year 2035. The plan does not include specific standards, but encourages education and voluntary reduction efforts, including for new construction projects. The applicable state plans that address renewable energy and energy efficiency are CALGreen, the California Energy Code, and the California Renewable Portfolios Standard (RPS). Under the California RPS, the State of California is transitioning to renewable energy through the California’s Renewable Energy Program. Renewable sources of electricity include wind, small hydropower, solar, geothermal, biomass, and biogas. Electricity production from renewable sources is generally considered carbon neutral. Executive Order S-1408, signed in November 2008, expanded the state’s RPS to 33 percent renewable power by 2020. This standard was adopted by the legislature in 2011 (SB X1-2). Senate Bill 350 (de Leon) was signed into law September 2015 and establishes tiered increases to the RPS— 40 percent by 2024, 45 percent by 2027, and 50 percent by 2030. Senate Bill 350 also set a new goal to double the energy-efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas through energy efficiency and conservation measures. The Project will be required to meet Title 24 and CALgreen standards at the time of construction and is anticipated to have a *less than significant* impact on local and state plans for energy use reduction.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <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 the Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

## SETTING

The western foothills of the Sierra Nevada are a complex assemblage of igneous and metamorphic rocks. The regional structure of the foothills is characterized by the north-northwest trending Foothills Fault System, a feature formed during the Mesozoic era (dating from 65 to 230 million years ago) in a compressional tectonic environment. A change to an extensional tectonic environment during the Late Cenozoic (last 9 million years) resulted in normal faulting which has occurred coincident with some segments of the older faults.

A Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation was prepared for the proposed project on August 5, 2024 by Geocon Consultants, Inc. The site is on a narrow tabular ridgetop that protrudes west from the vicinity of Whispering Pines Lane. According to the *Preliminary Site Plan for Jada Windows* (Nelson Engineering, 2024), site elevations range from approximately 2,580 feet above mean sea level (MSL) near its western end, outside of the proposed development area, to approximately 2,650 feet above MSL near its northeastern corner at Whispering Pines Lane. Adjacent land to the north, west, and south is lower in elevation. Earthwork cut and fill associated with previous site grading lowered the elevation of central portion of the site up to approximately 15 feet, and the current elevation is approximately 2,640 feet above MSL. The central portion of the development area is in cut native soil, although resistant bedrock outcroppings extend up to approximately 10 feet above the current. The site contains three areas of identified fill at the perimeter of the proposed development area

Earthwork cut and fill associated with previous site grading lowered the elevation of central portion of the site up to approximately 15 feet, and the current elevation is approximately 2,640 feet above MSL. The central portion of the development area is in cut native soil, although resistant bedrock outcroppings extend up to approximately 10 feet above the current grade.

The site contains three areas of identified fill at the perimeter of the proposed development area:

- an approximately 1-acre area on the southeast end of the proposed development area has an estimated maximum depth of 20 feet;
- an approximately ½-acre area on the northern edge of the proposed development area has an estimated maximum fill depth of approximately 15 feet; and
- an approximately ⅓-acre area on the southwestern edge of the proposed development area has an estimated maximum fill depth of approximately 5 feet.

Boulder piles resulting from the previous grading/earthwork are near the southeast and northwest site boundaries. The boulders are typically up to approximately five feet in greatest dimension.

An apparent soil/rock stockpile is located in the northeastern portion of the site near the site entrance. The stockpile surface is approximately four feet above the surrounding ground surface. Dense vegetation growing on the stockpile obscured its contents.

Geocon observed a shallow, densely vegetated depression west of the proposed development area, near the western end of the site. Historical mining maps depict a vertical mine shaft in this vicinity. ~~We did not observe evidence of a shaft portal, such as concrete structures or mine waste, at the~~

historically recorded shaft location. However, Holdrege & Kull (H&K, 2010) observed a segment of partially buried ore cart track extending from the edge of the surface depression during a geotechnical investigation performed in 2010.

Geocon observed a concrete basin near the northwestern site boundary. The concrete basin appears to be on adjacent, downslope property. The purpose of the concrete basin is not known.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND required similar mitigation as the current recommended mitigation related to geology and soil impacts.

- a) i, ii) The online Fault Activity Map of California (CGS, 2024) depicts a segment of the Grass Valley Fault near the site, near the eastern edge of the Foothills Fault System in the site vicinity. The Foothills Fault System is designated as a Type C fault zone with low seismicity and a low rate of recurrence. CGS (2024) indicates that the northwest-to-southeast-trending Grass Valley Fault is pre-Quaternary (older than 1.6 million years without recognized Quaternary displacement). The late Quaternary Wolf Creek Fault and Giant Gap fault (fault displacement during the past 700,000 years) are mapped approximately 6 miles south of the site and 12 miles east of the site, respectively. Special Publication 42 (CGS, 2018) is intended to promote uniform and effective statewide implementation of the evaluation and mitigation elements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Pursuant to CGS (2018) guidance, Geocon used the online California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQZ App; <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/>) to determine whether the site is located within a designated Earthquake Fault Zone (also known as Alquist-Priolo Zone, or A-P Zone). A-P Zones are regulatory zones that encompass traces of Holocene-active faults to address hazard associated with surface fault rupture. The site is not mapped within an A-P Zone and is therefore this project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact* related to exposure of people to rupture of a known earthquake fault and seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure and landslides.
- iii.) The site is not in a designated Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction. Geocon is not aware of any reported historical instances of liquefaction in the Grass Valley area. The site is not located near a large seismic source, subsurface conditions appear to be primarily granular, compacted fill and bedrock, and groundwater is relatively deep. Therefore, we expect that the potential for liquefaction is low and impacts of this project are considered to be *less than significant*.
- iv) The proposed improvements include engineered, 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) cut and fill slopes. Based on competent native materials at the site and the nature of the proposed improvements, Geocon considers deep-seated slope instability to be unlikely. The site is also not within a State-designated hazard zone for seismically induced landslides. However, near-surface soil, undocumented fill, and highly weathered bedrock are subject to instability, particularly under saturated conditions and/or seismic forces. Therefore, a Registered Professional Geologist should assess the potential for slope instability during project design. Therefore, this project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact with mitigation* related to exposure of people to landslides with incorporation of *GEO 1 Mitigation measures*.

- b) The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) *Web Soil Survey* application (<https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>) characterizes site soil predominantly as Sites very stony loam. Much of the soil profile was removed from the central portion of the development area and placed on the perimeter of the development area as engineered fill during previous earthwork grading. The soil survey describes Sites very stony loam as medium to high acid soil that may be highly corrosive to concrete and uncoated steel. A typical profile is described as heavy loam from 0 to 1 foot, underlain by clay loam, clay, and light clay loam from 1 to 6.5 feet. Variably weathered metasedimentary and basic rock is commonly encountered at depths greater than 6.5 feet. Up to one quarter of the soil profile is described as cobbles. Runoff is described as medium with slight to moderate erosion hazard.

The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The proposed project would require ground-disturbing activities such as grading, excavation, and other earthmoving activities prior to and during construction. These activities will expose surface soils to wind and precipitation, which could cause soil erosion and loss of topsoil if measures are not taken to prevent erosion and runoff during site construction. Projects that disturb one acre or more acres of soil are required to obtain the General Permit for Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list BMPs the proposed project would implement to control erosion and prevent the conveyance of sediments off-site.

The proposed project would comply with the CBC and with required erosion control measures including those outlined in Grass Valley Municipal Code Chapter 17.62 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Standards. Compliance with the CBC and Municipal Code would ensure that the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. With the implementation of the conditions of the Construction General Permit as well as compliance with the SWPPP, CBC and Municipal Code, erosion impacts resulting from project construction would remain *less than significant with incorporation of GEO 2 mitigation measures*.

- c) Landslides and other forms of mass wasting, including mud flows, debris flows, and soil slips, occur as soil moves downslope under the influence of gravity. Landslides are frequently triggered by intense rainfall or seismic shaking. A landslide generally occurs on relatively steep slopes and/or on slopes underlain by weak materials. As discussed in Response 4.7.a(iv), while the site is not within a State-designated hazard zone for seismically induced landslides near-surface soil, undocumented fill, and highly weathered bedrock are subject to instability, particularly under saturated conditions and/or seismic forces. Therefore, a Registered Professional Geologist should assess the potential for slope instability during project design. Therefore, this project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact with mitigation* related to exposure of people to with incorporation of *GEO 1 Mitigation measures*.
- d) A relatively thin layer of clay soil was identified by H&K (2010). The soil was classified as fat clay (CH) and had a liquid limit of 126, a plastic limit of 30, and a plasticity index of 96, and exhibited medium expansion potential (75) pursuant to UBC guidelines. We anticipate that the layer of potentially expansive clay soil was, to a large extent, removed and blended during previous earthwork grading. However, a Registered Geotechnical Engineer should observe soil conditions during earthwork improvements and foundation excavation to verify that the potentially expansive soil does not remain with a few feet of sensitive improvements. Therefore, this project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact with mitigation* related to creating risk to life or property due to expansive soil and shall be subject to of *GEO 1 Mitigation measures*.

- e) The proposed project would connect to an existing wastewater facility and sanitary sewer system and, therefore, would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of the capacity of the soils on the project site to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

**GEO 1 Mitigation Measures:**

1. Prior to building and grading permit issuance, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner indicating that grading and construction plans include all pertinent recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024.
2. Prior to building permit final, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner that indicates all recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, have been incorporated in to the geotechnical engineer's satisfaction.
3. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the following notes shall be included on all grading and construction plans:
  - a. All recommendations outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, shall be incorporated into the project.
  - b. Oversize rock may be encountered during excavation. Oversize rock may be removed and used in landscape areas, incorporated into slope protection, and/or used as fill in accordance with specific recommendations from a professional geotechnical engineer.
  - c. Clayey, alluvial soil, as well as seasonal surface water and shallow groundwater seepage, may be present in the lower, southeast corner of the site, where a road is to be constructed that extends offsite to the south. Significant drying effort to attain moisture content suitable for compaction should be anticipated regardless of the time of year
  - d. Moist to saturated soil conditions may be encountered in excavations advanced during and following the rainy season, particularly in excavations that reveal the soil/weathered rock transition. If grading occurs during or after the wet season (typically winter and spring), or in periods of precipitation, in place and excavated soils will likely be wet. Earthwork contractors should be aware of moisture sensitivity of clayey and fine-grained soils and potential compaction/workability difficulties.
  - e. Exploration of uncontrolled fill shall be performed before or during site development to identify locations of uncontrolled fill, if present, and rework the fill according to recommendations of the geotechnical engineer of record.
  - f. If future improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location at the lower, western end of the site (outside of the currently proposed development area, see Figure 2 of the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation), we

recommend that the shaft location be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design. The location of the closed feature should be surveyed and recorded along with as-built closure documentation.

- g. Foundations shall be embedded at least 18 inches. Allowable soil bearing capacity on the order of 3,000 psf may be used for preliminary foundation sizing. Specific foundation recommendations shall be provided as part of the design-level geotechnical investigation.
- h. Interior concrete flatwork shall be designed with a capillary break and moisture barrier. Exterior concrete flatwork placed over reworked granular fill materials will not likely require an aggregate layer.
- i. Conventional flexible pavement structural sections consisting of hot mix asphalt (HMA) over compacted Class 2 aggregate base (AB) may be used provided they are properly designed (i.e., thick enough), as determined by a geotechnical engineer, for the soil conditions at the site. A previous R-Value (21) for light brown sandy clay at the site appears suitable for design of alternative pavement sections and should be confirmed based on the specific subgrade soil characteristics encountered during site development.
- j. Prior to building permit issuance, a geotechnical engineer shall confirm that uncontrolled fill is not present in the development area. In addition, exploratory trenching and/or geophysical analysis may be useful to determine rock excavation characteristics in the central portion of the site. Soil corrosion testing may be performed to identify potentially corrosive conditions.

**GEO 2 Mitigation Measures:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City for acceptance, file a Notice of Intent with the California Water Quality Control Board and comply with all provisions of the Clean Water Act. The applicant shall submit the Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number, issued by the state, to the City of Grass Valley Engineering Division.
2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for review and approval, drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan & Criteria. Measures must be implemented for site design, source control, runoff reduction, storm water treatment and baseline hydromodification management measures per the City of Grass Valley Design Standards.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GASES –**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- a) Generate Greenhouse emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

**SETTING**

The City of Grass Valley has not conducted a greenhouse gas emissions inventory or adopted a Climate Action Plan, performance standards, or a GHG efficiency metric. However, the City has recently adopted an *Energy Action Plan* and the *Grass Valley 2020 General Plan* includes numerous goals, policies, and programs which, if implemented, will reduce Grass Valley’s impacts on global climate change and reduce the threats associated with global climate change to the City.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 provides direction to lead agencies in determining the significance of impacts from GHG emissions. Section 15064.4(a) calls on lead agencies to make a good faith effort, based upon available information, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. The lead agency has the discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, how to quantify GHG emissions.

Greenhouse gases (GHG) include gases that can affect the earth’s surface temperature. The natural process through which heat is retained in the troposphere is called the greenhouse effect. The greenhouse effect traps heat in the troposphere through a process of absorbing different levels of radiation. GHG are effective in absorbing radiation which would otherwise escape back into space. Therefore, the greater the amount of radiation absorbed, the greater the warming potential of the atmosphere. GHG are created through a natural process and/or industrial processes. These gases include water vapor (H2O), carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrfluorocarbons (HFCs), Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6). Carbon dioxide (CO2) is the main component of greenhouse gases and pollutants, and vehicles are a primary generator of CO2.

Since 2005, the California legislature adopted several bills, and the Governor signed several Executive Orders, in response to the impacts related to global warming. Assembly Bill 32 states global warming poses a serious threat to California and directs the Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Senate Bill 97 requires an assessment of projects GHG emissions as part of the CEQA process. SB 97 also required the Office of Planning and Research to develop guidelines to analyze GHG emissions.

The City has not adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing impacts related to GHG emissions, nor have the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD), CARB, or any

other State or regional agency adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing GHG emissions that is applicable to the project. The City's adopted Energy Action Plan does not include specific standards or thresholds but encourages education and voluntary reduction efforts. To date, no quantitative GHG emissions significance threshold for general use in the environmental review process that would apply to the Project have been adopted by a local, regional, or state agency per the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(b). As such, for this analysis, the potential significance of the Project's GHG emissions will be qualitatively evaluated based on the "extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)).

## IMPACTS

While the 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on greenhouse gas emissions to be less than significant, it nevertheless recommended mitigation measures to reduce energy consumption. Many of the measures required are accomplished with current project design and requirements under the current Title 24 building standards, the CalGreen Code, and the Model Water Efficiency Ordinance. Based on the current analysis, no mitigation is recommended for the project's impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

a)&b) Calculating the Greenhouse Impacts on an individual project is difficult to qualify or quantify. The incremental GHG emissions from the proposed project would not individually generate GHG emissions enough to measurably influence global climate change. However, ongoing occupancy and operation would result in a net increase of CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gas emissions due to vehicle miles traveled, energy use, and solid waste disposal. According to the *CalEEMod* emissions model conducted for the Project, the average daily CO<sub>2</sub> levels during construction will be 1,106 lbs/day, and annual levels will be 183.15 MT/yr. the average daily CO<sub>2</sub> levels during the operational phase of the Project will be 1,642.3 lbs/day, and annual levels will be 271.9 MT/yr.+

- As mentioned, there are no local, state, or regional adopted significance thresholds for assessing GHG emissions. In 2008, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change (Scoping Plan), which establishes an overall framework for measures to reduce statewide GHG emissions for various sources/sectors to 1990 levels by 2020, consistent with the reduction targets of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). The Scoping Plan was updated in 2014, 2017, and most recently in 2022. The 2022 update to the Scoping Plan revises CARB's strategy to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045, as directed by Assembly Bill 1279. The Scoping Plan identifies actions to reduce GHG emissions under a variety of sectors. Many of these are not applicable to the Project; however, the sectors and associated actions the Project would support include those related to: (1) GHG Emissions Reductions Relative to the SB 32 Target; (2) Smart Growth / Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); (3) Light-Duty Vehicles (LDVs) Zero Emissions Vehicle (ZEVs); (4) Truck ZEVs; (5) Electricity Generation; (6) New Residential and Commercial Buildings. The Project proposes a light industrial building in an area developed with other industrial and light industrial uses. This would provide more employment opportunities for nearby residents and within a localized area that may encourage carpool/vanpool activity. The Project would be subject to the standards of the Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11), including regulations

for energy efficiency and water efficiency as well as the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) in effect at the time building permits are issued. The project will also be subject to the California Department of Water Resources' Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO). The Project would install EV parking spaces and chargers and although there is not dedicated infrastructure for Medium-Duty Vehicle/Heavy-Duty Vehicle (MDV/HDV)- specific charging, there are no Project impediments to possible future implementation. In addition to the required energy efficiency regulations, the development plans to incorporate voluntary energy efficiency design features including accommodating photovoltaic power and incorporation of roof top HVAC units with economizers that use outdoor temperature sensors, to bring in cool night air and run in economizer mode during low-operation periods, along with maintaining a building temperature of 80°F, higher than standard manufacturing facilities. Thus, the Project would support efforts of the energy sector to achieve GHG emissions reduction planning targets and help meet increased demand for electrification. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the Climate Scoping Plan.

In the absence of an adopted quantitative threshold for determining the potential significance of GHG emissions that would be applicable to the Project, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(3), the determination of the significance of the Project's GHG emissions impact is based on a qualitative analysis considering the Project's consistency with applicable statewide, regional, and local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The Project also would be consistent with the policies of the 2022 Scoping Plan Update. Therefore, based on the CEQA Guidelines for determining the significance of GHG emissions, the currently available adopted plans for reducing GHG emissions applicable to the Project, and the absence of applicable adopted quantitative significance thresholds, potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be *less than significant*.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

environment?

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

## SETTING

Hazardous materials stored and used onsite and on surrounding properties would be associated with common construction and household chemicals used. However, these common household chemicals are legally purchased and are not considered a health hazard.

The City's Fire Department responds to all calls for emergency services within City limits that include, but are not limited to: fires, emergency medical incidents, hazardous materials incidents, public assists, traffic, vehicle accidents and other situations. Fire Station #1, located on Brighton Street, is staffed 24 hours a day. This station is located less than one mile from the project site.

In the Grass Valley area, industrial and commercial facilities that use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials present the greatest potential hazards. A search of available environmental records conducted indicates that the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site and no listed sites occur within an ASTM standard distance radius.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Hazards and Hazardous Material to be less than significant. However, the current geotechnical evaluation prepared for the project based recommended mitigation on the current design of the project and are determined appropriate for the currently proposed Project. Similarly, current standards outlined in the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan require review by the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission.

- a)&b) The storage, handling, or use of any hazardous materials is regulated by State and local regulations. The California Building Code regulates the types and amounts of hazardous substances allowed in conventional structures. Storage of any amount of hazardous materials is subject to the Grass Valley Fire Department and Nevada County Environmental Health Department regulations. The applicant and/or facility operator is required to adhere to all

applicable codes and regulations regarding the storage of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous wastes set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 25500 - 25519 and 25100 - 25258.2 including the electronic reporting requirement to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS). These regulations limit the amount of hazardous materials that can be stored in these facilities so that public safety is protected. The Project is not anticipated to involve any handling of hazardous wastes or other hazardous materials. Additionally, the Project is required to comply with the City of Grass Valley stormwater drainage requirements and State water quality control board regulations for stormwater in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board region (Region 5). This will ensure that water leaving the site is properly filtered before it enters area waterways. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact to the environment from a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials. Impacts to the public or the environment related to use, transport, disposal, or reasonable foreseeable release of hazardous material is anticipated to be *less than significant*.

- c) The proposed project does not involve an activity that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project site is located 1.2 miles from the nearest school and is not
- d) The City's General Plan identifies upwards of 46 mining claim boundaries in the Grass Valley area, one of which appears to have been located over a portion of the proposed site. General Plan Policy 4-SP requires that development plans in mined areas include in-depth assessments of potential safety, including mining-related excavations, and health hazards. The subject parcel 009-680-050 is listed in the Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) EnviroStor database under ID 29100007 for mining activity and has "likely mined soils" according to Nevada County Environmental Health. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) notes that the site is within the Idaho Maryland Mine property boundaries and requires that the site be deemed safe for construction and the proposed use.

Geocon Consultants, Inc prepared a preliminary geotechnical evaluation of the site. Historical mining maps depict a vertical mine shaft in the Project vicinity, in the lower, western end of the proposed open space portion of the site or beneath the present-day alignment of Whispering Pines Lane. Geocon did not observe evidence of a shaft portal, such as concrete structures or mine waste, at the historically recorded shaft location. However, Holdrege & Kull (H&K, 2010) observed a segment of partially buried ore cart track extending from the edge of the surface depression during a geotechnical investigation performed in 2010. Historical aerial photographs (USGS, 1939, 1947, and 1952) and historical topographic maps (USGS, 1901 and 1950) do not depict evidence of mining at the site.

Geocon's historical research and site reconnaissance did not identify evidence of historical mining in the proposed development area. Deep underground mine workings extend beneath the site and are associated with the historical Idaho Maryland Mine and Canyon winze, which inclined southeast beneath the site from the 1,000 level (typically measured in feet along the incline of the shaft) of the Idaho-Maryland shaft. Based on the recorded depth of the underground mine workings beneath the site, Geocon does not anticipate that the underground workings would impact the proposed site development from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. Historical maps depict a vertical mine shaft on or near the western

end of the site at the approximate location depicted on Figure 2 in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, outside of the development area. Development near the vertical mine shaft could create a hazard to the public if not properly treated. Furthermore, pursuant to DTSC, an appropriate agency must deem the site both safe for construction and the proposed usage. Therefore, the Project impact will be *less than significant* with mitigation incorporation as outlined in *HAZ 1 Mitigation Measures*.

- e)&f) The project site is located approximately 1 mile (as the crow flies) from the Nevada County Airport. As required by the Public Utilities Code, the Airport Land Use Commission adopted the *Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. The compatibility plan's function is to promote compatibility between the airport and surrounding land uses with respect to: height (e.g. height of structures), safety (e.g. number of persons per acre), and noise (e.g. noise sensitive land uses). According to the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project site is located within the area of influence. The Project proposal is considered a "major land use action" as a "discretionary development proposal for projects having a building floor area of 20,000 square feet or greater...." As such, the project must be reviewed by the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission (NCALUC) Executive Director. The NCALUC has delegated the review and consistency determination of major land use actions to the NCALUC Executive Director, who determined that "the proposed project does not contain characteristics likely to result in inconsistencies with the compatibility criteria set forth in the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan based on the following factors: The project is located in Compatibility Zone C - Inner Turning Zone & Extended Approach Zone with an identified risk level of low for safety and airspace protection factors; The proposed land uses are allowed in Compatibility Zone C and with 32 employees, the density would be consistent with the maximum Density/Intensity for the Compatibility Zone of 100 people average & 300 per single acre. The proposed height of the building is acceptable due to the building elevation sitting approximately 775-825 feet below the airport conical surface from 3375 feet to 3425 feet. Based on the NCALUC Executive Director's review, there is *less than significant impact* anticipated related to safety hazards for people residing or working in the vicinity of the Nevada County Airport.
- g) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There will be direct access to the site from Whispering Pines Lane and private driveway access through 179 Clydesdale Court (APN: 009-690-016). All fire access roads are required to comply with California Fire Code. The Grass Valley Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined the access to be sufficient and the site is not part of an adopted emergency response and evacuation plan. There is *no impact* anticipated to the environment related to interference with an adopted emergency response plan.
- h) CalFire provides a map of Fire Hazard Severity zones (FHSZ), which also indicates recommended FHSZs for Local Responsibility Areas (LRAs). The project site is located in a LRA with a recommended Very High Wildfire Severity zone. The project will provide an underground private water supply system, fire sprinkler and fire alarm. The proposed access and water system will support adequate fire suppression activities. The Grass Valley Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and does not have concerns about the project moving forward. It will be required to meet California Building and Fire codes at the time of construction. According to the CALEEMod emissions modeling, which includes climate risk evaluation, the project was determined to be at a high exposure risk to wildfire. However, the

project’s sensitivity from experiencing physical damage, experiencing regular disruptions, and on impacting sensitive populations from wildfire was determined to be low. The project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires is *less than significant*.

**HAZ 1 - Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, the applicant shall determine if the subject parcels have been impacted by historical mining and/or provide a “No Further Action (NFA) Letter” from the CA Department of Toxic Substance Control. The determination or letter shall be provided to the Nevada County Environmental Health Department and the Grass Valley Planning Department.
- 2) A State of California environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or a local agency that meets the requirements of Health and Safety Code section 101480 should provide regulatory concurrence that project is safe for construction and the proposed use. Please visit the DTSC Abandoned Mine Lands webpage for reference or further guidance.
- 3) If fill material is proposed at any phase of site development, the following mitigation shall be confirmed by a registered geotechnical engineer:

All imported soil and fill material shall be tested to assess any contaminants of concern meet screening levels as outlined in DTSC's Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) Guidance Manual. Additionally, DTSC advises referencing the DTSC Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material Fact Sheet if importing fill is necessary. To minimize the possibility of introducing contaminated soil and fill material there shall be documentation of the origins of the soil or fill material and, if applicable, sampling be conducted to ensure that the imported soil and fill material are suitable for the intended land use. The soil sampling shall include analysis based on the source of the fill and knowledge of the prior land use. Additional information can be found by visiting DTSC’s Human and Ecological Risk Office (HERO) webpage.

- 4) If improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location, the shaft location shall be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -**

pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

The general topography of the Project area is characterized as relatively flat along the northern section where the access into the Project area is proposed to be located and slight to moderate sloping from the northeast to the southwestern section of the Project area. Drainage is also along the eastern border of the Project area that runs north to south in a swale like area before connecting south into the drainage area along the southeastern section of the Project area. Average elevation in the Project area is approximately 2,625 feet above mean sea level (MSL) with the highest elevation of 2,650 feet above MSL within the northeastern section of the Project area and the lowest elevation of 2,590 feet above MSL within the southwestern section of the Project area.

A single aquatic resource is located within the Project area along the southeastern section and border of the Project area. The seasonal drainage area enters the Project area from the east and then runs

along the southeastern border of the Project area until it enters into an existing culvert and heads to the southwest into the large, adjacent pond area to the southwest of the Project area on the neighboring parcel. Overall, the Project area is surrounded by private commercial and industrial land use and zoning.

USGS topographic maps from 1949 to 1993 depict the historical Idaho-Maryland Ditch, a former water conveyance ditch, crossing the west side of the site from north to south. The ditch is no longer present as a result of previous earthwork grading at the site. The *Geologic Map of the Grass Valley Quadrangle and Adjacent Area* (Johnston, 1939) maps a historical, 0.15-acre, rectangular water reservoir near the site center. The reservoir is no longer present as a result of previous earthwork grading at the site. Wolf Creek is 600 feet north of the site at an elevation approximately 100 feet lower than the site elevation, and flows west.

The depth to groundwater at the site is not known. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Well Completion Report Map Application (DWR, 2024) depicts two monitoring wells approximately 500 feet north of the site at an approximate elevation of 2,530 feet above MSL (110 feet lower than the site elevation) where groundwater was encountered within 10 feet of the ground surface. These monitoring wells were near Wolf Creek. Information provided by Rise Gold Corporation indicates that the water level in the abandoned Idaho Maryland Mine workings is approximately 2,500 feet above MSL. Seasonal seepage and wet soil conditions have been reported near the lower, southwestern corner of the site

The seasonal drainage area and its 30-foot stream setback (per the City of Grass Valley Development Code 17.50 for Creek and Riparian Resource Protection) will be encroached upon by the proposed Project and therefore, a Resources Management Plan is attached in Section 6.0 of the Biological Inventory prepared for the Project. The Resources Management Plan includes measures such as the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to provide long-term protection of the water quality within the seasonal drainage and to downstream aquatic resources.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Hydrology and Water Quality to be less than significant. However, the current geotechnical evaluation and the biological resource evaluation prepared for the project based recommended mitigation on the current design of the project and are determined appropriate for the currently proposed Project.

- a) According to the project application, on-site drainage will flow from the building to storm water pipes in the parking lot which in turn flow to a bioswale and detention areas in the east and southeast areas of the site. be collected in a new drainage system containing drainage inlets, storm drain, manholes, etc. All drainage facilities are required to be designed to accommodate storm events in accordance with the City of Grass Valley requirements as reviewed by the City Engineer during building permit review.

As previously discussed in section VII(b) the proposed project will comply with the California Building Code and with required erosion control measures including those outlined in Grass Valley Municipal Code Chapter 17.62 Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Standards.

Compliance with the CBC and Municipal Code would ensure that the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. With the implementation of the conditions of the Construction General Permit as well as compliance with the SWPPP, CBC and Municipal Code, erosion impacts resulting from project construction would remain *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

The Engineering Department has determined that the proposed project will require a grading permit to be issued by the City of Grass Valley, Public Works Division pursuant to the City's Grading Ordinance and will also be required to submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board (CVWQCB) and comply with all provisions of the Clean Water Act. The City's Grading Ordinance requires specific measures to address erosion and the introduction of construction materials into surface waters. The applicant is also required to submit drainage and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan and Criteria. Standard Mitigation Measures requiring a SWPPP from the CAWQCB will reduce potential impacts to a *less than significant impact with mitigation* incorporation as already identified under *GEO 2 Mitigation Measures*.

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38. The Central Valley Water Board provided comments in response to the circulation of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration in a letter dated February 10, 2025. Mitigation identified in Mitigation Measure HY/WQ 2 is intended to ensure compliance with the adopted Basin Plan. Therefore, the standard mitigation measures requiring that the project comply with requirements of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins will reduce potential impacts to water quality to a *less than significant impact with mitigation* incorporation as already identified under *HY/WQ 2 Mitigation Measures*.

- b) The depth to groundwater at the site is not known. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Well Completion Report Map Application (DWR, 2024) depicts two monitoring wells approximately 500 feet north of the site at an approximate elevation of 2,530 feet above MSL (110 feet lower than the site elevation) where groundwater was encountered within 10 feet of the ground surface. These monitoring wells were near Wolf Creek. Information provided by Rise Gold Corporation indicates that the water level in the abandoned Idaho Maryland Mine workings is approximately 2,500 feet above MSL. Seasonal seepage and wet soil conditions have been reported near the lower, southwestern corner of the site.

The proposed project will be connected to the Nevada Irrigation District water supply. NID will require a Water Demand Analysis in order to determine the meter size. Water service will come from the NID Elizabeth George Treatment Plant is not anticipated to deplete groundwater

supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. This impact is *less than significant*.

- c-f) The applicant is required to submit drainage and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan and Criteria. The post-development rate and volume will be reduced below the pre-development rate and volume with the retention facilities and BMPs identified previously in the Biological section of this report. Storm drainage from impervious areas (roads, walks, roofs) is collected and routed through water quality treatment facilities for removal of potential pollutants including a bioswale and an onsite retention pond.

The Biological Resource Management Plan prepared for this project identifies minimization and mitigation measures to limit the potential impact to the stream proposed for developmental disturbance. This includes Best Management Practices (BMPs), including erosion control and sedimentation measures to avoid water quality impacts. With incorporation of BMPs along with improvement standards enforced by the Publics Works Department, the project impacts are expected to be *less than significant with mitigation* incorporated pursuant to **BIO 3 Mitigation Measures**.

- g-j) The project is located within FEMA Map Panel number 06057C0631E, effective date February 3, 2010. No portion of the project property is located within a mapped Flood Zone. The development area will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss and is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. *No impact* will occur.

#### **HY/WQ 1 - Mitigation Measures:**

See GEO 2 Mitigation Measures

See BIO 1 Mitigation Measures

#### HY/WQ 2 - Mitigation Measures

1. All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/sacsjr\\_201805.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf)

In part it states:

*Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.*

2. If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to,

isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/water\\_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf)

3. If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.
4. If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order.
5. If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING --**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

## SETTING

The ±7.74-acre project site is an infill industrial parcel located directly adjacent to the Whispering Pines Industrial Park and surrounded by business park and industrial uses.

The City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan Land Use Map (updated February 2007) identifies the property and area as being appropriate to support light industrial land uses. The zoning designation is likewise light industrial, M-1.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Land Use Planning to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a)&b) The property is zoned for light industrial development and has a land use designation of Manufacturing-Industrial, which is intended to accommodate a variety of industrial and service commercial uses. The project site is surrounded by light industrial development on all sides and is considered in-fill development and has been designed to be compatible in terms of style to the surrounding existing development. Multiple 2020 General Plan policies, goals and objectives support both in-fill development and preservation of existing neighborhoods which include, but are not limited to:

- 2-LUG - Promote infill as an alternative to peripheral expansion where feasible.
- 6-LUG- Promote a job/housing balance within Grass Valley region in order to facilitate pleasant convenient and enjoyable working conditions for residents, including opportunities for short home to work journeys.
- 17-LUO Future employment opportunities as adults for today's youth in well-paying local jobs.
- 7-LUG- Create a healthy economic base for the community, including increasing employment opportunities through attraction of new and compatible industry and commerce, and through retention, promotion and expansion of existing businesses.
- 20-LUO- Promote an expanding local tax base.
- 1-LUP Maintain General Plan that reflects the needs of the total community, including residents, businesses and industry
- 29-LUP - Promote the establishment and expansion of businesses and industries offering professional, light manufacturing and technical employment opportunities related to existing and developing forms of technology.
- 31-LUP - Promote primary jobs and core employment opportunities; those that export goods while importing capital.

The proposed window and door manufacturing business is consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan designation. **No impact** is anticipated with regard to dividing a community nor with conflicting with an adopted plan or regulation intended to mitigate an **environmental effect**.

- c) The City has not adopted a habitat or natural community conservation plan, so therefore the proposed project will not conflict with any applicable plan. *No impact* will occur.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES –

Would the project:

- |   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## SETTING

Mineral resources, particularly gold have played a major role in the history of Nevada County and Grass Valley. Since 1849, when gold was first discovered in the area, to the years preceding World War II, most of the County’s population was economically supported, directly or indirectly, by the local gold mining industry. Metals produced in the Grass Valley area since 1850 include lode gold, chromite, crushed stone, and placer gold.

Areas subject to mineral land classification studies are divided into various Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) categories that reflect varying degrees of mineral potential. Areas classified MRZ-2 are those containing potentially significant mining deposits. The existence of deposits may be actually measured or indicated by site data (MRZ-2a), or inferred from other sources (MRZ-2b).

According to the geotechnical investigation the portal of the Idaho Main Shaft was located approximately 600 feet northwest of the site, near Idaho Maryland Road, and the shaft inclined to the 1,000 level (commonly measured in feet along the shaft incline) at an angle of 70 degrees. A tunnel at the 1,000 level extended from the Idaho Main Shaft to the Canyon winze, and the vertical shaft mapped near the western end of the site extended from this intersection.

Plate II of the Plan of Underground Workings of Idaho-Maryland Development Co., Grass Valley, California (Adams, W.J., undated) does not depict a vertical shaft extending to the ground surface, but depicts tunnels extending from the inclined winze at depth beneath the site at the 1,000, 1,100, 1,200, 1,300, and 1,400 levels. A tunnel also extends from the Idaho Main Shaft beneath the northern edge of the site at the 700 level. The Supplemental Master Title Plat for Sections 25, 26, 35, and 36, Township 16 North, Range 8 East (United States Bureau of Land Management, 1996) depicts a portion of the historical Schofield Gold Quartz Claim (Mineral Survey Plat No. 30) in the northeastern portion of the site. Mineral Survey Plat No. 30 (United States Department of the Interior, September 1867) depicts a 50-foot-deep shaft north of the site under the present-day Whispering Pines Road, and a suspected mineral-bearing vein crossing the northeast corner of the site near the contact of the diabase and serpentinite. No mining features are depicted by the plat at the site

**IMPACTS**

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Mineral Resources to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

a & b) The 2011 Milco IS/MND notes that the City is classified as having significant mineral deposits, but that there is limited opportunity to mine these areas because of the incompatible urban development surrounding these areas. It also notes that this area is one of two that had previously been targeted as a mining conservation area. However, the current M-1 zoning designation does not permit either surface nor underground mining and would require re-zoning to M-2 and a conditional use permit in order to allow mining operations at the site. Should mining activities be proposed in the area, the 1993 Mineral Management Element includes a policy statement that requires a proposed mine project to address potential impacts on the urban uses based upon the nature of the mining activities. The Project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* impact related to the loss of availability of a known or locally-important mineral resource.

**XIII. NOISE –**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

Noise is generally defined as loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired sound that disrupts or interferes with normal human activities. Although exposure to high noise levels over an extended period has been demonstrated to cause hearing loss, the principal response to noise is annoyance.

Sound intensity is measured in decibels (dB) using a logarithmic scale. For example, a sound level of 0 dB is approximately the threshold of human hearing, while normal speech has a sound level of approximately 60 dB. Sound levels of approximately 120 dB become uncomfortable sounds.

Two composite noise descriptors are in common use today: L<sub>dn</sub> and CNEL. The L<sub>dn</sub> (Day-Night Average Level) is based upon the average hourly noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10-decibel weighting applied to nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) noise values. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were subjectively twice as loud as daytime exposures. The CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level), like L<sub>dn</sub>, is based upon the weighted average hourly noise over a 24-hour day, except that an additional +4.77 decibel penalty is applied to evening (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.) hours. The CNEL was developed for the California Airport Noise Regulations and is normally applied to airport/aircraft noise assessment. The L<sub>dn</sub> descriptor is a simplification of the CNEL concept, but the two will usually agree, for a given situation, within 1dB. Like the noise levels, these descriptors are also averaged and tend to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment. Because they presume increased evening or nighttime sensitivity, these descriptors are best applied as criteria for land uses where nighttime noise exposures are critical to the acceptability of the noise environment, such as residential developments. The Noise General Plan Element defines noise-sensitive land uses as including residential development, schools hospitals, churches, and hotels.

The 2011 Milco IS/MND found no mitigation necessary related to noise impacts

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Noise to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a) For purposes of this analysis, a significant impact would occur if construction activities would generate a substantial temporary 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. The city has not adopted construction-related noise thresholds of significance for CEQA consideration. The General Plan also does not contain quantitative noise standards that are specific or applicable to construction activities. Municipal Code Section 8.28.100 prohibits certain construction activity during the hours of 7 P.M. AND 7 A.M. when within 500-feet of a residential zone. However, the closest residential zone is located approximately 1,200 feet from the project site and the site is surrounded by light industrial buildings and uses. The operational phase will feature manufacturing activities that will take place completely within the enclosed building. There will be daily truck and employee traffic estimated to be 105 daily trips pursuant to the Traffic Study prepared for this Project. This traffic generation is anticipated to be consistent with the existing traffic serving the surrounding light industrial uses and Whispering Pines Business Park. The 2011 Milco IS/MND found no mitigation necessary related to noise impacts. Noise related to exposing persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance is anticipated to be *less than significant*.

b-d) An existing church is located across Whispering Pines Lane from the project site. Churches are a permitted use in the Light-Industrial zoning designation so are considered compatible with light and medium intensity manufacturing processing uses, also permitted, such as the proposed Project. The church's service occurs on Sunday mornings and the proposed manufacturing business hours are proposed to occur Monday through Friday pursuant to the submitted application. Construction noise and operations may temporarily impact church attendees but given the limited church hours and that generally construction activity occurs mid-week, impacts related to exposure to ground born vibration or noise, creating a substantial increase in permanent or temporary ambient noise, is considered *less than significant*.

e &f) The Nevada County Airpark is located east of Grass Valley and one mile from the Project site. The facility is a base for local personal and recreational flyers. The Airpark also serves as a transportation facility for business/corporate aviation and aerial fire-fighting operations. For the purposes of airport land use compatibility planning, noise generated by the operation of aircraft to, from, and around an airport is primarily measured in terms of the cumulative noise levels of all aircraft operations. In California, the cumulative noise level metric established by state regulations, including for measurement of airport noise, is the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Cumulative noise level metrics measure the noise levels of all aircraft operating at an airport on an average day (1/365) of the year. The calculations take into account not only the number of operations of each aircraft type and the noise levels they produce, but also their distribution geographically (the runways and flight tracks used) and by time of day. A map of CNEL contours for the Nevada County Airport are contained in the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Project site is not mapped within the calculated noise contour and therefore the Project is not anticipated to expose employees to excessive aircraft noise levels and is therefore considered *less than significant*.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction or replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

The project site is currently vacant. And is not located near housing or residential services. The 2013 Milco IS/MND did not include mitigation measures related to population and housing.

## Impacts

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Population and Housing to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a) The proposed window and door manufacturing business is a permitted use in the M-1 zoning designation and is compatible with the Manufacturing-Industrial land uses contemplated under the General Plan Land Use designation. The proposed project is anticipated to employ 35 people and will not involve the expansion of roads or utility lines. Therefore, the Project's impact on inducing substantial population growth is *less than significant*.
- b&c) The project site is currently vacant and will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing or people elsewhere. *No impact* will occur.

## XV. PUBLIC SERVICES --

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

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

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## SETTING

The proposed project area is within the City of Grass Valley and is served by the following public services:

*Fire Protection:* The City of Grass Valley Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services within the City. GVFD maintains three shifts, each managed by one of three Battalion Chief. Due to the location of the Grass Valley fire stations, city plays a crucial role in the fire service and emergency response throughout Western Nevada County. The response services

provided to the unincorporated areas of Nevada County are part of the boundary drop agreement the City has maintained with Nevada County Consolidated Fire District (NCCFD) for more than 20 years. The Fire Department also has a Mutual Threat Zone agreement with Cal Fire. All of these partnerships guarantee that any wildland fire incidents within the City leverage the full weight of response from GVFD, NCCFD, and Cal Fire. The Fire Department operates 3 front line fire engines, one from each fire station, cross staffs a 105 Truck Company (the only truck of its kind in Western Nevada County), along with a Type III engine and an Office of Emergency Services Type 1 and Type 6 fire engine.

*Police Protection:* The Department currently employs 27 FTE sworn members and 3 FTE civilian staff. Based upon Grass Valley's population of 13,041 the department's ratio of police officers per 1,000 residents is 2.1.

*Schools:* Throughout Grass Valley, the Grass Valley School District serves K-8 students and the Nevada Joint Union School District serves students in grades 9 - 12. In addition, through inter-district contracts (which can be retracted), 467 students from Grass Valley currently attend schools in other school districts.

*Parks:* The Grass Valley public parks and recreation system is comprised of approximately 108 acres of City park lands, including seven developed parks (Dow Alexander, Elizabeth Daniels, Glenn Jones, Minnie, Memorial, DeVere Mautino, and Condon and one underdeveloped park Morgan Ranch) within the City limits.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on Public Services to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

a) The project is not anticipated to have substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities; a 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. These impacts are considered less than significant.

*Fire Protection:* The City Fire Marshall reviewed the project and has no concerns about the Fire Department's ability to serve the Project with incorporation of Conditions of Approval required under the California Fire Code. Impacts of the project related to fire protection service are anticipated to *be less than significant*.

*Police Protection:* The proposed project will employ 35 people and is an existing business that has not had a track record of police activity. Impacts of the project related to police protection service are anticipated to *be less than significant*.

*Schools:* There are no schools located near the project site and impacts of the project related to school services are anticipated to *be less than significant*.

*Parks:* There are no parks located near the project site and the minimal number of employees anticipated to serve the project will not generate the need for additional park facilities. Impacts of the project related to park services are anticipated to ***be less than significant.***

The applicant will be required to pay the City’s impact fees for residential development, including fees for police, fire and Quimby Act (park) fees. The fees collected by the City are used to augment fire, police, parks and other public facilities. Accordingly, impacts to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities are considered ***less than significant impacts.***

**XVI. RECREATION –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**SETTING**

The City owns and maintains eight park/recreation facilities. These include three parks currently classified as “community parks”: Condon Park, Mautino Park, and Memorial Park. One of the eight parks, Morgan Ranch, is still undeveloped. In addition, the City contracts with Nevada County Historical Society to operate the Pelton Wheel Mining Museum/Glen Jones Park. An inventory of City owned/operated parks and recreation facilities include: Memorial Park, 8.4 acres; Condon Park, 80 acres; Pelton Wheel Mining Museum/Glen Jones Park, 1.7 acres; Brighton Street Park (Minnie Street), 1.6 acres; Elizabeth Daniels Park, 0.3 acres; Dow Alexander Park, 0.5 acres; Morgan Ranch Park, 4.08 acres; and Mautino Park, 12.5 acres. Additional park/recreational facilities within the City of Grass Valley but owned and maintained by entities other than the City are: Nevada County Country Club, 58 acres; Sierra College fields, 7.95 acres; Hennessy School, 3 acres. The 2013 Milco IS/MND did not include mitigation measures related to public services.

**IMPACTS**

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on recreation to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a & b) The proposed project could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and facilities. The proposed project does not include the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan, adopted February 2001, does not show any planned parks

in the project vicinity, though it does depict a potential trail near the project site to link Whispering Pines Lane to East Bennett Street through Kidder Avenue. However, while contemplated under the Master Plan, a detailed Trails Master Plan has not been developed and intervening land uses now existing warrant revisiting trail considerations in the area of the project since the adoption of the Master Plan in 2001. As described above, the proposed project includes a window and door manufacturing operation that would employ approximately 42 people, and does not propose any residential units. Therefore, an increase in population that would increase the use of parks is unlikely. As described above, there are multiple parks available for use in the Grass Valley area. As a result, the proposed project would be served by adequate recreational facilities and would not substantially increase physical deterioration of a recreational facility. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>Would the project:</b>				
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

The project site is an infill light-industrial designated property adjacent to the Whispering Pines Business Park. The project site has primary access on Whispering Pines Lane and will be served by a secondary driveway off of Clydesdale Court via an access easement on adjacent property, APN 009-680-052. The 2013 Milco IS/MND did not include mitigation measures related to transportation.

**IMPACTS**

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on transportation and traffic to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a) The project would generate temporary construction traffic initially. However, this would be temporary and would not materially alter the traffic volumes along Whispering Pines Lane or the surrounding roadways. In addition to the building, the project would include the construction of 50 parking spaces accessed by a driveway on Whispering Pines Lane. The project proposal includes a future direct (off-street) connection between the project site and the existing

Jada Windows facility on Clydesdale Court. The anticipated trip generation of the operational phase of the project was based on employees as an independent variable, as opposed to overall floor area. To achieve the anticipated trip generation associated with 70,458 square feet of floor area, the proposed facility would need to be staffed by 130 to 170 employees, which well exceeds the 42 employees conservatively anticipated to be based in the proposed facility. Based on the application of these employee-based rates, the proposed project would be expected to generate an average of 105 trips per day, including 13 during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

The City's General Plan uses Level of Service (LOS) as means to measure the functional adequacy of the city's road system. LOS is determined based on general daily traffic volume thresholds. Per the City's Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies, the City requires a Traffic Impact Study when a specific project exceeds 63 p.m. peak hour trips. The above trip generation rates for the project above p.m. peak trips are below the threshold of 63 p.m. peak hour trips that would require a traffic study by the City of Grass Valley so LOS. The applicant will be subject to the payment of AB 1600 traffic mitigation fees, (i.e. City of Grass Valley and regional traffic impact fees) which is the acceptable form of traffic mitigation for this type of infill project. These fees are used exclusively for projects identified in the City's Capital Improvement Program to finance needed infrastructure improvements to achieve the LOS anticipated with the City's 2020 General Plan. Therefore conflict with an adopted plan as it relates to the circulation system or other travel facilities is anticipated to be *less than significant*.

- b) CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, requires land use projects to be analyzed using a "vehicle miles traveled" metric to determine impacts of significance. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions are presumed to have a less than significant impact on transportation. While the City of Grass Valley has not yet adopted thresholds of significance related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) has recommended thresholds via Senate Bill 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled Implementation, Fehr & Peers, 2020. Per this document, a project that would generate fewer than 110 trips per day on average would be expected to have a less-than-significant impact on VMT and therefore would be screened from detailed study. The project would be expected to generate an average of 105 trips per day; therefore, the project can be presumed to have a less-than-significant impact on VMT.

The NCTC document states that substantial evidence for the 110-trip threshold was not provided and as VMT is measured cumulatively, any addition may be considered significant. However, support for this threshold was provided in the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA from the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which established the statewide guiding principles for VMT analysis in 2018. In this document, OPR prescribes that projects that generate fewer than 110 trips per day may be presumed to have a less-than-significant impact, unless there is substantial evidence to the contrary. This language was then adopted by Caltrans in their Transportation Impact Study Guide, 2020, which is referenced by the NCTC document as forming the basis for NCTC's policy. The project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* impact in terms of vehicle miles traveled due to the low overall trip generation estimated for the project.

- c) Based on the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS), only 21 crashes occurred in the entirety of the city in the year 2022 (current year information is not reliably available). The Idaho-Maryland and Brunswick Road intersection, which may be utilized by travelers to and from the

Project site, experienced one of the higher rates of crash incidents according to the 2022 TIMS report. However, the Project does not introduce any design features that would substantially increase hazards or create incompatible uses, and therefore there is a *less than significant* impact.

- d) The project has been reviewed by the City of Grass Valley Fire Department for emergency response. The Project site plan provides full access around the entirety of the proposed structure. The City Fire Marshall reviewed the project and has no concerns about the Fire Department’s ability to serve the Project with incorporation of Conditions of Approval required under the California Fire Code. Impacts of the project related to fire protection service are anticipated to *be less than significant*.

**XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SETTING**

The City of Grass Valley Public Works Department maintains the City’s sewer system as well as the storm drain system. The City’s sanitary sewer collection system serves an area of approximately 2,630 acres with approximately 612.5 miles of gravity sewer varying in size from 4 inches to 36 inches and nearly 1,400 manholes. Of this system, approximately 59.2 miles of pipe flow by gravity, and between 2 and 3 miles are pressurized pipes fed by pump stations. The system has seven active lift stations that are maintained by City operations personnel. The City’s Wastewater Master Plan provides assessments of the existing collection system and treatment plant capacity. The Master Plan contemplated capacity for future development including within General Plan planning area, for

which the project site had been within at the time of the study. The project was annexed in 2013 and there were no service capacity concerns noted at the time of annexation.

The Nevada Irrigation District provides domestic water service to the proposed project site whereby service comes from the Elizabeth George Treatment Plant.

Solid waste within the project area is collected by Waste Management, a licensed private disposal company. Solid waste is transported to the company's transfer station located on McCourtney Road.

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Nevada Irrigation District. Per District records, this parcel does not currently have an account however does have proper frontage to a waterline which will allow for a meter installation.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco Development IS/MND determined the proposed project impact on utilities and service systems to be less than significant and did not recommend mitigation, as is the case with the current recommendation.

- a) The proposed project will employ up to 42 employees and has limited visitation by the public. There is no concern of the project exceeding wastewater treatment requirements by the Regional Water Quality Control Board or result in the need to construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities.
- b) The Nevada Irrigation District has indicated that there is adequate capacity for the consumptive needs of the project. Potable water service would be available to this parcel from the E. George Treatment Plant upon proper application and payment of the applicable connection fees. A Water Demand Analysis is required to determine the appropriate meter size. As an infill site, water supplies are sufficient to serve the proposed development. This impact is considered *less than significant*
- c) The City's Wastewater Master Plan provides assessments of the existing collection system and treatment plant capacity. The Master Plan contemplated capacity for future development including within General Plan planning area, for which the project site had been within at the time of the study. There is an existing 6-inch sewer main line running along Whispering Pines Lane adjacent to the project. The project will include internal infrastructure improvements, including wastewater sewer in accordance with City standards. Sewer connection and capacity impact fees will be assessed at the time a building permit issuance. The wastewater generated by the project is not anticipated to cause significant environmental effects. These impacts are considered *less than significant*
- d) Solid waste within the project area is collected by Waste Management of Nevada County, a licensed private disposal company. Solid waste is transported to the company's transfer station located on McCourtney Road and will serve this site with the opening of an account. Because no demolition is required at the project site, the proposed project is not expected to generate a substantial amount of construction waste. According to CalRecycle, manufacturing uses typically produce 1.42 pounds of waste per 100 square feet per day (<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>). The proposed project would develop 70,458 square feet of manufacturing use. Therefore, it can be expected

to produce 1,000 pounds of solid waste or 0.5 tons per day. According to CalRecycle, the maximum daily volume at the McCoutney Road Transfer Station is 350 tons per day (<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/2713?siteID=2048>). The Project will therefore account for approximately 0.14% of the daily capacity of the transfer station. Commercial solid waste generated at an industrial facility or site, for example paper, plastic, metals, cardboard, etc., could be subject to the requirements of the regulation provided the facility/site generates four or more cubic yards of commercial solid waste per week. The Project would participate in the Waste Management’s commercial recycling and waste reduction program to comply with AB 939, AB 341 and AB 1826.

The industrial uses proposed by the Project, and solid waste generated by those uses, would not otherwise conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Based on the preceding, the potential for the Project to 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 is *less than significant*.

- e) The Project would be implemented and operated in compliance with applicable City General Plan Goals and Policies, and would conform with City Zoning regulations – specifically, the Project would comply with local, state, and federal initiatives and directives acting to reduce and divert solid waste from landfill waste streams. As described in section (d) above, the Project would comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) and AB 341 as implemented by Waste Management. The proposed Project is required to comply with applicable federal, state, County, and City statutes and regulations related to solid waste as a standard project condition of approval. Therefore, a *less than significant* impact would occur.

**XIX. WILDFIRE –**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## SETTING

Wildland fire protection in California is the responsibility of either the state, local government, or the federal government. The State of California has the primary financial responsibility for the prevention and suppression of wildland fires within State Responsibility Areas (SRA). The SRA forms one large area over 31 million acres to which the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) provides a basic level of wildland fire prevention and protection services.

Local Responsibility Areas (LRA) include incorporated cities, cultivated agriculture lands, and portions of the desert. LRA fire protection is typically provided by city fire departments, fire protection districts, counties, and by CAL FIRE under contract to local government. CAL FIRE uses an extension of the SRA Fire Hazard Severity Zone model as the basis for evaluating fire hazard in LRA. The LRA hazard rating reflects flame and ember intrusion from adjacent wildlands and from flammable vegetation in the urban area. The Project site is located within an LRA, and the Grass Valley Fire Department currently provides fire protection service to the City.

The project site is located in a LRA with a recommended Very High Wildfire Severity zone. The project will provide an underground private water supply system, fire sprinkler and fire alarm. The proposed access and water system will support adequate fire suppression activities. The Grass Valley Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and does not have concerns about the project moving forward. It will be required to meet California Building and Fire codes at the time of construction. According to the CALEEMod emissions modeling, which includes climate risk evaluation, the project was determined to be at a high exposure risk to wildfire. However, the project's sensitivity from experiencing physical damage, experiencing regular disruptions, and on impacting sensitive populations from wildfire was determined to be low. The project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires is *less than significant*.

## IMPACTS

The 2011 Milco IS/MND did not address wildfire impacts because it was not a mandatory CEQA checklist item at the time of its preparation.

- a) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There will be direct access to the site from Whispering Pines Lane and private driveway access through 179 Clydesdale Court (APN: 009-690-016). All fire access roads are required to comply with California Fire Code. The Grass Valley Fire Department has reviewed the project and determined the access to be sufficient and the site is not part of an adopted emergency response and evacuation plan. There is *no impact* anticipated for significant impact to the environment from interference with an adopted emergency response plan.
- b & c) The Project site is identified within a recommended Very High Wildfire Hazard Area, as shown within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) Very High Fire Severity Zone as mapped by the State Fire Marshal. The Grass Valley Fire Department has reviewed the preliminary plans and will review the final construction plans prior to building permit issuance to ensure that the project will meet all requirements for building sprinklers, fire, hydrants and fire flow. The infrastructure installation/expansion associated with the proposed project would not exacerbate

fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, the project will have *less than significant* impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks or requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

- c) The proposed improvements include engineered, 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) cut and fill slopes. Based on competent native materials at the site and the nature of the proposed improvements, the project geotechnical engineer considers deep-seated slope instability to be unlikely. The site is also not within a State-designated hazard zone for seismically induced landslides. However, near-surface soil, undocumented fill, and highly weathered bedrock are subject to instability, particularly under saturated conditions and/or seismic forces. Therefore, a Registered Professional Geologist should assess the potential for slope instability during project design. Therefore, this project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact with mitigation* related to Exposure of people or structures to significant risks, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes with incorporation of **GEO 1 Mitigation measures**.

WF 1 Mitigation Measures:

See GEO 1 Mitigation Measures

**XX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

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

- a) As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of this IS/MND, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to have the potential to result in adverse effects to special-status plant and wildlife species. Additionally, while unlikely, the project could result in impacts related to eliminating important examples of California History or Pre-history associated with

undiscovered archeological and/or paleontological resources during project construction. However, this IS/MND includes mitigation measures that would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels. With implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in this IS/MND, as well as compliance with General Plan policies these potential impacts are less than significant.

- b) The proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the City of Grass Valley, could incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts in the area. Cumulative impacts, evaluated by NSAQMD thresholds, are daily rather than cumulative. Pursuant to the NSAQMD “Guidelines for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts of Land Use Projects,” NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions must be mitigated to a level below significant for both construction and operational phases of the project. If emissions for NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG or PM<sub>10</sub> exceed 136 pounds per day (Level C), then there is a significant impact; Level B is significant if two or more pollutants fall into this category. According to the CalEEMod modeling outputs for the proposed project, short-term construction-related impacts for the project will trigger Level B mitigation measures for ROG pollution. According to the CalEEMod modeling outputs for the proposed project, Air Quality impacts related to NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> pollution from project construction, as well as all three criteria pollutants from operational project impacts are anticipated to be less than significant when compared to the NSAQMD thresholds. While they did not exceed thresholds of daily significance as determined by NSAQMD, the Level B mitigation measures will also provide a level of mitigation for these pollutants, as well as ROG, to further reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts.
- c) The window and door manufacturing project would not result in any substantial adverse effects to human beings, directly or indirectly, since each potentially significant impact can be reduced to a less than significant level with adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in this report and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations. This includes potential impacts to air quality, biological resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, and wildfire. Therefore, there would be no substantial adverse effects to human beings as a result of the project, resulting in impacts that would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

## REFERENCES

The following references used in preparing this report have not been attached to this report. The reference material listed below is available for review upon request of the Grass Valley Community Development Department, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945.

- City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan and General Plan EIR
- City of Grass Valley Development Code
- CalRecycle SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details: McCourtney Transfer Station
- CalRecycle Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- CA Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention
- City of Grass Valley Municipal Code
- Geotechnical Investigation Prepared by Geocon, dated December 2024
- Letter dated December 10, 2024 from the NCALUC Executive Director, Subject: Jada Windows
- Biological Inventory Prepared by Greg Matuzak, Biological Consultant dated September 2024
- Draft Transportation Impact Study for the Jada Windows Project, prepared by W-Trans dated November 13, 2024
- Nevada County General Plan
- North Central Information Center

- Native American Heritage Commission
- United Auburn Indian Community
- City of Grass Valley Energy Action Plan
- Office of Planning and Research
- State Geotracker, Envirostar and Department of Conservation websites
- Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- City of Grass Valley Grading Ordinance
- Mineral Management Element of the City's General Plan, dated August 24, 1993
- Background Report, City of Grass Valley General Plan Update, November 1998
- Soil Survey of Nevada County, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service
- Flood Insurance Rate Map 06057C0632E dated February 3, 2010
- On line soil survey maps and data from USDA - <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>
- California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod)

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b>					
None Required					
<b>II. Agriculture and Forest Resources</b>					
None Required					
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b>					
<p>AQ 1 Due to the possibility of Naturally Occurring Asbestos at the project site, one of the following two options shall be submitted and approved by the Northern Sierra AirQuality Management District NSAQMD prior to ground disturbance:</p> <p>1) Option 1: The applicant can engage a registered geologist to conduct an evaluation of the property. If this evaluation determines that no serpentine or ultramafic rock is likely to be found in the disturbed area, the applicant can request an exemption from the Air Pollution Control Officer of the NSAQMD. (See Tit. 17 Section 93105 (c)(1)(A) for report requirements.)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>2) Option 2: The applicant can proceed as if all soils contain asbestos and incorporate the required asbestos dust mitigation measures into the project documents and practices. As more than one acre will be disturbed, the regulations found in CCR Title 17 Section 93105(e)(2) and (4) apply. This includes submitting and acquiring</p>	Applicant	Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District	Prior to issuance of grading permits	Applicant	Written verification from NSAQMD to City Planner and Grading plans must note required items

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>NSAQMD approval of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) before moving forward. The approved ADMP shall be referenced as notes on all grading and construction plans and shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Soil track-out prevention and control</li> <li>b. Dust prevention measures for active construction areas and storage piles</li> <li>c. Dust minimization from unpaved roads, parking lots, or staging areas, including limit on vehicles speeds to 15 mph or less.</li> <li>d. Offsite material transport control</li> <li>e. Methods of post construction stabilization (in perpetuity)</li> </ul> <p>3) There may be additional OSHA requirements for employee safety throughout improvements, landscaping, and final use phases. Please contact Cal OSHA for additional information on personal protective equipment and signage requirements. The Consultation Office can be reached at (800) 963-9424.</p> <p>4) If dust or asbestos exposure appears to be an issue at any time, air monitoring may be required.</p> <p>5) Also note that under regulations of the California Department of Real Estate, the</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
presence of environmental hazards, including asbestos, must be disclosed by a property seller during any future real estate transactions					
<p>AQ 2</p> <p>1) The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project and shall be made notes on grading and construction plans:</p> <p>a) Alternatives to open burning of vegetative material will be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the District. Among suitable alternatives are chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel.</p> <p>b) Grid power shall be used (as opposed to diesel generators) for jobsite power needs where feasible during construction.</p> <p>c) Temporary traffic controls shall be provided during all phases of the construction to improve traffic flow as deemed appropriate by the City Engineer and /or Caltrans.</p> <p>d) Construction activities shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to off-peak hours as much as practicable.</p>	Applicant	Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District And City Engineer	Prior to grading and building permit issuance	Applicant	Grading and Construction plans must note required items
<p>AQ 3</p> <p>1) The following mitigation measures are standard measures relied on by the CalEEMod modeling system to determine emissions results and shall be included as notes on all grading and</p>	Applicant	City Planner	Prior to grading and building permit issuance	Applicant	Grading and Construction plans must note required items

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>construction plans:</p> <p>a) Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 25 mph on unpaved roads.</p> <p>b) Paved roads shall be swept regularly during construction to achieve dust suppression.</p> <p>c) The project shall use zero or low-VOC paints during construction. The VOC content must be lower than 50 g/L for interior coatings and 150 g/L for parking VOC coatings.</p> <p>d) Diesel-fueled, heavy-duty vehicles of more than 10,000 pounds shall not idle the vehicle's primary engine for 5 minutes or more at a single location pursuant to 13 CCR Section 2485. Exceptions include idling for the purposes of positioning or providing a power source for equipment operation, such as a lift, crane, pump, drill, hoist, or other auxiliary equipment.</p>					
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
<p>BIO 1</p> <p>1. A follow up survey of CNPS special status plants, with particular focus on dubious pea, shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist between April through May prior to any ground disturbing activity. If the Project will not include the removal of native vegetation or grading within the larger, open area within the Project area, then no additional special-status plant surveys would be required.</p>	Applicant	Planning Department	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	Survey results to be provided to City Planner

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>a) If any special-status plant species is documented within or directly adjacent to areas proposed for disturbance, as determined by the survey, and are within areas proposed for disturbance within the Project area that contain native vegetation and that are CNPS list 1A, 1B, 2A, or 2B per CEQA Guidelines Section 15380, or are listed under the ESA and/or CESA, protection of such plants shall be ensured with one of the following methods in consultation and recommendation by a qualified wildlife biologist: 1) complete avoidance, 2)transplantation, and/or 3) on- or offsite restoration.</p> <p>b) If an ESA listed special-status plant species is identified within the Project area and would be impacted by disturbance within the Project area, then a consultation with USFWS would be required as part of any future project permitting within the Project area and therefore, additional avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and monitoring requirements may be included as part of the development of a Biological Assessment (BA) to be submitted to the USFWS and a Biological Opinion (BO) developed by the USFWS through the ESA consultation process, whether Section 7 or Section 10 of</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
the ESA.					
<p><b>BIO 2</b></p> <p>1) Prior to disturbance of any riparian and/or forested woodlands within the Project area and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction bat roosting survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify the presence or absence of roosting bats, particularly the hoary bat and the pallid bat. The pre-construction bat surveys should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the riparian and forested woodland habitats along and adjacent to the seasonal drainage within the Project area. Any woodland or riparian associated trees have the potential to contain roosting bats and therefore, the trunk diameter of trees to be disturbed, removed, or within 100 feet of proposed disturbance would not preclude the preconstruction survey requirement.</p> <p>a) If any species of bat, including the hoary and pallid bat are identified during roosting surveys, passive removal of the roosting bats prior to disturbance to structures and forested woodlands should be implemented to avoid impacts to this species. Passive removal includes allowing roosting bats to freely leave the roost site. Once the roosting bats have been passively</p>	Applicant	Planning Department	Prior to any tree removal and issuance of grading permit	Applicant	Survey results to be submitted to City Planner

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>removed from the structure(s) and/or forested woodlands, the structure(s) shall be closed off from recurring bat roosting within the structure and the proposed work within the structure(s) would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species. For forested woodlands containing bat roosts, the removal of trees associated with such woodlands would only occur once the bats leave the day roosts. Furthermore, if a maternal (breeding) roost is documented, no disturbance will occur until the breeding roost has dispersed from the structure or forested woodlands they are found in.</p> <p>2) Prior to disturbance within the areas of the Project area that contain disturbed surfaces and/or annual grassland vegetation community, and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction survey for the species shall be conducted prior to any disturbance within those disturbed and developed areas of the Project area in order to avoid direct impacts to the species. The pre-construction survey should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the disturbed and annual grassland habitats within the Project area.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i) If the species is documented during pre-construction surveys, a qualified wildlife biologist (approved by CDFW) would</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>have the authority to move individual coast horned lizards outside of the proposed disturbance area(s) in order to avoid an impact to this species. Once the coast horned lizard(s) have been removed from the disturbance area(s) and out of harms way, the proposed work would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species.</p> <p>3) Construction or disturbance activities during the breeding season, February 1 through August 30, could disturb or remove occupied nests of raptors and/or protected bird species and shall require the implementation of a pre-construction survey, conducted by a qualified biologist, within and adjacent to any proposed disturbance area within the Project area along with a 250-foot buffer for nesting raptors and other protected bird species within seven (7) days prior to disturbance. The nesting survey radius around the proposed disturbance would be identified prior to the implementation of the protected bird nesting surveys by a CDFW qualified biologist and would be based on the habitat type, habitat quality, and type of disturbance proposed within or adjacent to nesting habitat.</p> <p>a) If any nesting raptors or protected birds are identified during such pre-construction surveys, trees or shrubs or grasslands with active nests</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>should be not be removed or disturbed and a no-disturbance buffer should be established around the nesting site to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site until after the breeding season or after a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged. The extent of these buffers would be determined by a CDFW qualified wildlife biologist and would depend on the special-status species present, the level of noise or construction disturbance, line of sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. These factors should be analyzed by a qualified wildlife biologist to make an appropriate decision on buffer distances based on the species and level of disturbance proposed in the vicinity of an active nest.</p>					
<p>BIO 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pursuant to the Management Plan within the Biological Inventory Report, which covers the proposed disturbance within the 30-foot stream setback, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The following measures to minimize potential impacts to the seasonal drainage and downstream aquatic resources are required during</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Applicant	Planning Department	Prior to grading or building permit issuance	Applicant	Noted on grading/construction plans

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>construction and shall be made notes or reflected graphically on all grading and construction plans. These measures are intended for inclusion into the proposed development and/or disturbances within the stream setback during and after construction to minimize direct and indirect impacts to water quality during and following construction. This will be accomplished by implementing the following during and following construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Limit construction to periods of dry weather;</li> <li>ii. Establish the area around the outside edge of the seasonal drainage as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) where those areas will not be impacted by construction;</li> <li>iii. No fill or dredge material will enter or be removed from the seasonal drainage during construction and thereafter;</li> <li>iv. Use appropriate machinery and equipment to limit</li> </ul>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>disturbance in these areas;</p> <p>v. Placement of soil erosion control devices (such as wattles, hay bales, etc.) between the seasonal drainage and the areas to be developed to limit potential runoff and sedimentation into the seasonal drainage and potentially into downstream aquatic resources;</p> <p>vi. No dewatering of seasonal drainage will occur as part of the proposed construction;</p> <p>vii. Implement Best Management Practices during and following construction; and</p> <p>viii. The project shall adhere to the City of Grass Valley stormwater drainage requirements and State water quality control board regulations for stormwater in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board region (Region 5) shall be followed and implemented as</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>part of the proposed Project and within the seasonal drainage and its 30-foot stream setback requirement.</p> <p>b. To protect the seasonal drainage and the stream setback buffer areas, as well as water quality and downstream water resources, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures should include, but are not limited to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Minimize the number and size of work areas for equipment and spoil storage sites in the vicinity of the seasonal drainage. Place staging areas and other work areas outside of the 30-foot stream setback buffers.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. The contractor shall exercise reasonable precaution to protect the seasonal drainage as well as adjacent stream setback buffers from pollution with fuels, oils, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>pollutants such as oil, cement, and wash water shall be prevented from discharging into or near these resources and shall be collected for removal off the site. All construction debris and associated materials and litter shall be removed from the work site immediately upon completion.</p> <p>iii. No equipment for vehicle maintenance or refueling shall occur within the 30-foot stream setback buffers. The contractor shall immediately contain and clean up any petroleum or other chemical spills with absorbent materials such as sawdust or kitty litter. For other hazardous materials, follow the cleanup instruction on the label.</p> <p>c. Exposed bare soil within the 30-foot stream setback buffers to the seasonal drainage should be protected against loss from erosion by the seeding of an erosion control mixture and restored with native grasses and mulching.</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>Non-native species that are known to invade wild lands, such as orchard grass, velvet grass, rose clover, winter and spring vetch, and wild oats should not be used as they displace native species.</p> <p>d. To ensure the proper and timely implementation of all mitigation measures contained in this Resources Management Plan, as well as the terms and conditions of any other required permits, the applicant shall distribute copies of these mitigation measures and permit requirements to the contractors prior to grading and construction within the stream setback buffers. All contractors shall be completely familiar with the mitigation measures contained above and with the terms and conditions of all permits.</p>					
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
<p>CUL 1</p> <p>1) The following mitigation measures shall be required as notes on all grading and construction documents:</p> <p>a) <i>Cultural Resources</i> - The presence of the</p>	Applicant	Planning Department	Prior to grading and building permit issuance.	Applicant	Notes on grading and construction plans

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>isolated prehistoric find from 2008 raises the potential for buried cultural resources within the project area. This site (P-29-003133) was documented as an isolated find and was subsequently removed (likely in 2013) by grading activities within the project area, therefore it does not constitute an archaeological site. Construction personnel should be made aware of the potential for prehistoric and historic resources within the Project Area, and construction activities should be observed by a qualified archaeological monitor. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications.</p> <p>b) <i>Cultural Resources Awareness Training</i> - Prior to the initiation of the project it is recommended that a cultural resources training be provided to supervisors, construction foreman, crew members, and any additional key construction personnel. A professional archaeologist shall administer the training. The purpose of the training is to increase awareness and knowledge of cultural resources and appropriate protocols in the event of an inadvertent discovery. The</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>training will include a discussion on the procedures for stopping work and notification of key personnel. Upon completion of the training, participants will be able to define cultural resources, describe the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, know how to locate and receive assistance from the professional archaeologist and coordinate with other sources, and describe steps to be taken when cultural resources are encountered during project implementation. Documentation of the training, signed by the professional archeologist who conducted the training, shall be submitted to the City Planner prior to any ground disturbing activities.</p> <p>c) <i>Archaeological Monitoring</i> - Cultural resource monitoring of construction activities is designed to ensure that known archaeological resources associated are protected and that previously undocumented cultural resources are identified, recorded and properly treated. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications. Monitoring shall include</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>observation of excavations to their maximum depths, documentation of soil stratigraphy, and inspection of stockpiled soil sediments. The Archaeological Monitor will be responsible for documenting monitoring activities in a daily log. At a minimum, documentation should include location of archaeological monitoring, activities for the reporting period and periodic digital photographs of the project work. Most importantly, if cultural resource remains are encountered, the Archaeological Monitor will have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities. The amount and duration of archaeological monitoring will be determined by the Professional Archaeologist.</p> <p>d) <i>Inadvertent Discoveries</i> - If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, are discovered work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources) and a qualified cultural resources specialist and UAIC representative will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The Tribe does not consider curation of TCR's to be appropriate or respectful and request materials not be permanently curated, unless requested by the Tribe.</p> <p>e) <i>Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains</i> - Any person who, in the process of project activities, discovers any cultural resources, tribal cultural resources including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits, and/or human remains within the project area, shall cease from all project activities within at least 200 feet of the discovery. A qualified professional, the Lead agency and a Tribal Representative shall be immediately notified to assess any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for cultural resource treatment.. In the event that human remains are encountered, the sheriff-coroner shall be notified immediately upon discovery. In the event that Native American human remains are encountered, the Native American Heritage Commission or the most</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>likely descendants of the buried individual(s) who are qualified to represent Native American interests shall be contacted. Specific treatment of Native American human remains shall occur consistent with State law. If adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, unique archaeology, or other cultural resources occurs, then consultation with UAIC and other traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribes regarding mitigation contained in Public Resources Code sections 21084.3(a) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15370 should occur.</p> <p>f) If the find is determined to be a TCR, the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary:</p> <p>i) The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the City to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>ii) The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a temporary conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.</p> <p>iii) The construction contractor(s) and the City shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.</p> <p>iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.</p> <p>v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>resume until authorization is granted by the City in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the City/County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the City/County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.</p>					
<p>CUL 2</p> <p>a) If any suspected Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) of cultural significance to UAIC, including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease</p>	Applicant	Planning and UAIC	During grading/ground disturbance activity	Applicant	Verification from Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archeologist.

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archeologist.</p> <p>b) A tribal Representative and the City of Grass Valley shall be immediately notified, and the Tribal Representative in coordination with the City of Grass Valley shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.</p> <p>i) The culturally affiliated tribe shall consult with the City of Grass Valley to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>ii) The construction contractor(s) shall</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.</p> <p>iii) The construction contractor(s) and City of Grass Valley shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.</p> <p>iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.</p> <p>v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>by the City of Grass Valley in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.</p> <p>vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials</p>					
<b>VI. ENERGY</b>					
No mitigation required					
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>					
<p>GEO 1</p> <p>1. Prior to building and grading permit issuance, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner indicating that grading and construction plans include all pertinent recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project</p>	Applicant	Planning Department	Prior to grading and building permit	Applicant	Notes on construction and grading plans; Written verification from geotechnical engineer

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024.</p> <p>2. Prior to building permit final, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner that indicates all recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, have been incorporated in to the geotechnical engineer's satisfaction.</p> <p>3. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the following notes shall be included on all grading and construction plans:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All recommendations outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, shall be incorporated into the project.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Oversize rock may be encountered during excavation. Oversize rock may be removed and used in landscape areas, incorporated into slope protection, and/or used as fill in accordance with specific recommendations from a</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>professional geotechnical engineer.</p> <p>c. Clayey, alluvial soil, as well as seasonal surface water and shallow groundwater seepage, may be present in the lower, southeast corner of the site, where a road is to be constructed that extends offsite to the south. Significant drying effort to attain moisture content suitable for compaction should be anticipated regardless of the time of year</p> <p>d. Moist to saturated soil conditions may be encountered in excavations advanced during and following the rainy season, particularly in excavations that reveal the soil/weathered rock transition. If grading occurs during or after the wet season (typically winter and spring), or in periods of precipitation, in place and excavated soils will likely be wet. Earthwork contractors should be aware of moisture sensitivity of clayey and fine-grained soils and potential compaction/workability difficulties.</p> <p>e. Exploration of uncontrolled fill shall be performed before or during site</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>development to identify locations of uncontrolled fill, if present, and rework the fill according to recommendations of the geotechnical engineer of record.</p> <p>f. If future improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location at the lower, western end of the site (outside of the currently proposed development area, see Figure 2 of the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation), we recommend that the shaft location be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design. The location of the closed feature should be surveyed and recorded along with as-built closure documentation.</p> <p>g. Foundations shall be embedded at least 18 inches. Allowable soil bearing capacity on the order of 3,000 psf may be used for preliminary foundation sizing. Specific foundation recommendations shall be provided as part of the design-</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>level geotechnical investigation.</p> <p>h. Interior concrete flatwork shall be designed with a capillary break and moisture barrier. Exterior concrete flatwork placed over reworked granular fill materials will not likely require an aggregate layer.</p> <p>i. Conventional flexible pavement structural sections consisting of hot mix asphalt (HMA) over compacted Class 2 aggregate base (AB) may be used provided they are properly designed (i.e., thick enough), as determined by a geotechnical engineer, for the soil conditions at the site. A previous R-Value (21) for light brown sandy clay at the site appears suitable for design of alternative pavement sections and should be confirmed based on the specific subgrade soil characteristics encountered during site development.</p> <p>j. Prior to building permit issuance, a geotechnical engineer shall confirm that uncontrolled fill is not present in the development area. In addition, exploratory trenching and/or</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
geophysical analysis may be useful to determine rock excavation characteristics in the central portion of the site. Soil corrosion testing may be performed to identify potentially corrosive conditions.					
<p>GEO 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City for acceptance, file a Notice of Intent with the California Water Quality Control Board and comply with all provisions of the Clean Water Act. The applicant shall submit the Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number, issued by the state, to the City of Grass Valley Engineering Division.</li>   <li>2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for review and approval, drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan &amp; Criteria. Measures must be implemented for site design, source control, runoff reduction, storm water treatment and</li> </ol>	Applicant	City Engineer	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Applicant	Documented filing and noted on grading plans

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
baseline hydromodification management measures per the City of Grass Valley Design Standards.					
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>					
No mitigation required					
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>					
<p>HAZ 1</p> <p>1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, the applicant shall determine if the subject parcels have been impacted by historical mining and/or provide a "No Further Action (NFA) Letter" from the CA Department of Toxic Substance Control. The determination or letter shall be provided to the Nevada County Environmental Health Department and the Grass Valley Planning Department.</p> <p>2) A State of California environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or a local agency that meets the requirements of Health and Safety Code section 101480 should provide regulatory concurrence that project is safe for construction and the proposed use. Please visit the DTSC Abandoned Mine Lands webpage for reference or further guidance.</p> <p>3) If fill material is proposed at any phase of site development, the following mitigation shall be confirmed by a registered geotechnical engineer:</p>	Applicant	Planning Department/ DTSC	Prior to issuance of grading and building permits	Applicant	Written verification from DTSC/ Geotechnical Engineer

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>All imported soil and fill material shall be tested to assess any contaminants of concern meet screening levels as outlined in DTSC's Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) Guidance Manual. Additionally, DTSC advises referencing the DTSC Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material Fact Sheet if importing fill is necessary. To minimize the possibility of introducing contaminated soil and fill material there shall be documentation of the origins of the soil or fill material and, if applicable, sampling be conducted to ensure that the imported soil and fill material are suitable for the intended land use. The soil sampling shall include analysis based on the source of the fill and knowledge of the prior land use. Additional information can be found by visiting DTSC's Human and Ecological Risk Office (HERO) webpage.</p> <p>4) If improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location, the shaft location shall be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design.</p>					
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>					
HY/WQ 1					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
See GEO 2 Mitigation Measures  See BIO 1 Mitigation Measures					
<p>HY/WQ 2 HY/WQ 2 – Mitigation Measures</p> <p>1. All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at: <a href="https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf">https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf</a></p> <p>In part it states:</p> <p><i>Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.</i></p> <p>2. If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement</p>	Applicant	City Engineering Department	Prior to Grading Permit	Applicant	Documented filing when necessary and noted on grading plans

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>(WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: <a href="https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf">https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf</a></p> <p>3. If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
<p>Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.</p> <p>4. If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for <i>Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water</i> (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order.</p> <p>5. If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant</p>					

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Jada windows

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Funding	Performance Evaluation Criteria
Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit.					
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>					
None Required					
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES</b>					
None Required					
<b>XIII. NOISE</b>					
None required					
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>					
None Required					
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>					
None Required					
<b>XVI. RECREATION</b>					
None Required					
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>					
None Required					
<b>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>					
None Required					
<b>XIX. WILDFIRE</b>					
See GEO 1 Mitigation Measures					

## Community Development Department

Amy Wolfson, City Planner

125 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

**Building Division**

530-274-4340

**Planning Division**

530-274-4330

Fax 530-274-4399

---

March 25, 2025

### **Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report for the Approved Jada Windows Expansion Project**

**Project:** Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted for the Jada Windows Project at 1021 Whispering Pines Lane to analyze the environmental impacts related to a proposal to expand the approved grading for the project to include a 36,000 square foot graded pad on the adjacent parcel at 1011 Whispering Pines Lane, owned in common.

**Lead Agency:** City of Grass Valley

**Contact:** Amy Wolfson, City Planner

**Applicant:** Jada, Inc represented by Keven Nelson, Registered Professional Engineer

**Project Location:** 1011 Whispering Pines Lane

#### **Background:**

At its February 18, 2025 regular meeting, the Planning Commission approved the 70,480 sq ft metal manufacturing buildings to accommodate an expansion for the existing Jada Windows business at 179 Clydesdale Court and a Use Permit to accommodate a reduction in parking standards, to be developed at 1201 Whispering Pines Lane. The Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration with associated Mitigation Measures for the project. This document analyzes the environmental impact of a proposed expansion of the originally analyzed grading area to include a 36,000 square foot graded pad on 1011 Whispering Pines Lane, adjacent to the approved development at 1021 Whispering Pines Lane.

#### **Purpose of this Addendum:**

An addendum to the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Jada Windows Development Review and Use Permit project at 1011 Whispering Pines Lane (State Clearinghouse No. 2025010265) has been prepared in conformance with Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which allows a lead agency to prepare an addendum to a certified EIR if changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions in Section 15162 calling for a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

The purpose of this Addendum is to document that none of the conditions outlined in Section 15162 calling for a subsequent EIR or MND have occurred with the addition of the proposed 36,000 square foot grading area to accommodate a pad on the adjacent parcel at 1011 Whispering Pines Lane, owned in common with 1021 Whispering Pines Lane. The pad would

accommodate a future building site and also allow the applicant to retain excavated material associated with grading on 1021 Whispering Pines Lane project. This is beneficial from an air quality and greenhouse gas emissions perspective because material will not have to be off-hauled for the grading work associated with the current building construction, and will also not need to be on-hauled for the future building construction project, thereby reducing vehicle emissions associated with on/off-haul truck trips.

### **Description of the Proposed Changes:**

#### **Proposed Modification:**

Expand the approved grading associated with the project at 1121 and previously analyzed in an adopted Tiered Mitigated Negative Declaration associated with project file no. 24PLN-0046, to expand the grading area to include a 36,000 square foot building pad for the future construction of a building at 1101 Whispering Pines Lane, which is under common ownership, in order to avoid off-haul of excavated soil.

#### **CEQA Analysis :**

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with Section 21166 of CEQA and Sections 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15164(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." Pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, a Subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration is only required when:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revision of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revision of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;  
or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - (a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
  - (b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative;  
or
  - (d) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a])

The biological and geotechnical special studies submitted by the applicant in 2024 were prepared in a manner that encompassed additional grading work because the applicant had originally considered developing both parcels. The IS/MND only evaluated the impact of the project description as was submitted for the application which only included the manufacturing building and the associated circulation and parking area. However, the mitigation measures were informed by the special studies and therefore, are effective at mitigating the project impacts of the expanded grading area, as well. None of the conditions described above from CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent document have occurred. Therefore, the differences between the approved Jada Windows manufacturing building Project, as described in the adopted IS/MND, and the project modification for an expanded grading pad on the adjacent lot now being considered, are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, and may be addressed in an addendum to the IS/MND.

**Environmental Review of Expanded Grading:**

The City of Grass Valley has determined that, in accordance with PRC Section 21166 and Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, minor technical changes or additions to the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration are necessary to address the modifications to the approved Jada Windows development Project. The analysis of environmental effects provided below addresses the same impacts addressed in the Jada Windows development IS/MND. The environmental analysis evaluates whether, for each applicable environmental resource topic there are any changes in the project or the circumstances under which it would be undertaken that would result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts than considered in the adopted IS/MND. This analysis focuses only on those topics potentially affected by the proposed change in expanded grading. No changes are proposed to the use of the development, approved land use or density, required infrastructure improvements or any of the previously adopted mitigation measures. The City has reviewed the adopted IS/MND and determined the following:

<b>Environmental Topic</b>	<b>Evaluation Summary</b>
Aesthetics	The proposed expanded graded pad is located just west of the truck maneuvering area associated with the manufacturing building. Due to the configuration of the lot in relation to Whispering Pines Lane, the graded pad will angle away from the public roadway and will have intervening private property between it and the road. The area is sparsely vegetated. A total of 12 small trees between 3 and 8 inches DBH will be removed to accommodate the grading. The aesthetic appeal of the site is not anticipated to visually degrade the character of the area, particularly given the light industrial character surrounding the site and the limited ability to view the site from public vantages.
Air Quality/GHG	The Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) has indicated that the proposed retention of the excavated material is a preferable approach due to the considerable process involved in off-hauling soil with potential

	natural occurring asbestos. Retaining onsite limits exposure risk. It also has the added benefit of reducing overall truck trips required to off-haul excavated material to an off-site facility, and on-haul fill material for a future pad development, thus reducing vehicle emissions.
Biological Resources	All previously identified mitigation measures remain applicable to the expanded project including biological surveys associated with ground disturbance and tree removal . No new or increased impact would occur. The Biological Resources Assessment dated September 2024, prepared for the project analyzed the entire property, including the area encompassed by the proposed expanded grading. All recommendations were made mitigation measures and will be applicable to the proposed expansion area.
Geotechnical	Jason Muir, Geotechnical Engineer with Geocon, Inc. provided a letter dated March 16, 2026 confirming that the expanded grading area generally conforms with the geotechnical investigation report prepared for the original project and which informed the adopted IS/MND. All recommendations were made mitigation measures and will be applicable to the proposed expansion area.
Traffic/Transportation	Overall, traffic would be reduced by avoiding off-haul of the excavated material and future traffic due to avoiding on-haul of fill material if the expanded graded pad were to be created at a future time.
Noise	Temporary construction noise may occur but is not anticipated to be of any more intensity than was evaluated by the IS/MND. The nearest sensitive receptor will remain 1,200 feet from the construction site as was analyzed at the time of the IS/MND preparation. The expanded grading is not anticipated to generate any additional noise impacts.
Public Services/Utilities	Infrastructure demand remains consistent with prior analysis; The expanded graded pad would not create new service needs.
Cumulative Impacts	Cumulative impacts remain as previously analyzed.

No other CEQA topics would experience new or substantially more severe impacts due to the proposed modification.

**Consistency with Adopted Mitigation Measures:**

All mitigation measures adopted under the IS/MND prepared for the Jada Windows Development Review Permit project remain in effect and are applicable to the expanded grading area. If mitigation timing is linked to specific milestones (e.g. “prior to issuance of grading permit” or “prior to occupancy”), such measures will apply to the expanded grading as relevant to the scope of work.

**CEQA Determination:**


Based on the above evaluation and the criteria of CEQA Guidelines SS15162-15164:

- No substantial changes are proposed that would require major revisions to the IS/MND or SEIR;
- No substantial changes in the surrounding circumstances have occurred; and
- No new information of substantial importance has been identified that would result in new significant effects or more severe impacts.

Therefore, an Addendum to the adopted IS/MND is the appropriate CEQA documentation, and preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental IS/MND or EIR is not required to allow the expansion of the grading to encompass 5,000 cubic yards of excavated material from the current grading site to be used to create a 36,000 square foot building pad for future construction. Overall impacts, particularly related to air quality and traffic are anticipated to be reduced to decreased traffic associated with off-haul and on-haul of soil to/from the construction site. include a condition of approval for phasing the project over a seven-year period.

**References:**

- Tiered Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration, Jada Windows Development and Use Permit Application (24PLN-46)
- CEQA Guidelines §§15162, 15164.
- City of Grass Valley, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Jada Windows.



**SCALE**  
1 INCH = 30 FEET

- LEGEND**
- FLOW LINE
  - PROPERTY LINE
  - EXIST. EDGE OF PAVEMENT
  - PROPOSED CULVERTS (AS CALLED OUT)
  - EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN
  - ✗ EXISTING TREES TO REMOVED


NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	DESIGNED BY: KJN
			DRAWN BY: KJN
			CHECKED BY: KJN
			DATE: March 16, 2026
			PROJECT No.: 21-242
			DWG. NAME: 21-242 Off-Site Grading Plan.dwg



**NELSON ENGINEERING**  
Civil Engineering, Surveying & Land Planning  
14028 Camas Court (530) 432-4818  
Penn Valley, CA 95946 www.nelsonengineer.com

ENGINEERING DIVISION  
**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
GRADING PLAN FOR:  
**JADA, Inc. - Parcel 1**  
A.P.N. 009-680-058

DRN BY: KJN	DES BY: KJN	CK'D BY: KJN
PROJECT ENGINEER: Nelson Engineering		
ACCEPTED BY:	DATE: 7/5/26	RCE NUMBER:
CITY ENGINEER	DATE: 7/5/26	RCE NUMBER:
PROJECT NUMBER:	DRAWING NUMBER:	
SHEET 1 OF 3	DRAWING NUMBER:	



INSTALL 700 LF± OF SILT FENCING AROUND PERIMETER OF GRADING AREA PER BMP STD. DWG SE-1

INSTALL 340 LF± OF FIBER ROLLS AT TOP OF SLOPE PER BMP STD. DWG SE-5

INSTALL 235 LF± OF FIBER ROLLS MIDWAY DOWN THE SLOPE PER BMP STD. DWG SE-5

**Jada, Inc. Parcel 1**  
 LLA Deed Doc. No. 2025-007946  
 2.04 Acres

**PAD AREA**  
 36,000± SF  
 CUT: 1,000± CY  
 FILL: 6,000± CY  
 EXISTING STOCKPILE AREA: 5,000± CY  
 EXPORT/IMPORT AREA: 0± CY

**Jada, Inc. Parcel 2**  
 LLA Deed Doc. No. 2025-007946  
 5.70 Acres

**Jada Windows Building**  
 70,458 SF  
 F.F.=2,636.0

**LEGEND**

- HYDROSEEDING PER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES HANDBOOK DETAIL EC-4. (54,000 SF±)
- SILT FENCING PER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES HANDBOOK DETAIL SE-1. (700 LF±)
- FIBER ROLLS PER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES HANDBOOK DETAIL SE-5. (575 LF±)
- INDICATES TREE PROTECTION FENCING
- FLOW LINE
- PROPERTY LINE
- EXIST. EDGE OF PAVEMENT
- PROPOSED CULVERTS (AS CALLED OUT)
- EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN
- EXISTING TREES TO REMOVED




**NELSON ENGINEERING**  
 Civil Engineering, Surveying & Land Planning  
 14028 Camas Court (530) 432-4818  
 Penn Valley, CA 95946 www.nelsonengineer.com

ENGINEERING DIVISION  
**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
 EROSION CONTROL PLAN FOR:  
**JADA, Inc. - Parcel 1**  
 A.P.N. 009-680-058

DRN BY: KJN	DES BY: KJN	CK'D BY: KJN
PROJECT ENGINEER: Nelson Engineering		
ACCEPTED BY:	DATE: 7/5/26	RCE NUMBER:
CITY ENGINEER	DATE	RCE NUMBER
PROJECT NUMBER		
SHEET <b>2</b> OF <b>3</b>		DRAWING NUMBER

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	DESIGNED BY: KJN
			DRAWN BY: KJN
			CHECKED BY: KJN
			DATE: March 16, 2026
			PROJECT No.: 21-242
			DWG. NAME: 21-242 Off-Site Grading Plan.dwg



**Cross Section "A-A"**

Scales: Horiz.: 1" = 30'  
Vert.: 1" = 15'

**NELSON ENGINEERING**  
Civil Engineering, Surveying & Land Planning  
14028 Camas Court (530) 432-4818  
Penn Valley, CA 95946 www.nelsonengineer.com



ENGINEERING DIVISION  
**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
CROSS-SECTION FOR:  
**JADA, Inc. - Parcel 1**  
A.P.N. 009-680-058

DRN BY: KJN DES BY: KJN CK'D BY: KJN  
PROJECT ENGINEER: Nelson Engineering

ACCEPTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: 7/5/26  
CITY ENGINEER RCE NUMBER

PROJECT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
SHEET **3** OF **3** DRAWING NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	DESIGNED BY: KJN
			DRAWN BY: KJN
			CHECKED BY: KJN
			DATE: March 16, 2026
			PROJECT No.: 21-242
			DWG. NAME: 21-242 Off-Site Grading Plan.dwg



**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
**Community Development Department**

Amy Wolfson, City Planner

125 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

**Building Division**  
530-274-4340

**Planning Division**  
530-274-4330  
530-274-4399 fax

**Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures for 24PLN-46 / 26PLN-10**  
**(Modified to reflect Expanded Graded Pad)**

**PLANNING:**

1. The approval date for Development Review is February 18, 2025 with an effective date of Thursday, March 6, 2025 pursuant to Section 17.74.020 GVMC. Once necessary permitting is secured through the CA Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), considered the initial phase of this project, subsequent phases, including grading, and building permit issuance, shall be exercised within 12 months from the date the previous phase was exercised pursuant to section 17.74.060, or the applicant requests a time extension that is approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to the Development Code.
2. The final design shall be consistent with the Development Review application and plans provided by the applicant and approved by the Development Review Committee (24PLN-46). The project is approved subject to plans on file with the Community Development Department. The Community Development Director may approve minor changes as determined appropriate.
3. A tree removal permit shall be required for the removal of any tree over 10 inches Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) pursuant to city municipal code chapter 12.36
4. The applicant's landscape architect shall submit a letter specifying that the landscaping and irrigation has been installed in accordance with the approved landscape plans
5. The applicant's landscape architect or landscape contractor shall submit to the City for approval the "certificate of completion" form as required by the Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (MWELo)
6. The applicant shall conduct an irrigation audit pursuant to the requirements of the MWELo. This shall be conducted by a third-party certified landscape irrigation auditor that did not install or design the landscape and irrigation. Prior to the audit City must confirm the selected auditor complies with MWELo requirements.
7. Prior to building final and to accommodate the shared truck maneuvering space that crosses the adjusted property line, a deed restriction requiring an access easement, shall be reviewed by city staff prior to recording at the Nevada County Recorder's Office.
8. The applicant shall file for a sign permit prior to erecting signage.

9. Any change of occupancy, and or change of building use, would require a revised traffic study to determine whether roadway improvements are required with a larger occupancy potential, and requiring expansion of the parking facility to be consistent with Section 17.36.030.
10. Use of the expanded graded pad shall be consistent with Table 2-10 of the City Municipal Code and is subject to Development Review permit review. Outdoor storage is prohibited unless a Use Permit is approved through a subsequent application.
11. The applicant agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Grass Valley in any action or proceeding brought against the City of Grass Valley to void or annul this discretionary land use approval

**BUILDING:**

12. The occupancy of the building shall be classified as “F-2.”
13. The Construction type shall be “VA” or 60’ setback to all property lines for unlimited type VB
14. Plumbing fixtures shall be based on occupancy- precise floor area calculations will be required to justify reduced fixtures
15. 2022 or current Building Codes shall apply

**ENGINEERING:**

1. The applicant shall submit to the Building Department for review and approval, an improvements and grading plan prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer; shall obtain a Grading Permit; and shall pay all appropriate fees for plan check and inspection. The grading and improvement plans shall include but not be limited to roadway/driveway/parking lot slopes and elevations, curb, gutters, sidewalks, striping and signing, paving, water and sewer pipelines, storm drains, street/parking lot lights, accessible access from the sidewalk to the building and from the accessible parking spaces to the building, retaining walls, any necessary alteration of existing utilities, and all easements, in accordance with City Improvement Standards.
2. The project plans shall include the following note:  
“All trees to be saved shall be enclosed by a construction barrier placed around the dripline zone of the tree. The construction barrier shall consist of four-foot tall mesh safety fencing in a bright color. The fencing shall be tied to six-foot tall metal poles spaced a maximum of twenty feet apart. Each pole shall be placed with two feet below the surface of the ground.”
3. If trees to be removed are 6” or greater in diameter, are classified to be in Group A or B per the California Forest Practice Rules, and are on timberland, the applicant shall obtain one of the following harvest document(s) from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and submit a copy of the approved document to the City:

- a. Less than 3 Acre Conversion Exemption. Any project with less than 3 acres of land disturbance may qualify (see 14 CCR 1104.1 (a)(2) for conditions).
  - b. Timberland Conversion (PRC4621) and Timber Harvest Plan (PRC.4581). Any project with 3 acres or greater or that do not meet the conditions in 14 CCR 1104.1 (a)(2).
4. The applicant shall submit to the Building Department for review and acceptance two copies of a detailed Soils Engineering Report and Engineering Geology Report certified by a Civil Engineer registered in the State of California. In addition to the California Building Code requirements, the report shall specify the pavement structural sections for the proposed roadways in relation to the proposed traffic indexes. The improvements and grading plans shall incorporate the recommendations of the approved Soils Engineering Report and Engineering Geology Report. The project developer shall retain a civil engineer, soils engineer, and engineering geologist to provide professional inspection of the grading operations. If work is observed as not being done in compliance with the California Building Code and the approved improvements and grading plans, the discrepancies shall be reported immediately in writing to the permittee, the building official, and the Engineering Division.
5. If any retaining walls or other wall structures equal to or greater than four feet in height (from the base of the footing to the top of the wall) are identified on the grading/improvement plans, the applicant shall:
  - a. Place a note on the grading/improvement plans stating that any walls equal to or greater than four feet in height will require a Building Permit prior to being constructed.
  - b. Submit design calculations for the walls for review and acceptance.
  - c. If the proposed walls are to be constructed against a cut slope that cannot be graded back per the California Building Code, submit:
  - d. A signed and stamped letter from a Licensed Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer identifying a temporary shoring plan and how the cut slopes for the walls will be protected from the weather during construction.
6. A signed and stamped letter from a Licensed Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer stating that a copy of the required OSHA Permit will be supplied to the City prior to any excavation on the site and that a qualified OSHA Approved Inspector or Professional Civil Engineer will:
  - a. Be onsite during excavation for an construction of the retaining walls;
  - b. Be onsite at least once a day during inclement weather; and
  - c. Will submit daily reports to the City.
7. The applicant shall submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City for acceptance, file a Notice of Intent with the California Water Quality Control Board and comply with all provisions of the Clean Water Act. The applicant shall include the Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number, issued by the State, on all sheets of the grading plan set.

8. The applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for review and approval, drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan & Criteria.
9. Measures must be implemented for site design, source control, runoff reduction, storm water treatment and baseline hydromodification management measures per the City of Grass Valley Design Standards.
10. An Improvement Performance Security shall be submitted (if a subdivision improvement agreement is not in place). The amount of the security shall be for the sum of: 1) 100% of the cost of public improvements necessary to restore the public right of way back to existing conditions or the cost of the public improvements, whichever is less; 2) 10% of the cost erosion and sedimentation control necessary to stabilize the site; 3) 10% of the cost of tree replacement; and 4) 100% of the cost to address any features which could cause a hazard to the public or neighboring property owners if left in an incomplete state. The minimum security amount shall be \$500.00. The cost estimate shall be provided to the Engineering Division for review and approval as a part of the plan submittal. All costs shall include a ten (10) percent contingency. Either a cash deposit or our standard bond shall be provided. In either case, the applicant shall submit the "Bonds/Security Agreement with their Security.
11. A detailed grading, permanent erosion control and landscaping plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Engineering Division prior to commencing grading. Erosion control measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans. Any expenses made by the City to enforce the required erosion control measures will be paid by the deposit.
12. The applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for review, a separate sight distance exhibit showing that minimum sight distance requirements are achieved in accordance with City of Grass Valley Design Standards. The exhibit shall indicate the roadway design speed, sight distance design speed, sight distance in both directions, and delineate any areas of vegetation removal/easements and no parking areas, recommended for optimal sight distance and/or vehicular movements.
13. The applicant shall submit sewer calculations for the proposed development and any calculations necessary to verify the existing sewer system's ability to carry the additional flow created by the development.
14. The improvements and grading plans shall be signed by all other jurisdictional agencies involved (i.e. NID), prior to receiving City Engineer approval.
15. Per the Development Code, the Grading Permit shall expire one (1) year from the effective date of the permit unless an extension is granted by the City Engineer (for up to 180 days)

**Prior to initiating grading and/or construction of the site improvements for the project, the developer shall complete the following:**

16. Prior to any work being conducted within the State, County or City right-of-way, the applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from the appropriate Agency.
17. A minimum of forty-eight (48) hours prior to commencement of grading activities, the developer's contractor shall notify the Engineering Division of the intent to begin grading operations. Prior to notification, all grade stakes shall be in place identifying limits of all cut and fill activities. After notification, Engineering staff shall be provided the opportunity to field review the grading limits to ensure conformity with the approved improvement and grading plans. If differences are noted in the field, grading activities shall be delayed until issues are resolved.
18. Placement of construction fencing around all trees designated to be preserved in the project.

**During construction, the following conditions shall apply:**

19. The developer shall keep adjoining public streets free and clean of project dirt, mud, materials, and debris during the construction period.
20. Where soil or geologic conditions encountered in grading operations are different from that anticipated in the soil and/or geologic investigation report, or where such conditions warrant changes to the recommendations contained in the original soil investigation, a revised soil or geologic report shall be submitted by the applicant, for approval by the City Engineer. It shall be accompanied by an engineering or geologic opinion as to the safety of the site from hazards of land slippage, erosion, settlement, and seismic activity.
21. No trucks may transport excavated material off-site unless the loads are adequately wetted and either covered with tarps or loaded such that the material does not touch the front, back, or sides of the cargo compartment at any point less than six inches to top of the cargo compartment. All excavated material must be properly disposed of in accordance with the City's Standard Specifications.
22. The contractor shall comply with all Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements.
23. For any public work, the contractor shall comply with all Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) requirements including complying with prevailing wage requirements.

**STANDARD PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT SECURITY CONDITIONS:**

**Prior to acceptance of public improvements and/or exoneration of bonds, or other form of security, the following conditions shall be satisfied:**

24. A Warranty and Guarantee security guaranteeing the public improvements for a period of one year shall be provided in the amount of 10% of the total improvement costs. Either a cash deposit or our standard bond shall be provided. In either case, the applicant shall submit the "Bonds - Security Agreement" with their security. The form, "Bonds – Guarantee and Warranty" shall be used for the bond.


25. The applicant shall sign and record a covenant and agreement to ensure that the onsite storm water facilities will be maintained by the property owner(s).
26. "As-built" plans showing all of the public improvements installed, signed by the Engineer of Record, must be submitted to the Engineering Division in digital format (either in AutoCAD or a PDF).
27. A final report prepared by the soils engineer, in accordance with the California Building Code, must be submitted to the Engineering Division.
28. A final report prepared by the geologist, in accordance with the California Building Code, must be submitted to the Engineering Division.
29. The grading contractor shall submit a statement of conformance to the as-built plans and specifications. Statement must meet intent of the California Building Code. An example is: "As the grading contractor, I confirm that all improvements were constructed as shown on these improvement plans." Include signature, company and date.

**GRADING PERMIT PLAN REQUIREMENTS:**

**Complete Grading Plans must address all applicable provisions of the Grass Valley Municipal Code, Section 15.06.020, Development Code, Improvement Standards and Appendix J of the California Building Code, including but not limited to the following:**

30. Grading plan is to be signed and stamped by a California registered Civil Engineer if grading is in excess of 5,000 cubic yards. Printed name, address, registration number, and phone number of engineer or architect to be shown on the cover sheet of the grading plans.
31. Printed name, address, and phone number of both owner/applicant and soils engineer are to be shown on the cover sheet of the grading plans.
32. Title block on all plan sheets shall be included showing the address, APN, Planning Project Number, if any, and/or location of the project.

ENGINEERING DIVISION CITY OF GRASS VALLEY			
GRADING AND IMPROVEMENT PLANS FOR MEC STORAGE FACILITY			
PROJECT ENGINEER:		JASON BARNUM	
ACCEPTED BY:			
CITY ENGINEER:	DATE	75378	REG. NUMBER
PROJECT NUMBER		GP23-01	
SHEET 1 OF 14	DRAWING NUMBER:	2200	



C

33. The estimated volumes, in cubic yards, of cut and/or fill and area of site to be shown on plans. Excess dirt moved outside the City Limits shall comply with the applicable standards of the area it is moved to. Any location within the City Limits used for disposal of excess dirt will require a separate Grading Permit for that site.
34. Vicinity map, north arrow, benchmark and scale (min. of 1" = 50') to be shown on the cover sheet of the grading plans.
35. External property boundary lines and all internal lot lines, numbers, and dimensions shall be included on the plans.
36. Existing natural features, including wetlands, streams, trees, etc. shall be shown on the grading plans. Include specific tree protection measures and other mitigation measures being incorporated in plans to protect natural features.
37. All existing improvements, easements, drainage facilities, and underground utilities on the property and within 25 feet of the project boundaries shall be shown on the plans.
38. Location of all proposed drainage facilities and storm water detention facilities consistent with the drainage report, calculations and additional documentation pursuant to the City's Improvement Standards shall be shown on the plans.
39. Existing contours (maximum interval of 2 feet) to be shown as broken (dashed) lines properly identified on the plan and extend to a minimum of 25 feet beyond the perimeter of the property. All buildings, trees, fences and structures on-site and on adjacent lots within 15 feet of the perimeter of the property to be shown and labeled on the plans. The effect the proposed grading will have on adjacent properties (cuts, fills, drainage, etc.) to be shown on the plans. Any grading performed on adjacent private property shall be clearly shown and will require a signed release for the adjacent legal owner.
40. Proposed final grades to be clearly shown and designated on plans along with all cut and fill slopes. Slopes to be clearly designated on plans with slope (H:V) being shown. The contours of all new grading shall be in solid lines.
  - d. Toe of fill slopes must be inside site boundaries by H/2 (2 ft. min., 20 ft. max.) and 5' away from the top of cut slope or existing steep bank to provide a bench in natural ground.
  - e. Top of cut/fill slopes must be inside site boundaries by H/2 (2ft. min., 10 ft. max.).
  - f. All slopes shall be a maximum of 2:1, unless approved by the soil engineer (with accompanying data) and the Building Official.
  - g. No fill may be placed on existing terrain where slopes are greater than 2:1.
  - h. Lots must have required 1-2% slope to public right of way or drainage easement or drainage purposes unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
  - i. Show how drainage is prevented from crossing property lines.
  - j. Show cross sections for all cut and fill slopes.

41. Details of site drainage, including any proposed on-site drainage structures, walls, cribbing, surface protection, etc. must meet City Improvement Standards and must be shown on the grading plans.
42. Retaining walls, including details and cross sections, etc., shall be shown on the grading plans.
43. Recommendations and conclusions in the Preliminary Soils Report and/or Geotechnical Report are to be incorporated in the design of the grading plan.
44. Plan size is to be standard 36" x 24" sheets.
45. Erosion Control Plan and Best Management Practices shall be included in the plans per the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards.

**THE FOLLOWING NOTES ARE REQUIRED ON GRADING PLANS/EROSION CONTROL PLANS:**

46. All grading shall conform to the Grass Valley Development Code, Improvement Standards, and the current City-adopted edition of the California Building Code.
47. All provisions of the preliminary soils report that must be submitted to the Engineering Division shall be complied with during grading operations.
48. This plan is for grading purposes only and is not to be used for the purpose of constructing on-site or off-site improvements. Issuance of a permit based on this plan does not constitute approval of driveway locations or sizes, parking lot structural sections or layout, ADA-related requirements, building locations or foundations, walls, curbing, off-site drainage facilities or other items not related directly to the basic grading operation. On-site improvements shall be constructed from approved building permit plans. Off-site improvements shall be constructed from plans approved for this purpose by the Engineering Department.
49. Certification from the registered civil engineer, if engineered grading, or California licensed contractor, if not engineered grading, stating that the grading has been completed per the approved plan, and a compaction report from the soil engineer for fill areas are required prior to building permits being issued.
50. Contractor is responsible for erosion, dust and temporary drainage control during grading operations.
51. All manufactured slopes in excess of 5 feet in vertical height are to be protected from erosion during rough grading operations and, thereafter, until installation of final ground cover. (See landscape plans for final ground cover).
52. All slope protection swales to be constructed at the same time as banks are graded.

53. The property owner is responsible for implementation and maintenance of the erosion control measures shown on this plan and SWPPP, if applicable, and also to provide any additional erosion control measures (e.g., hydroseeding, mulching of straw, sandbagging, diversion ditches, retention basins, etc.) dictated by field conditions to prevent erosion and/or sedimentation from leaving the site and/or impacting stormwater runoff. Special attention shall be given to additional measures during any qualifying rain event.
54. After a rainstorm, all silt and debris shall be removed from check berms, check dams, and all paved areas.
55. Any improvements constructed in the public right-of-way will require a separate encroachment permit and inspection from the Engineering Department.
56. Any walls, fences, structures and/or appurtenances adjacent to this project are to be protected in place. If grading operations damage or adversely affect said items in any way, the contractor and/or developer is responsible for working out an acceptable solution to the satisfaction of the affected property owner(s).
57. The contractor/developer is responsible for ensuring that retaining walls do not interfere with provision of utilities.
58. It is the grading contractor's responsibility to ensure that adequate compaction has been attained on the entire grading site, including fill areas outside the building pads and on all fill slopes.
59. The soil engineer shall observe and perform compaction tests during the grading to evaluate the preparation of the natural ground surface to receive the fill and the compaction attained in the fill, including fill areas outside the building pads and on all fill slopes.
60. Earthwork quantities are shown for grading permit purposes only, and the City of Grass Valley is not responsible for their accuracy.
61. Grading operations within a residential zone or within 500 feet of a residential zone shall be limited to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and on Saturday. No grading will be permitted on Sunday or legal holidays (Municipal Code, Section 8.28.100).
62. If grading or other construction operations unearth archeological or historical artifacts or resources, construction activities shall cease immediately. The Planning and Engineering Division shall be notified of the extent and location of discovered materials so that they may be recorded by a qualified archeologist. Disposition of artifacts shall comply with State and Federal laws.
63. If any hazardous waste is encountered during the construction of this project, all work shall be immediately stopped and the Nevada County Environmental Health Department, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the City Inspector shall be notified immediately. Work shall not proceed until clearance has been issued by all of these agencies.

64. Where soil or geologic conditions encountered in grading operations are different from that anticipated in the soil and/or geologic investigation report, or where such conditions warrant changes to the recommendations contained in the original soil investigation, a revised soil or geologic report shall be submitted by the applicant, for approval by the City Engineer. It shall be accompanied by an engineering and geological opinion as to the safety of the site from hazards of land slippage, erosion, settlement, and seismic activity.
65. No trucks may transport excavated material off-site unless the loads are adequately wetted and either covered with tarps or loaded such that the material does not touch the front, back, or sides of the cargo compartment at any point less than six inches to the top of the cargo compartment. All excavated material must be properly disposed of in accordance with the City's Standard Specifications.
66. If trees to be removed are 6" or greater in diameter, are classified to be in Group A or B per the California Forest Practice Rules, and are on timberland, the applicant shall obtain one of the following harvest document(s) from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and submit a copy of the approved document to the City:
- a. Less than 3 Acre Conversion Exemption. Any project with less than 3 acres of land disturbance may qualify (see 14 CCR 1104.1 (a)(2) for conditions).
  - b. Timberland Conversion (PRC4621) and Timber Harvest Plan (PRC.4581). Any project with 3 acres or greater or that do not meet the conditions in 14 CCR 1104.1 (a)(2).

**Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger Conditions:**

67. The applicant agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City in any action or proceeding brought against the City to void or annul this discretionary land use approval.
68. Lot Line Adjustment documents must be approved by the City Engineer prior to recording. To receive approval, the applicant shall submit the documents listed below to the Engineering Division. Upon approval by the City Engineer, the applicant shall record the deed(s) at his expense and submit one copy of the recorded deed(s) to the Engineering Division.
- a. Draft legal description for each parcel.
  - b. Lot Line Adjustment Exhibit Plat(s) or record of survey. The Lot Line Adjustment Exhibit Plat(s) and/or record of survey must conform to the Lot Line Adjustment application, be prepared, stamped, and signed by a licensed professional surveyor, and include the following statement for approval by the City Engineer:  
"This plat (or record of survey) conforms to the lot line adjustment [Insert Application No.] approved by the City of Grass Valley City Engineer on [Insert blank line for City to fill in date].  
[Insert Blank Line or Signature] Bjorn P. Jones, RCE 75378"
  - c. Draft deed documents. The following note shall be placed on the deed or deeds:

“This deed describes a Lot Line Adjustment between the lands of [Insert Name], described in that certain document recorded at [Insert Document No.], Nevada County Records, [Insert APN], and the lands of [Insert Name], described in that certain document recorded at [Insert Document No.], Nevada County Records, [Insert APN]. This deed is recorded pursuant to [Insert Application No.], on file in the office of the City of Grass Valley Planning Division. It is the express intent of the signators hereto that the recordation of this deed extinguishes any underlying parcels or portions of parcels.”

- d. Current tax certificate for each parcel.
- e. Evidence that any existing deeds of trust have been or will be revised upon recordation of the lot line adjustment deeds to reflect the new property descriptions. Verification may be in letter form, or copies of the reconveyance submitted with the Lot Line Adjustment deeds for review.
- f. Closure calculations.
- g. Copies of reference deeds.

**NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT:**

- 69. Prior to installation of the Private Fire System (PFS) an easement shall be recorded on the property to the satisfaction of NID
- 70. Service appears to come from the Elizabeth George Treatment Plant and shall require Reduced Pressure (RP) for backflow and irrigation water.
- 71. A Water Demand Analysis (WDA) shall be required to determine meter size(s)
- 72. Prior to building permit issuance, applicant shall request fire flow for location.

**COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT:**

- 73. Historical Mining Activity: Determine if the subject parcels have been impacted by historical mining activities and/or provide to NCDEH a “No Further Action (NFA) Letter” from DTSC for the subject parcels. For more information:  
<https://dtsc.ca.gov/brownfields/preliminary-endangerment-assessment-pea-process-quick-reference-guide/>

Solid Waste:

- 74. The proposed project shall comply with applicable regulations which are enforced by Nevada County Department of Environmental Health (NCDEH) as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) pertaining to the storage and management of solid wastes (Title 14, California Code of Regulations (14 CCR), Title 27, California Code of Regulations (27 CCR) & Nevada County Code, Chapter IV, Article 8).

Hazardous Materials:

- 75. The applicant and/or facility operator shall adhere to all applicable codes and regulations regarding the storage of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous wastes set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 25500 - 25519 and 25100 - 25258.2 including the electronic reporting requirement to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS). [CERS | California Environmental Reporting System](#)

**GRASS VALLEY FIRE DEPARTMENT**

76. The entrance and drive aisles shall be widened to 26-feet so that a fire apparatus has clear access around the entire building.
77. The applicant shall provide fire apparatus access to the gates that are planned for installation at the property entrance to the satisfaction of the Grass Valley Fire Department.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

**AIR QUALITY**

**AQ 1 – Mitigation Measures:**

Due to the possibility of Naturally Occurring Asbestos at the project site, one of the following two options shall be submitted and approved by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District NSAQMD prior to ground disturbance:

- 1) Option 1: The applicant can engage a registered geologist to conduct an evaluation of the property. If this evaluation determines that no serpentine or ultramafic rock is likely to be found in the disturbed area, the applicant can request an exemption from the Air Pollution Control Officer of the NSAQMD. (See Tit. 17 Section 93105 (c)(1)(A) for report requirements.)

OR

- 2) Option 2: The applicant can proceed as if all soils contain asbestos and incorporate the required asbestos dust mitigation measures into the project documents and practices. As more than one acre will be disturbed, the regulations found in CCR Title 17 Section 93105(e)(2) and (4) apply. This includes submitting and acquiring NSAQMD approval of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) before moving forward. The approved ADMP shall be referenced as notes on all grading and construction plans and shall include the following:
  - a. Soil track-out prevention and control
  - b. Dust prevention measures for active construction areas and storage piles
  - c. Dust minimization from unpaved roads, parking lots, or staging areas, including limit on vehicles speeds to 15 mph or less.
  - d. Offsite material transport control
  - e. Methods of post construction stabilization (in perpetuity)
- 3) There may be additional OSHA requirements for employee safety throughout improvements, landscaping, and final use phases. Please contact Cal OSHA for additional information on personal protective equipment and signage requirements. The Consultation Office can be reached at (800) 963-9424.
- 4) If dust or asbestos exposure appears to be an issue at any time, air monitoring may be required.
- 5) Also note that under regulations of the California Department of Real Estate, the presence of environmental hazards, including asbestos, must be disclosed by a property seller during any future real estate transactions

### **AQ 2 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project and shall be made notes on grading and construction plans:
  - a) Alternatives to open burning of vegetative material will be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the District. Among suitable alternatives are chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel.
  - b) Grid power shall be used (as opposed to diesel generators) for jobsite power needs where feasible during construction.
  - c) Temporary traffic controls shall be provided during all phases of the construction to improve traffic flow as deemed appropriate by the City Engineer and /or Caltrans.
  - d) Construction activities shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to off-peak hours as much as practicable.

### **AQ 3 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures are standard measures relied on by the CalEEMod modeling system to determine emissions results and shall be included as notes on all grading and construction plans:
  - a) Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 25 mph on unpaved roads.
  - b) Paved roads shall be swept regularly during construction to achieve dust suppression.
  - c) The project shall use zero or low-VOC paints during construction. The VOC content must be lower than 50 g/L for interior coatings and 150 g/L for parking VOC coatings.
  - d) Diesel-fueled, heavy-duty vehicles of more than 10,000 pounds shall not idle the vehicle's primary engine for 5 minutes or more at a single location pursuant to 13 CCR Section 2485. Exceptions include idling for the purposes of positioning or providing a power source for equipment operation, such as a lift, crane, pump, drill, hoist, or other auxiliary equipment.

## **BIOLOGY**

### **BIO 1 – Mitigation Measures:**

1. A follow up survey of CNPS special status plants, with particular focus on dubious pea, shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist between April through May prior to any ground disturbing activity. If the Project will not include the removal of native vegetation or grading within the larger, open area within the Project area, then no additional special-status plant surveys would be required.
  - a) If any special-status plant species is documented within or directly adjacent to areas proposed for disturbance, as determined by the survey, and are within areas proposed for disturbance within the Project area that contain native vegetation and that are CNPS list 1A, 1B, 2A, or 2B per CEQA Guidelines Section 15380, or are listed under the ESA and/or CESA, protection of such plants shall be ensured with one of the following methods in consultation and recommendation by a qualified wildlife biologist: 1) complete avoidance, 2)transplantation, and/or 3) on- or offsite restoration.
  - b) If an ESA listed special-status plant species is identified within the Project area and would be impacted by disturbance within the Project area, then a

consultation with USFWS would be required as part of any future project permitting within the Project area and therefore, additional avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and monitoring requirements may be included as part of the development of a Biological Assessment (BA) to be submitted to the USFWS and a Biological Opinion (BO) developed by the USFWS through the ESA consultation process, whether Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA.

**BIO 2 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) Prior to disturbance of any riparian and/or forested woodlands within the Project area and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction bat roosting survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify the presence or absence of roosting bats, particularly the hoary bat and the pallid bat. The pre-construction bat surveys should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the riparian and forested woodland habitats along and adjacent to the seasonal drainage within the Project area. Any woodland or riparian associated trees have the potential to contain roosting bats and therefore, the trunk diameter of trees to be disturbed, removed, or within 100 feet of proposed disturbance would not preclude the preconstruction survey requirement.
  - a) If any species of bat, including the hoary and pallid bat are identified during roosting surveys, passive removal of the roosting bats prior to disturbance to structures and forested woodlands should be implemented to avoid impacts to this species. Passive removal includes allowing roosting bats to freely leave the roost site. Once the roosting bats have been passively removed from the structure(s) and/or forested woodlands, the structure(s) shall be closed off from recurring bat roosting within the structure and the proposed work within the structure(s) would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species. For forested woodlands containing bat roosts, the removal of trees associated with such woodlands would only occur once the bats leave the day roosts. Furthermore, if a maternal (breeding) roost is documented, no disturbance will occur until the breeding roost has dispersed from the structure or forested woodlands they are found in.
- 2) Prior to disturbance within the areas of the Project area that contain disturbed surfaces and/or annual grassland vegetation community, and no more than seven (7) days prior to such disturbance, a pre-construction survey for the species shall be conducted prior to any disturbance within those disturbed and developed areas of the Project area in order to avoid direct impacts to the species. The pre-construction survey should be implemented for any disturbance proposed to be located within 100 feet of the disturbed and annual grassland habitats within the Project area.
  - i) If the species is documented during pre-construction surveys, a qualified wildlife biologist (approved by CDFW) would have the authority to move individual coast horned lizards outside of the proposed disturbance area(s) in order to avoid an impact to this species. Once the coast horned lizard(s) have been removed from the disturbance area(s) and out of harms way, the proposed work would no longer pose a risk to individuals of the species.
- 3) Construction or disturbance activities during the breeding season, February 1 through August 30, could disturb or remove occupied nests of raptors and/or protected bird species and shall require the implementation of a pre-construction survey, conducted by a qualified biologist, within and adjacent to any proposed

disturbance area within the Project area along with a 250-foot buffer for nesting raptors and other protected bird species within seven (7) days prior to disturbance. The nesting survey radius around the proposed disturbance would be identified prior to the implementation of the protected bird nesting surveys by a CDFW qualified biologist and would be based on the habitat type, habitat quality, and type of disturbance proposed within or adjacent to nesting habitat.

- a) If any nesting raptors or protected birds are identified during such pre-construction surveys, trees or shrubs or grasslands with active nests should not be removed or disturbed and a no-disturbance buffer should be established around the nesting site to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site until after the breeding season or after a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged. The extent of these buffers would be determined by a CDFW qualified wildlife biologist and would depend on the special-status species present, the level of noise or construction disturbance, line of sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. These factors should be analyzed by a qualified wildlife biologist to make an appropriate decision on buffer distances based on the species and level of disturbance proposed in the vicinity of an active nest.

### **BIO 3 – Mitigation Measures:**

1. Pursuant to the Management Plan within the Biological Inventory Report, which covers the proposed disturbance within the 30-foot stream setback, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
  - a. The following measures to minimize potential impacts to the seasonal drainage and downstream aquatic resources are required during construction and shall be made notes or reflected graphically on all grading and construction plans. These measures are intended for inclusion into the proposed development and/or disturbances within the stream setback during and after construction to minimize direct and indirect impacts to water quality during and following construction. This will be accomplished by implementing the following during and following construction:
    - i. Limit construction to periods of dry weather;
    - ii. Establish the area around the outside edge of the seasonal drainage as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) where those areas will not be impacted by construction;
    - iii. No fill or dredge material will enter or be removed from the seasonal drainage during construction and thereafter;
    - iv. Use appropriate machinery and equipment to limit disturbance in these areas;
    - v. Placement of soil erosion control devices (such as wattles, hay bales, etc.) between the seasonal drainage and the areas to be developed to limit potential runoff and sedimentation into the

seasonal drainage and potentially into downstream aquatic resources;

- vi. No dewatering of seasonal drainage will occur as part of the proposed construction;
  - vii. Implement Best Management Practices during and following construction; and
  - viii. The project shall adhere to the City of Grass Valley stormwater drainage requirements and State water quality control board regulations for stormwater in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board region (Region 5) shall be followed and implemented as part of the proposed Project and within the seasonal drainage and its 30-foot stream setback requirement.
- b. To protect the seasonal drainage and the stream setback buffer areas, as well as water quality and downstream water resources, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures should include, but are not limited to:
- i. Minimize the number and size of work areas for equipment and spoil storage sites in the vicinity of the seasonal drainage. Place staging areas and other work areas outside of the 30-foot stream setback buffers.
  - ii. The contractor shall exercise reasonable precaution to protect the seasonal drainage as well as adjacent stream setback buffers from pollution with fuels, oils, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and wash water shall be prevented from discharging into or near these resources and shall be collected for removal off the site. All construction debris and associated materials and litter shall be removed from the work site immediately upon completion.
  - iii. No equipment for vehicle maintenance or refueling shall occur within the 30-foot stream setback buffers. The contractor shall immediately contain and clean up any petroleum or other chemical spills with absorbent materials such as sawdust or kitty litter. For other hazardous materials, follow the cleanup instruction on the label.
- c. Exposed bare soil within the 30-foot stream setback buffers to the seasonal drainage should be protected against loss from erosion by the seeding of an erosion control mixture and restored with native grasses and mulching. Non-native species that are known to invade wild lands, such as orchard grass, velvet grass, rose clover, winter and spring vetch, and wild oats should not be used as they displace native species.
- d. To ensure the proper and timely implementation of all mitigation measures contained in this Resources Management Plan, as well as the

terms and conditions of any other required permits, the applicant shall distribute copies of these mitigation measures and permit requirements to the contractors prior to grading and construction within the stream setback buffers. All contractors shall be completely familiar with the mitigation measures contained above and with the terms and conditions of all permits.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **CUL 1 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) The following mitigation measures shall be required as notes on all grading and construction documents:
  - a) *Cultural Resources* – The presence of the isolated prehistoric find from 2008 raises the potential for buried cultural resources within the project area. This site (P-29-003133) was documented as an isolated find and was subsequently removed (likely in 2013) by grading activities within the project area, therefore it does not constitute an archaeological site. Construction personnel should be made aware of the potential for prehistoric and historic resources within the Project Area, and construction activities should be observed by a qualified archaeological monitor. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications.
  - b) *Cultural Resources Awareness Training* – Prior to the initiation of the project it is recommended that a cultural resources training be provided to supervisors, construction foreman, crew members, and any additional key construction personnel. A professional archaeologist shall administer the training. The purpose of the training is to increase awareness and knowledge of cultural resources and appropriate protocols in the event of an inadvertent discovery. The training will include a discussion on the procedures for stopping work and notification of key personnel. Upon completion of the training, participants will be able to define cultural resources, describe the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, know how to locate and receive assistance from the professional archaeologist and coordinate with other sources, and describe steps to be taken when cultural resources are encountered during project implementation. Documentation of the training, signed by the professional archeologist who conducted the training, shall be submitted to the City Planner prior to any ground disturbing activities.
  - c) *Archaeological Monitoring* – Cultural resource monitoring of construction activities is designed to ensure that known archaeological resources associated are protected and that previously undocumented cultural resources are identified, recorded and properly treated. The on-site Archaeological Monitor shall meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional qualifications for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeology or be directly supervised by an individual who meets those qualifications. Monitoring shall include observation of excavations to their maximum depths, documentation of soil stratigraphy, and inspection of stockpiled soil sediments. The Archaeological Monitor will be responsible for documenting monitoring activities in a daily log. At a minimum, documentation should include location of archaeological monitoring, activities for

the reporting period and periodic digital photographs of the project work. Most importantly, if cultural resource remains are encountered, the Archaeological Monitor will have the authority to temporarily halt or re-direct construction activities. The amount and duration of archaeological monitoring will be determined by the Professional Archaeologist.

- d) *Inadvertent Discoveries* – If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, are discovered work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources) and a qualified cultural resources specialist and UAIC representative will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The Tribe does not consider curation of TCR's to be appropriate or respectful and request materials not be permanently curated, unless requested by the Tribe.
- e) *Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains* – Any person who, in the process of project activities, discovers any cultural resources, tribal cultural resources including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits, and/or human remains within the project area, shall cease from all project activities within at least 200 feet of the discovery. A qualified professional, the Lead agency and a Tribal Representative shall be immediately notified to assess any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for cultural resource treatment.. In the event that human remains are encountered, the sheriff-coroner shall be notified immediately upon discovery. In the event that Native American human remains are encountered, the Native American Heritage Commission or the most likely descendants of the buried individual(s) who are qualified to represent Native American interests shall be contacted. Specific treatment of Native American human remains shall occur consistent with State law. If adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, unique archaeology, or other cultural resources occurs, then consultation with UAIC and other traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribes regarding mitigation contained in Public Resources Code sections 21084.3(a) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15370 should occur.
- f) If the find is determined to be a TCR, the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary:
  - i) The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the City to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.

- ii) The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a temporary conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.
- iii) The construction contractor(s) and the City shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.
- iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.
- v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the City in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.
- vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the City/County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the City/County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

**CUL 2 – Mitigation Measure:**

- a) If any suspected Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) of cultural significance to UAIC, including but not limited to features, anthropogenic/cultural soils, cultural belongings or objects (artifacts), shell, bone, shaped stones or bone, or ash/charcoal deposits are discovered by any person during construction activities including ground disturbing activities, all work shall pause immediately within 100 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature of the find. Work shall cease in and within the immediate vicinity of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a Tribal Monitor, cultural resources specialist, or professional archeologist.
- b) A tribal Representative and the City of Grass Valley shall be immediately notified, and the Tribal Representative in coordination with the City of Grass Valley shall determine if the find is a TCR (PRC §21074) and the Tribal Representative shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.
  - i) The culturally affiliated tribe shall consult with the City of Grass Valley to (1) identify the boundaries of the new TCR and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of

TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.

- ii) The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of TCRs that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.
- iii) The construction contractor(s) and City of Grass Valley shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.
- iv) Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 2 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.
- v) Work at the TCR discovery location shall not resume until authorization is granted by the City of Grass Valley in coordination with the culturally affiliated Tribe.
- vi) If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials

## **GEOLOGY**

### **GEO 1 Mitigation Measures:**

1. Prior to building and grading permit issuance, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner indicating that grading and construction plans include all pertinent recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024.
2. Prior to building permit final, written verification from a geotechnical engineer shall be provided to the City Planner that indicates all recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, have been incorporated in to the geotechnical engineer's satisfaction.
3. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the following notes shall be included on all grading and construction plans:

- a. All recommendations outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project by Geocon Consultants, Inc., dated December 2024, shall be incorporated into the project.
- b. Oversize rock may be encountered during excavation. Oversize rock may be removed and used in landscape areas, incorporated into slope protection, and/or used as fill in accordance with specific recommendations from a professional geotechnical engineer.
- c. Clayey, alluvial soil, as well as seasonal surface water and shallow groundwater seepage, may be present in the lower, southeast corner of the site, where a road is to be constructed that extends offsite to the south. Significant drying effort to attain moisture content suitable for compaction should be anticipated regardless of the time of year
- d. Moist to saturated soil conditions may be encountered in excavations advanced during and following the rainy season, particularly in excavations that reveal the soil/weathered rock transition. If grading occurs during or after the wet season (typically winter and spring), or in periods of precipitation, in place and excavated soils will likely be wet. Earthwork contractors should be aware of moisture sensitivity of clayey and fine-grained soils and potential compaction/workability difficulties.
- e. Exploration of uncontrolled fill shall be performed before or during site development to identify locations of uncontrolled fill, if present, and rework the fill according to recommendations of the geotechnical engineer of record.
- f. If future improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location at the lower, western end of the site (outside of the currently proposed development area, see Figure 2 of the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation), we recommend that the shaft location be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design. The location of the closed feature should be surveyed and recorded along with as-built closure documentation.
- g. Foundations shall be embedded at least 18 inches. Allowable soil bearing capacity on the order of 3,000 psf may be used for preliminary foundation sizing. Specific foundation recommendations shall be provided as part of the design-level geotechnical investigation.
- h. Interior concrete flatwork shall be designed with a capillary break and moisture barrier. Exterior concrete flatwork placed over reworked granular fill materials will not likely require an aggregate layer.
- i. Conventional flexible pavement structural sections consisting of hot mix asphalt (HMA) over compacted Class 2 aggregate base (AB) may be used provided they are properly designed (i.e., thick enough), as determined by a geotechnical engineer, for the soil conditions at the site.

A previous R-Value (21) for light brown sandy clay at the site appears suitable for design of alternative pavement sections and should be confirmed based on the specific subgrade soil characteristics encountered during site development.

- j. Prior to building permit issuance, a geotechnical engineer shall confirm that uncontrolled fill is not present in the development area. In addition, exploratory trenching and/or geophysical analysis may be useful to determine rock excavation characteristics in the central portion of the site. Soil corrosion testing may be performed to identify potentially corrosive conditions.

### **GEO 2 Mitigation Measures:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City for acceptance, file a Notice of Intent with the California Water Quality Control Board and comply with all provisions of the Clean Water Act. The applicant shall submit the Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number, issued by the state, to the City of Grass Valley Engineering Division.
2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit to the City Engineer for review and approval, drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations in accordance with the City of Grass Valley Improvement Standards and Storm Drainage Master Plan & Criteria. Measures must be implemented for site design, source control, runoff reduction, storm water treatment and baseline hydromodification management measures per the City of Grass Valley Design Standards.

### **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL**

#### **HAZ 1 – Mitigation Measures:**

- 1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, the applicant shall determine if the subject parcels have been impacted by historical mining and/or provide a “No Further Action (NFA) Letter” from the CA Department of Toxic Substance Control. The determination or letter shall be provided to the Nevada County Environmental Health Department and the Grass Valley Planning Department.
- 2) A State of California environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or a local agency that meets the requirements of Health and Safety Code section 101480 should provide regulatory concurrence that project is safe for construction and the proposed use. Please visit the DTSC Abandoned Mine Lands webpage for reference or further guidance.
- 3) If fill material is proposed at any phase of site development, the following mitigation shall be confirmed by a registered geotechnical engineer:

All imported soil and fill material shall be tested to assess any contaminants of concern meet screening levels as outlined in DTSC's Preliminary Endangerment

Assessment (PEA) Guidance Manual. Additionally, DTSC advises referencing the DTSC Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material Fact Sheet if importing fill is necessary. To minimize the possibility of introducing contaminated soil and fill material there shall be documentation of the origins of the soil or fill material and, if applicable, sampling be conducted to ensure that the imported soil and fill material are suitable for the intended land use. The soil sampling shall include analysis based on the source of the fill and knowledge of the prior land use. Additional information can be found by visiting DTSC's Human and Ecological Risk Office (HERO) webpage.

- 4) If improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location, the shaft location shall be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design.

## **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

### **HY/WQ 1 – Mitigation Measures:**

See GEO 2 Mitigation Measures

See BIO 1 Mitigation Measures

### **HY/WQ 2 – Mitigation Measures**

1. All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/sacsjr\\_201805.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf)

In part it states:

*Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.*

2. If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order

No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/water\\_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf)

3. If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.
4. If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order.
5. If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit.

## **WILDFIRE**

### **WF 1 Mitigation Measures:**

See GEO 1 Mitigation Measures

## 26PLN-10 Engineering Comments

Expansion of area originally approved in Jada Windows Grading Permit

The following engineering comment will apply:

- 1) All conditions of approved grading permit 25GP-02 will apply to this additional area. Special attention shall be given to the dust mitigation and storm water protection provisions while this additional grading is to occur.
- 2) Please provide a site plan showing additional trees to be removed and the tree removal document showing that the necessary additional trees have been approved for removal/harvesting.

**From:** Nicole Johnson <Nicole.Johnson@nevadacountyca.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 3:02 PM  
**To:** Amy Kesler-Wolfson <awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Jada Windows Expanded Scope

Hi Amy,

I see that Jada Windows entered into a voluntary agreement with DTSC in early 2025 and received a No Further Action Letter in September of 2025. Envirostor shows the case as still open. The NFA mentions that following the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) approved by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District is advised. We would also advise that the same.

The PEA mentions the vertical shaft which you have captured below in mitigation measure 4.).

In summary, with the inclusion of a mention of the elevated level of naturally occurring asbestos and following the approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan, along with what you have described in numbers 1.) through 4.) below, and my original comments 10-30-24, we have no objection to the expanded scope.

Thank you,



**Nicole Johnson, REHS**

Environmental Health Specialist

Department of Environmental Health

Desk: 530-265-1531

[Nicole.Johnson@NevadaCountyCA.gov](mailto:Nicole.Johnson@NevadaCountyCA.gov)

**From:** Env.Health <[Env.Health@nevadacountyca.gov](mailto:Env.Health@nevadacountyca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 9:40 AM  
**To:** Nicole Johnson <[Nicole.Johnson@nevadacountyca.gov](mailto:Nicole.Johnson@nevadacountyca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Jada Windows Expanded Scope

**From:** Amy Kesler-Wolfson <[awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov](mailto:awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 8:39 AM  
**To:** Env.Health <[Env.Health@nevadacountyca.gov](mailto:Env.Health@nevadacountyca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Jada Windows Expanded Scope

You don't often get email from [awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov](mailto:awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov). [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

**Do not click links or open attachments** unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Jada Windows was approved for a 70,000 sq ft warehouse building in February 2025 on APN 009-680-057. They have recently submitted a revision that expands their grading area to the west, on the adjacent parcel APN 009-680-058. They are asking to grade a pad for future development so that they don't have to haul the excavated dirt from the current grading work offsite. In looking at the IS/MND adopted for this project I think we can use the

same mitigation measures, which I would apply to the proposed grading work through an Addendum document, but I wanted to make sure Environmental Health doesn't have any concerns. Attached is the proposed expanded grading plan and below are the previously established mitigation measures based on a letter from Nicole Johnston dated October 30, 2024, which we would apply to the expanded scope:

#### HAZ 1

- 1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, the applicant shall determine if the subject parcels have been impacted by historical mining and/or provide a "No Further Action (NFA) Letter" from the CA Department of Toxic Substance Control. The determination or letter shall be provided to the Nevada County Environmental Health Department and the Grass Valley Planning Department.
- 2) A State of California environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or a local agency that meets the requirements of Health and Safety Code section 101480 should provide regulatory concurrence that project is safe for construction and the proposed use. Please visit the DTSC Abandoned Mine Lands webpage for reference or further guidance.
- 3) If fill material is proposed at any phase of site development, the following mitigation shall be confirmed by a registered geotechnical engineer:

All imported soil and fill material shall be tested to assess any contaminants of concern meet screening levels as outlined in DTSC's Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) Guidance Manual. Additionally, DTSC advises referencing the DTSC Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material Fact Sheet if importing fill is necessary. To minimize the possibility of introducing contaminated soil and fill material there shall be documentation of the origins of the soil or fill material and, if applicable, sampling be conducted to ensure that the imported soil and fill material are suitable for the intended land use. The soil sampling shall include analysis based on the source of the fill and knowledge of the prior land use. Additional information can be found by visiting DTSC's Human and Ecological Risk Office (HERO) webpage.

- 4) If improvements are planned within 100 feet of the recorded vertical shaft location, the shaft location shall be determined by survey and physically closed with a concrete slab or plug. Physical closure, if performed, should be performed under permit with Nevada County and according to an engineered design.

**Amy Kesler-Wolfson - City Planner**


Planning Division



CITY OF GRASS VALLEY

125 East Main St. • Grass Valley, CA 95945

---

 (530) 274-4711



 [awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov](mailto:awolfson@grassvalleyca.gov)

 [www.grassvalleyca.gov/planning](http://www.grassvalleyca.gov/planning)

**\*Please be aware of phishing emails impersonating the City of Grass Valley Departments with urgent demand for payment of applications or permits. Please contact City personnel for any questions on received email invoices.\***

**Beginning February 2, 2026, official city emails will be sent from @grassvalleyca.gov. Please update your contacts and email filters for whitelisting that domain.**

This message is for the designated recipient only and MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original. Any other use of this E-mail is prohibited.

Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District  
200 Litton Drive, Suite 320  
Grass Valley, CA 95945  
(530) 274-9360 / FAX: (530) 274-7546  
email: [office@myairdistrict.com](mailto:office@myairdistrict.com)



NSAQMD – Planning Dept.

March 17, 2026

To: Jason Barnum  
SCO P&E Principal Engineer  
530-272-5841 / [jason@scopeinc.net](mailto:jason@scopeinc.net)

**C&D Contract Yard: APN: 022-150-034**

25PLN-14

This document acknowledges that the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District has received the updated planning documents for contractor yard expansion located at **928 Taylorville Road, Grass Valley, CA.**

The NSAQMD requirement for a dust control plan and paved entry apron have been included in the plans. As a very tiny note, the dust plan has a small typo where measure 7.4 is attached to the end of 7.3, and then the numbering is off for the remainder. However, we do not need any corrections for this, as our requirements have been met.

Lastly, the Mitigation Measure Notes section includes an additional verification requirement in note #1. This EIR mandated measure requires that air district approves that the Off-Road Construction Equipment is cleaner than Tier 4 engine emissions specifications. (Please change this note on the plans, Tier 2 was required in the 2013 version and Tier 4 in the 2022 version, hence the typo "Tier 24". ) Please submit a complete list of the fleet specifications so that the Tier status can be verified for **all off-road mobile and portable diesel-powered equipment** that will be used at the site.

Thank you so much for your attention to this detail.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julie D. Hunter".

Julie Hunter  
Air Pollution Control Officer  
Submitted by Suzie Tarnay APCS II / NSAQMD – (530) 274-9360 x505



Project No. S2851-05-05

March 16, 2026

Jada, Inc.

124 Clydesdale Court

Grass Valley, California 95945

Attention: Aaron Beyer, General Manager

Subject: REVIEW OF GRADING PLAN MODIFICATION  
JADA WINDOWS  
GRASS VALLEY, NEVADA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Mr. Beyer:

On behalf of Jada, Inc., Geocon Consultants, Inc. (Geocon) reviewed elements of the *Grading Plan for Jada, Inc., – Parcel 1, APN 009-680-058* (Nelson Engineering, February 17, 2026) pertaining to grading/earthwork for the placement of approximately 5,000 cubic yards of surplus soil previously generated during the Jada Windows development project. The purpose of our plan review was to assess whether the recommendations presented in our *Geotechnical Investigation, Jada Windows* (Geocon, December 3, 2024) were properly incorporated into the grading plan.

At the time we submitted our geotechnical investigation report, the Jada Windows site was identified as Nevada County assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) 009-680-050 and 009-680-050-056. As shown on the grading plan prepared by Nelson Engineering in February 2026, fill is to be constructed on the recently created APN 009-680-058, which comprises the western portion of the former APN 009-680-050-056 and is part of the development site addressed in our report.


Based on our review, the grading plan generally conforms with our geotechnical investigation report. We note that the fill will be placed on sloping ground steeper than 5:1 (horizontal to vertical). Per Section 6.5.8 of the geotechnical report, a keyway will be required at the base of the fill as will periodic benching into the existing slope as the fill is placed. We understand that the stockpiled surplus soil contains a significant amount of rock. Per Section 6.4.1, oversize rock up to 2 feet in maximum dimension may be used in the fill; however, this material should be placed such that smaller rock and soil fills void spaces between large rocks. Nesting of oversized rock should be avoided.

Our professional services were performed, our findings obtained, and our recommendations prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering principles and practices used in the site area at this time. No warranty is expressed or implied.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist with this important project. Please contact the undersigned with any questions regarding our recommendations.

Sincerely,

GEOCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

  
Jason Muir, PE, GE  
Senior Engineer



  
Jeremy Zorne, PE, GE  
Senior Engineer

