



**Environmental Assessment 16-06  
Initial Study and Negative Declaration for  
Use Permit 16-03, Eco Compliance**

*Prepared for:*

City of Yuba City  
1201 Civic Center Blvd.  
Yuba City, CA 95993

*Prepared By:*

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

August, 2016



CITY OF YUBA CITY

## Development Services Department

Planning Division

1201 Civic Center Blvd. Yuba City, CA 95993 Phone (530) 822-4700

---

### Section 1. Introduction & Project Overview

---

#### Purpose and CEQA Process

---

This IS/MND has been prepared in conformance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15070. The purpose of the IS/MND is to determine the potential significant impacts associated with the Eco Compliance use permit. In addition, this document is intended to provide the basis for input from public agencies, organization, and interested members of the public for the project.

---

#### Introduction

---

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess any anticipated environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Medical Waste Transfer Station purposed by ECO Compliance. ECO Compliance is a bio-hazardous waste transporter. Their proposal is to collect bio-hazardous waste from Generators (hospitals, clinics, urgent care facilities, medical and dental practices, pharmacies, veterinarian clinics mortuaries etc.) and deliver the waste to permitted treatment facilities. ECO Compliance serves as a conduit between the Generators and the proper processing facilities. As part of that process ECO Compliance will operate a transfer station (3180 Industrial Drive) whereby the waste collected by Eco Compliance, as well as waste received from other authorized transporters, will be gathered at the transfer station for weekly or more often transport to a permitted treatment facility. The focus of the use permit is the use of the existing facilities located at 3180 Industrial Drive for a bio-hazardous waste transfer station. The application is considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as the City has discretionary authority over the project.

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

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to use a previously prepared EIR and

## Notice of Declaration

---

**1. PROJECT TITLE:**

Use Permit 16-03, ECO Compliance.

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

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

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

Arnoldo Rodriguez, AICP, Development Services Director  
(530) 822-3231  
[arodrigu@yubacity.net](mailto:arodrigu@yubacity.net)

**4. PROJECT LOCATION:**

3180 Industrial Drive, located on the corner of Industrial Drive where it makes a 90 degree turn, located just west of George Washington Boulevard.

**5. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:**

The subject property is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 63-020-065.

**6. PROJECT APPLICANT:**

ECO Compliance  
59 West Liberty Street, Suite 880  
Reno, NV 89501

**7. PROPERTY OWNER:**

Lang Revocable 2001 Trust  
1945 Case Drive, Suite U  
Yuba City, CA 95993

**8. GENERAL PLAN and SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGNATIONS:**

*Existing GP:* Business, Technology and Light Industry  
No specific plan

**9. ZONE DISTRICT:**

*Existing Zoning:* Light Industrial (M-1) Zone District

## **10. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

ECO Compliance is a bio-hazardous waste transporter. Their proposal is to collect bio-hazardous waste from Generators (hospitals, clinics, urgent care facilities, medical and dental practices, pharmacies, veterinarian clinics mortuaries etc.) and delivers the waste to permitted treatment facilities. ECO Compliance serves as a conduit between the Generators and the proper processing facilities. As part of that process ECO Compliance will operate a transfer station (3180 Industrial Drive) whereby the waste collected by Eco Compliance, as well as waste received from other authorized transporters, will be gathered at the transfer station for weekly or more often transport to a permitted treatment facility. The bio-hazardous waste will be received at the facility in approved specially marked containers, will be stored as such and shipped in the same containers. This is not a bio-hazardous waste treatment facility so the containers will not be opened.

The facility that will serve as the transfer station is an existing 4,344 square foot building consisting of a 1,344 square foot office area and a 3,000 square foot warehouse with adequate on-site parking and a fenced and gated outside yard in the rear of the property. The rear yard area is needed for septic tank leach fields, as the property is served by an on-site wastewater disposal system. The property is served by City water.

The bio-hazardous waste processing consists of pick-up of the hazardous waste at the generating facility already enclosed in air-tight and water-tight metal containers. The containers will be stored indoors at the transfer facility until such time as there are enough containers to warrant pick-up by a larger truck and delivered to a licensed processing facility located outside of this area. At no time will the containers be opened while at the transfer station, nor will the containers be stored outdoors. It is estimated by the applicant that the pick-up will occur once or twice a week. The building has a large door at the rear of the building. The trucks will be driven into the rear yard and loaded by on-site staff and the driver.

## **11. SURROUNDING LAND USES & SETTING:**

The project is surrounded by developed properties within an industrial park. Surrounding properties are of a similar size and utilized for light industrial and storage uses. There are no nearby residences.

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

State and Federal Bio-hazardous waste regulatory agencies.

## Section 2. Environmental Checklist and Impact Evaluation

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials    | <input 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/Traffic             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems        |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |  |

### Determination: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

Submit comments to:

Initial Study Prepared by:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Denis Cook, Planning Consultant

The public hearing for this item is scheduled for September 14, 2016, at 6:00 P.M. before the Yuba City Planning Commission and will be held in the City Council Chambers located at 1201 Civic Center Blvd., Yuba City, California.

### **Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

- A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- B. 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.
- C. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- D. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described below, may be cross referenced).
- E. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - 1. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - 2. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by

mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

3. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they addressed site-specific conditions for the project.
- 
- F. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  - G. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

### Section 3. Environmental Checklist and Impact Evaluation

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

#### I. AESTHETICS

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

#### Response to Questions:

a-d) This is an existing developed facility. The site will be improved with the parking lot being resurfaced and new landscaping will be added, so the appearance of the site will be an environmental positive. The storage of the waste will not be indoors and not publically visible.

#### II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact



a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4256), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

**Response to Questions:**

- a) The property is already fully developed, as are neighboring properties, so there will be no additional loss of agricultural land.
- b-c) The property is currently zoned and utilized for non-agricultural uses; it is not zoned for agricultural uses nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore this project will not result in the conversion of other agricultural properties to non-agricultural uses.
- d) There are no forest lands or areas designated for forest land in the City of Yuba City.
- e) This property and neighboring properties were previously developed for non-agricultural uses, so there will be no loss of agricultural loss due to this project.

**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.

Would the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	

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)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

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

**Response to Questions:**

- a-d) Since the containers will not be opened while on-site there will be no air quality impacts from the materials that are within the containers. The only air quality impact is exhaust from the transport vehicles. However, these vehicles already operate in the area, transporting the hazardous waste between the generators and the processing facility. By adding this transfer station the amount of vehicle pollution is not expected to increase.
  
- e) As the containers will not be opened there will be no odors that originate from this facility.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or				X

regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?				X
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?				X

**Response to Questions:**

a-d) This property was previously fully improved with building and parking that was designed for light industrial uses, so there will be no loss of biological resources.

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

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource.				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy unique paleontological resources or site or unique geologic features?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

**Response to Questions:**

a-d) The site was previously full developed with a building, pave parking, and outdoor storage area, and there are no further improvements proposed so there will be no impact on cultural resources.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b>				
<b>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?</b>			<b>X</b>	
<b>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</b>			<b>X</b>	
<b>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</b>			<b>X</b>	
<b>iv) Landslides?</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>b) Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>c) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the California Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?</b>				<b>X</b>
<b>d) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</b>				<b>X</b>

### Response to Questions:

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

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

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

- c) The extreme southwest corner of the Yuba City Sphere of Influence is the only known area with expansive soils. The project site is not located within this area and therefore will not be impacted by the presence of expansive soils.
- d) The project has an existing septic tank and leach lines for wastewater disposal. No new or expanded system will be utilized.

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

**Response to Questions:**

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

The proposed project will require delivery of containerized waste material to the site and weekly or bi-weekly pick-up of the waste material, so some vehicle trips will be

generated. However, according to the applicant many of those delivery vehicles already operate in the area, picking up the containers from the generators and delivering directly to a treatment facility or another transfer station outside the area. Due to the small size of this project and the few new trips that would be generated, it likely would not be classified as a major source of greenhouse gas emissions by CARB (the lower reporting limit being 25,000 metric tons/year of CO<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this impact is considered less than significant.

## VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
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?				X
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

### Response to Questions:

a-b) The project involves delivery to the site of bio-hazardous waste materials. The waste materials will be stored indoors and scheduled for weekly pick-up. Some of that material may have to be refrigerated for which refrigeration will be provided on-site. The hazardous material will be delivered in approved air-tight and water-tight containers. Since this is not a hazardous materials treatment center, the containers will not be opened while on-site and the hazardous materials will be removed while still in their original containers.

There is the risk of an accident during which the containers could become un-sealed. However, those containers are already being handled throughout this area. Assuming that all federal and state laws are abided by (reinforced by a condition of the use permit) by introducing the transfer station this risk of exposure is not expected to be a significant impact.

- c) There are no schools within ¼ mile of the proposed bio-hazardous waste transfer site.
- d) The site does not appear on any listings of sites that are contaminated by hazardous wastes.
- e) The project is not located within the sphere of influence of the Sutter County Airport.
- f) There are no private airstrips located within City limits or the City's Urban Growth Boundary.
- g) The proposed project will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Neither the Police or Fire Departments expressed concern over the project's impacts on any emergency response plans.

## VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
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?				X
h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?				X
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?			X	
j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

### Response to Questions:

- a) The proposed bio-hazardous waste facility will be located on a previously developed property that utilizes City water and has established on-site wastewater disposal and drainage facilities to which no changes are proposed. Therefore the project will not violate any water quality or wastewater discharge requirements.



- b) The project will need water only for employee use and landscaping. The site is served by the City water system, which primarily uses surface water. The City has concluded that it has adequate surface water entitlements from the Feather River as well as treatment/distribution capacity to accommodate any need associated with the project.
- (c-e) No new stormwater drainage will be generated, as this is an existing facility.
- f-h) According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, this portion of the City is considered to be outside of the 100-year flood plain. It is classified as such because of an extensive series of levees and dams along the Feather and Yuba Rivers, which protect the city from potential flooding. Local drainage improvements, principally the Live Oak Canal, provide storm water relief for this area.
- i) There are 10 dams located outside Sutter County that could cause significant flooding should failure occur, among which there are six dams that are located on the Feather River and Yuba River. Failure of any one of these dams could cause significant flooding in Yuba City. These dams are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Yuba County Water Agency, Pacific Gas & Electric, and the Corps of Engineers. However, all new development must be in compliance with General Plan policies to conduct hydrologic studies before construction and to provide information to property owners about the availability of flood insurance, as detailed in Policy 9.3-I-3 and 9.3-I-5. These policies would minimize the effects of prospective growth from flooding hazards and the impact would be less than significant.
- j) A seiche is the periodic oscillation of a body of water resulting from seismic shaking. The City is not close to any big lakes so seiche is unlikely to happen to the City. A tsunami is a very large ocean wave caused by an underwater earthquake or volcanic eruption. The City is located inland from the Pacific Ocean, so people or structures in the City would not be exposed to inundation by tsunami. Mudflows are shallow water-saturated landslides that travel rapidly down slopes carrying rocks, brush, and other debris. Landslides are unlikely to happen due to the relatively flat topography within the project area. Thus, it is unlikely that the project site would be subject to inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, there is no impact.

**VIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				<b>X</b>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or				<b>X</b>

regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				<b>X</b>

**Response to Questions:**

- a) The project, by its nature, will not physically divide an established community. Instead, it is located within a larger industrial area hosting many other businesses.
- b) The project is consistent with the Yuba City General Plan designation and the zoning for this property, which are an industrial type designation and zone district.
- c) There are currently no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans within the City limits or the Urban Growth Boundary.

**IX. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless 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?				<b>X</b>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				<b>X</b>

**Response to Questions:**

- a-b) The proposed project is not expected to impact mineral resources. The project site has no known mineral resource value nor is there opportunity for mineral resource extraction due to the surrounding development that would be impacted.

**X. NOISE**

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless 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				<b>X</b>

or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
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?				X
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?				X

**Response to Questions:**

a-d) The proposed bio-hazardous waste facility will not be a significant noise generator, with the only noise generated is by vehicle traffic, and it is located within an industrial area that is not noise sensitive. Therefore there are not expected to be any noise concerns from this project.

e-f) The project is not located within an airport land use planning area. There are no private airstrips in Yuba City.

**XI. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

**Response to Questions**

a) The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in the area as the

facility will not create more than five jobs, which is not a significant number of new jobs that would induce growth to the area.

b-c) The project will not cause any existing housing to be removed that will necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**XII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

**Response to Questions:**

ai-ii) The project site is currently located in the City and is served by Yuba City Police and Fire Departments. The Yuba City Police Department and Fire Department received project plans and did not comment on the project. Other than the very small incremental growth this project brings, the project will not result in any additional need for police or fire protection.

aiii) This project will not result in any additional direct need for educational services since no residential uses are proposed or significant job creating uses that will induce residential development.

aiv-v) This project will not result in any additional need for parks or other public facilities.

### XIII. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
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?				X

#### Response to Questions:

a-b) The utilization of this site for a bio-hazardous waste facility will not induce new growth to the area that would cause a need for additional parks.

### XIV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
c) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
d) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
e) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

#### Response to Questions:

a,b) The 2-5 new employees of the site will generate a very small insignificant number of vehicle trips. Many of the waste collection trips already exist in the area in that the waste collection is already occurring. There will be approximately one or two weekly

truck trips that remove the materials.

- c) The Fire Department and Police Departments have reviewed the project plans and did not express concerns about emergency access to the property.
- d) There are at least four on-site parking spaces as well as on-street parking, but not more than two to five employees are expected to occupy the site. Therefore the available parking should be more than adequate.
- e) There are no changes proposed that would adversely impact bus or bicycle movements.

## XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to the existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

### Response to Questions:

- a-e) The existing on-site septic system is designed to accommodate employee generated wastewater. There are no proposals to expand the existing water and wastewater usage. The only need for additional water is to irrigate the small amount of additional landscaping that is proposed. The existing site and its facilities are not proposed to be modified or expanded to the extent that it would impact the existing drainage system.
- f-g) The hazardous waste materials will not be disposed locally. The non-hazardous waste

generated at the site will be handled by Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc., which provides solid waste disposal for the area. There is adequate collection and landfill capacity to accommodate the proposed development.

## XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Does the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important example of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				<b>X</b>
b) 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)			<b>X</b>	
c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			<b>X</b>	

- a) The project site is in an urbanized area with little biological value. The proposed project will not alter the existing developed property and therefore will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate an important example of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b) The project does not create a situation with limited individual but cumulatively considerable impacts that can be considered significant.
- c) The proposed project will create no adverse impacts, either directly or indirectly, to residents in the project area as there are no nearby residential uses.

## Section 4. References and/or Incorporated by Reference

According to Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, an ND may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document that is a matter of public record. The incorporated language will be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of the MND. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at, or can be obtained through, the City of Yuba City Development Services Department located at the address provided above. The following documents are incorporated by reference:

Airport Land Use Commission. 1994. Sutter County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. April 1994.

Airport Land Use Commission. 2011. Yuba County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Adopted March 17, 2011

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (CDC DLRP). 2014. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program – Sutter County Important Farmland 2012. August 2014.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (CDC DLRP). 2013. Sutter County Williamson Act FY 2013/2014.

Carollo. 2011. City of Yuba City 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2011.

Yuba City, City of. 2016. City of Yuba City Municipal Code. [https://www.municode.com/library/ca/yuba\\_city/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances](https://www.municode.com/library/ca/yuba_city/codes/code_of_ordinances)

Dyett & Bhatia. 2004. City of Yuba City General Plan. Adopted April 8, 2004.

Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc. 1995. Yuba-Sutter Bikeway Master Plan. December 1995.

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

Yuba Sutter Transit Route Map.

California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. "Fault Zone Activity Map." Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2016. EnviroStor. Available at <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>



California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program – Sutter County Important Farmland Map.

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

Carollo. 2011. City of Yuba City 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2011.

City of Yuba City Wastewater Master Plan.

Sutter County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, April, 1994.

Yuba County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Sept., 2010.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System website. Updated September 7, 2011. Available at [http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm)