Jackson Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, June 15, 2020 – 6:30 PM Regular Meeting

Please Note Location for this meeting only:
Amador County Administration Building, 810 Court St., Jackson, California 95642

Participation via Zoom Conference is highly recommended due to LIMITED SEATING of 20 people for social-distancing. Should there be remaining people wanting to attend/speak, we will rotate people in/out.

Public Teleconference Line: 1 669 900 6833
Meeting ID: 815 4305 3128#

Join Zoom Meeting: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81543053128

NOTE: Callers will be muted upon entry. Should you wish to speak upon Public Comment, please “Raise your Hand”, you will be unmuted one at a time and asked to state your name. If you are not accessing via Zoom application; enter *9 to “raise your hand” to speak.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

1. PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA.

Discussion items only, no action will be taken. Any person may address the Planning Commission at this time on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Please note – there is a three (3) minute limit. Any matter that may require action may be referred to administration for review and appropriate administrative and/or legislative action.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Approve the minutes of the May 18, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting.

3. DISCUSSION CALENDAR.

   a. Possible City Council recommendation for a General Plan Amendment - Northwest Corner of Schober Avenue and Hwy 49 (APN 020-367-001). Applicant Mr. Lee Scundi.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.

This section is to provide staff and Commissioners an opportunity to present oral status reports on issues. No action is expected to be taken by the Planning Commissions.
5. **ADJOURNMENT.**

Regular meeting adjournment.

*Posted:  City Hall, Jackson*

*Agenda materials will be available for review (pursuant to §54957.5 Government Code Section) in the City Clerk’s office in City Hall.*

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, you should contact the Office of the City Clerk at (209) 223-1646 (voice) or (209) 223-3141 (fax). Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.*

**Visit our website at http://ci.jackson.ca.us**

*for copies of previous agendas, minutes and City budget.*
Chairman McLean called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG.**

Chairman McLean led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Prior to starting the meeting, Chairman McLean announced that item 3a. on the Discussion Calendar was moved to the June 15, 2020 Planning Commission meeting date and relocated to Amador County Board of Supervisors Chambers to accommodate a larger audience.

City Planner Susan Peters explained why this item is returning to the Planning Commission and why it was postponed and moved. The item is being brought back to the Planning Commission because the application has changed from a rezone, general plan amendment and variance to only a general plan amendment. Subsequent to the Planning Commission Public Hearing, the applicant pressed the City about his ability to develop this commercially as he believed it was commercially zoned because that is how it was sold to him by CalTrans. CP Peters engaged the City Attorney on the discussion who went back through the records and that the previous zoning on the site was in fact correct as commercial. This information along with the change in site plan from two kiosks to one was significant enough for CP Peters to direct the application back to the Planning Commission for their recommendation to the City Council. The intent was to have it on this meeting but both CP Peters and the City Manager received some calls with various concerns. There were a lot of people at the last meeting - over 50 people. This room cannot accommodate social distancing in accordance with the Governor’s mandate. To be able to maximize the attendance for those who wish to attend in person, it was decided to postpone to the next Planning Commission meeting scheduled for June 15th and hold it at the Board of Supervisors Chambers at the Administration Building at 810 Court St.

John Johnson, Jackson resident, was concerned why there was not a letter of notice mentioning the postponement of this item. CP Peters answered that there was not adequate time to get another letter out once we were able to schedule the Board of Supervisors Chambers to communicate the postponement and relocation. This information will be in the Ledger this Friday and will be re-noticed to all property owners within 300 feet. The meeting on June 15th will be accessible via Zoom Conference for those who wish to call in and participate.
1) **PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA.**

Chairman McLean opened for Public Matters not on the Agenda. After hearing none he moved to next item.

2) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

*Motion to approve the minutes of February 18, 2020. Moved by Commissioner Consolo, seconded by Commissioner Simmons, and carried by a 3 to 0 vote:*

- **AYES:** Collins, White, Consolo
- **NOES:** None
- **ABSENT:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** Simmons, McLean

3) **DISCUSSION CALENDAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Possible City Council recommendation for a General Plan Amendment and Variance - Northwest Corner of Schober Avenue and Hwy 49 (APN 020-367-001). Applicant Mr. Lee Scundi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong><strong>Please note that this Public Hearing has been postponed to June 15, 2020 at 6:30 pm and will be held at the Amador County Board of Supervisors Chambers – 810 Court Street, Jackson</strong></strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Possible City Council recommendation for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment – Residential Duplex to Residential Medium Density – 1460 Jackson Gate Road (APN 020-031-001). Applicant Mr. Mark Carman.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CP Peters explained that the applicant had recently acquired the building at 1460 Jackson Gate Road which has historically been utilized for three residential units. The Residential Duplex only allows for two residential units so the applicant is requesting a rezone to Residential Medium Density to accommodate the existing use.

While rezones are typically subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), projects which have no possibility of causing an environmental impact can be categorically exempted from CEQA review in accordance with Section 15061(b)(3) of CEQA. The proposed rezone does not increase the intensity of the use since the proposed zoning and General Plan designation allow for what the building has historically been used for.

Should the Planning Commission choose to recommend approval of the requested rezone and general plan amendment to the City Council the following findings should be made in accordance with Article VI, Section 17.160.060 Findings for Amendments:

An amendment to the General Plan, the Zoning Map, or this Development Code may be approved only if all of the following findings are made, as applicable to the type of amendment.
1. The proposed amendment ensures and maintains internal consistency with all of the goals, policies, and actions of all elements of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan; and

2. The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City, and

3. There is adequate capacity available in the community sewer and water systems to serve the potential development, and the site is physically suitable for the requested zoning designation(s) and anticipated land use development(s). Factors considered to evaluate suitability shall include access, provision of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and absence of physical constraints, and

4. The proposed amendment ensures and maintains internal consistency with other applicable provisions of this Development Code.

It is recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing on the Rezone and General Plan and forward the application and its associated categorical exemption to the City Council for adoption based on the Findings in this report.

Committee held discussion.

Chairman McLean asked for Public Comment, no comment was brought forth.

CP Peters stated this is basically a housekeeping request to bring the residence into compliance by rezoning to Residential Medium Density since the property has 3 units. CP Peters also confirmed the residence has 3 water meters.

*Motion by Commissioner Consolo, seconded by Vice Chair Collins, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote to make recommendation to the City Council to Rezone and General Plan designate 1460 Jackson Gate Road from residential Duplex to the Residential Medium Density.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES:</th>
<th>McLean, Collins, White, Consolo, Simmons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOES:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.

CP Susan Peters reported that she released an RFQ for the Comprehensive General Plan (GP), including 7 elements, and the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Planning Commission received $160K in Grant funds – sounds like a lot of money, but it is not. She had several firms who reached out to her asking if this was covering just part of the proposal. Typically, you would spend between $250-400K on a GP update and associated EIR. As expected, CP Peters only received one (1) proposal from a firm she is familiar with who has done low-cost GP’s for other jurisdictions. CP Peters will put a contract together to put in process to the City Manager and City Council. As a heads-up, GP workshops will be coming up.

In advance of the workshops, CP Peters will put together some information on the GP, processes for updates and the EIR for the Planning Commission to review.
Chairwoman Collins questioned the timing of the workshops. CP Peters responded that back in 2008 when they re-did the Land Use Element and Circulation Element, they created neighborhood committees and tried to get a representative from each neighborhood onto a committee. They found this time consuming and hard to get participation. Public participation is key and very important and there is not a lot of money allocated to this and public participation will be a little more limited this time. Public interest has been low as the public does not understand what a GP is, part of it is trying to educate people and why it’s important for them to get involved. The PC will be doing an outreach however they do not have that many meetings allocated for the workshops. The crux issues usually evolve around the Land Use Element. There were a lot of changes in 2008. In the 70’s it was pretty much a free-for-all for rezoning and still sees a lot of that today. When the PC was looking at the GP in 2008, there was commercial zoning in residential neighborhoods and we’re still seeing the impacts of that today where there are a lot of spotty commercial developments. The PC successfully, with a lot of effort, down-zoned approximately 400 pieces of property in the City. More work remains to be done but we have to be mindful that commercial is important and you have to balance that with housing, and affordable housing. This grant is an affordable housing grant. The idea is to create more housing opportunities for development in the city so the prices can be more reasonable. The water and sewer issues will be a part of this update. There have been a lot of changes and the political climate for affordable housing also has quite a few changes. To answer the original question of how much time, there will be public workshops where the PC will be involved, additional review time will be needed when the elements are completed for review, followed by the Public Hearings for the adoption and review of the environmental document.

This grant opportunity is a really good thing and the ability to receive it in order to update the General Plan. The only element, of the 7 elements that requires you to be in compliance with state man-date, is the housing element. We were on a 5-year cycle but was granted a complicated extension because housing and transportation are related. The Amador County Transportation Commission regularly updates the Regional Transportation Plan that affords us the ability to go on an 8-year cycle. Our Housing element is relatively up to date and not due for an update until 2022.

After no further comments, Chairman McLean adjourned the meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT.

Chairman McLean adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

ATTEST:

Patti Ungaro, Administrative Assistant          Date Approved
CITY OF JACKSON
Planning Staff Report

Date: June 15, 2020
Application Type: General Plan Amendment from no Designation to Commercial
Applicant: Mr. Lee Scundi
Location: North West Corner of Schober Avenue and Highway 49 (APN 020-367-001)

Project Description

The project site, located at the northwest corner of Schober Avenue and Highway 49 in the City of Jackson, is currently zoned Commercial with no General Plan Designation. The applicant is requesting the site be designated Commercial to be consistent with the existing zoning to accommodate construction of a drive through coffee kiosk which will be accessed from two separate entrances on either end of the property from Schober Avenue. There will be two exits onto Schober Avenue (see attached plans).

Discussion

The project site was originally owned by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and considered Right of Way. In 2019 Caltrans established that this was a separate property from the right of way and has sold it to a developer, Mr. Lee Scundi. Mr. Scundi originally applied for a general plan amendment, rezone and variance because staff asserted that there was no zoning or designation on this parcel because it had been right of way. The variance was to accommodate construction of a second coffee kiosk in the ten-foot rear yard setback.

In November 2019 the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the original application and made a recommendation to the City Council to deny the requested entitlements. Subsequent to that meeting the applicant requested review of the determination that there was no zoning and general plan designation on the site. After careful review it was determined that the site retained the Commercial zoning applied prior to converting the property to right of way. The General Plan Land Use Element was updated in 2008 and did not apply a designation to the property. For this reason, a General Plan Amendment is required to designate the property Commercial to be consistent with the zoning.

Environmental Review

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) an Initial Study was prepared for the original project and updated to reflect the amended application as well as new Initial Study requirements. The Initial Study did not reveal any significant
adverse environmental impacts that could not be addressed with mitigation. For this reason, the project qualifies for a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Findings

Should the Planning Commission choose to recommend City Council approval of the requested General Plan Amendment, in accordance with the City of Jackson, Development Code, Article VI, Chapter 17.160.060 Findings for Amendments, the following Findings are required:

A. Findings for all amendments.
   1. The proposed amendment ensures and maintains internal consistency with all of the goals, policies, and actions of all elements of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan; and
   2. The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.

Action

It is recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and make a recommendation (approval or denial) to the City Council on the requested General Plan Amendment based on the Findings in this report.
In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15063 (Initial Study), this Initial Study has been prepared for the proposed General Plan Amendment to allow for a coffee kiosk to be located at the intersection of Schober Avenue and Highway 49 (APN 020-367-001). Application has been submitted by Mr. Lee Scundi.

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

PREPARED BY: Susan M. Peters, AICP
City Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project site, located at the northwest corner of Schober Avenue and Highway 49 in the City of Jackson, is currently zoned Commercial with no General Plan Designation. The applicant is requesting the site be designated Commercial to be consistent with the existing zoning to accommodate construction of a drive through coffee kiosk which will be accessed from two separate entrances on either end of the property from Schober Avenue. There will be two exits onto Schober Avenue.

California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project are were notified of the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wildfire
- 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 attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________  
Printed name: Susan M. Peters For: City of Jackson
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:

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

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☒

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

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

Background:

The Project occurs in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada, in the middle of an urbanized area outside of the City of Jackson 2008 General Plan Land Use Element Visual Corridor Overlay. Additionally, the project is not located on a highway or route that is designated or eligible for designation as a scenic highway.

Discussion of Impacts:

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

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

c) Conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

The project site is not located in a scenic vista. Because this site is located in an urbanized area and is consistent with the neighboring commercial uses fronting Highway 49, the proposed improvements are not anticipated to significantly impact the aesthetics of the area. No impact.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
The proposed improvements will require lighting, however the City’s Development Code, Article III, Chapter 17.43 – Lighting Regulations has regulations in place which, when implemented, will minimize any impact associated with the new light sources. Less than significant impact.

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

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

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?
   ☒

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

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))?  
   ☒

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

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?
   ☒

Discussion of Impacts:

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

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

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

Background:

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

Discussion of Impacts:

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

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

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

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

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

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

d) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

The project site is highly disturbed due to surrounding construction. Minimal vegetation exists on the site nor does it support any trees (including oaks. Additionally, the City of Jackson does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact.
### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Impact Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

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

### VI. ENERGY -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Impact Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

Temporary increases in energy use (i.e. fuel) would be required during construction activities. Project energy use would primarily consist of energy consumption for space heating and cooling, use of appliances and transportation energy use associated with increases in vehicle trips to and from the site. All building energy needs would be met by electricity supplied by Pacific Gas and Electric. Project construction would be temporary and minor in terms of energy use. Compliance with CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in an energy-
efficient building. For these reasons the project’s energy impacts are considered less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil?

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

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

The site will utilize the City’s wastewater collection and treatment system. **No impact.**
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

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

Construction of the proposed project will comply with applicable Amador Air District rules and best management practices. Traffic generated by the project is anticipated to be minimal. Less than significant impact.

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

The City of Jackson does not have regulations regarding the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. No impact.
| IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |

Discussion of Impacts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project may result in temporarily rerouting vehicular traffic or decreasing the number of travel lanes during construction. This work would require an encroachment permit with traffic management requirements to address emergency access. **Less than significant impact.**

g) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows? ☒

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

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

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

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

Some areas of the project will be covered with synthetic materials or asphalt concrete/concrete pavement which will impede the vertical movement of water, however these areas are proportionally small so their effect on overall, local and regional groundwater recharge is considered to be minimal. Less than significant impact.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would; result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows?

Implementation of the project will require professionally prepared grading and drainage plans which are reviewed and approved by the City engineer. Drainage plans will be required to demonstrate that project-related drainage improvements will ensure that post-project runoff quantities will not exceed pre-project quantities. By doing so, substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site will not occur. Less than significant impact.

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

The project site is depicted on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) no 06005C0557F. No project activities are proposed in the portion of the site designated as being subject to the 1% annual chance flood. No impact.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

There are no applicable water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plans affecting the site. No impact.
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☒

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

Discussion of Impacts:

A General Plan Amendment applying a Commercial designation to the site is consistent with the site’s zoning. No impact.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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) 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? ☒

Discussion of Impacts:

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

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[☒] With Mitigation Incorporated
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[ ] No Impact

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[ ] With Mitigation Incorporated
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[☐] No Impact

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

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[ ] With Mitigation Incorporated
[ ] Less Than Significant Impact
[☐] No Impact

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

In accordance with the City’s noise ordinance, all site work will be completed between the hours of 7:00 am and 9:00 pm on any day except Sunday, and between 9:00 am and 6:00 pm on Sunday. Construction activities during site development have the potential to generate short-term increases in noise, however based upon historic experience with construction-related traffic and noise, the City does not anticipate objectionable levels to be associated with this project. Post-construction noise will be associated with commercial use of the site. Compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance will minimize the significance of noise impacts. **Less than significant.**

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

Neither the project’s construction nor post-construction activities will include activities likely to produce significant or excessive groundborne vibration or noise (e.g. blasting, impact pile driving, etc.) that would produce excessive ground-borne vibration at excessive levels. Conventional construction and event activities will not produce excessive groundborne vibration or noise. **No impact.**
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels?

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

The location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population and housing will not be affected or altered by the proposed project activities. No impact.
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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?
  - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated
  - ☒ Less Than Significant Impact
  - ☐ No Impact

- Police protection?
  - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated
  - ☒ Less Than Significant Impact
  - ☐ No Impact

- Schools?
  - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated
  - ☒ No Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact

- Parks?
  - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated
  - ☒ No Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact

- Other public facilities?
  - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated
  - ☒ No Impact
  - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact

Discussion of Impacts:

Because of the small size of the development and proximity to services, impacts to fire and police protection services are not expected to be significant. Less than significant impact.

The proposed project center will not generate increased use of schools or parks. No impact.
XVI. RECREATION --

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

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

Discussion of Impacts:

The proposed project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or require new park facilities. **No Impact.**

XVII. TRANSPORTATION -- Would the project:

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

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

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

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? ☒

Discussion of Impacts:

a) Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
The project is consistent with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. **No impact.**

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?

*In the absence of models to estimate the vehicle miles traveled for the proposed project CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)3 allows for a jurisdiction to analyze a project’s vehicle miles traveled qualitatively. This analysis evaluates factors such as the availability of transit and proximity to other destinations. The proposed project’s proximity to an established Amador Transit stop (at CVS) and the close proximity to the neighboring commercial and residential developments reduces the anticipated vehicle miles attributed to this project to a level of insignificance. Less than significant impact.*

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp cures or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. fam equipment)?

*There is a curve at the top of Schober Avenue which may be hazardous without appropriate traffic controls exiting the project site. Stop signs will be required at each egress to minimize the potential hazard. Additionally, the applicant will be required to install “No Parking” signs along Schober Avenue fronting the project property to ensure that the road will not be blocked. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The existing roads in the vicinity of the project site can accommodate emergency vehicles. **No impact.**
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or ☒ ☐ ☐ ☒

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Discussion of Impacts:

The site is currently vacant and has been highly disturbed by the widening of Highway 49 and previous uses of the site. A project description was circulated to interested Tribes. No comments regarding the proposed project were submitted. No impact.
### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| 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? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| 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? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion of Impacts:**

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

*The proposed project would utilize the City’s existing water and wastewater services which both have capacity to accommodate commercial use of the site. Implementation of the project will require professionally prepared grading and drainage plans which are reviewed and approved by the City engineer. Drainage plans will be required to demonstrate that project-related drainage improvements will ensure that post-project runoff quantities will not exceed pre-project quantities. Storm drainage improvements may include culverts, detention basins, grass-lined swales, or any number of other peak-reducing measures to control runoff quantities. Such facilities will be constructed on-site, in non-biologically sensitive areas, and will be designed by*
professional engineers in consultation with the project biologist to ensure significant environmental effect will not occur as a result of construction. Less than significant impact.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

The proposed project will be served by the City’s water system which has capacity for the proposed commercial use. No impact.

c) Would the project 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?

The proposed project will be served by the City’s wastewater system which has capacity for the proposed commercial use. No impact.

d) Would the project 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?

Solid waste collection service is provided to the City by ACES, a contract hauler who delivers collected waste to local transfer stations. Waste from transfer stations is segregated and non-recyclable refuse is disposed at Keifer Landfill in Sacramento County. The hauler reports that waste generated by the project will be minimal and that collection and disposal capacity exists to serve the project. No impact.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Solid waste will be collected and handled by ACES. ACES operates under contract to the City as a contract hauler. By contract, ACES must demonstrate that its operations are in continuous compliance with federal, state and local statutes and regulations. In addition, ACES’s operations are routinely audited by a third-party service specializing in solid waste operations and its operations are routinely found to be compliant. No impact.
**XX. WILDFIRE** – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Impacts:**

The proposed project is not located in a state responsibility area or classified as very high severity zone. **No impact.**
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

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)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Approval of the General Plan Amendment request will not by itself 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. Approval of the General Plan Amendment will not by itself have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable as all cumulative environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the 2008 Land Use Element have been addressed in the EIR. The General Plan Amendment proposal does not increase the residential growth potential of Jackson. Approval of the General Plan Amendment request will not require mitigation to minimize impacts.
Hi Mr. Johnson,

Following are responses to your questions regarding the development application for a coffee kiosk proposal for property on Schober Avenue. As requested, your comments along with these responses will be added to the public record and provided to the Planning Commission and City Council.

1. The intent of the Planning Commission is to act as advisors to the City Council for all land use related issues. The original application for a rezone, general plan amendment and variance was presented to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the City Council, and the Planning Commission’s recommendation was for denial. Subsequent to that meeting the application type changed from a rezone, general plan amendment and variance to strictly a general plan amendment. I made the determination that the change in the application was significant and should be taken back to the Planning Commission to ensure the recommendation to the City Council accurately reflected the amended application.

2. I agree that the consolidation from two kiosks to a single kiosk does not change the intensity of the use. It does however change the site design and traffic circulation.

3. Staff is in the process of updating the Initial Study to reflect the amended application. Based on the Initial Study staff is recommending a Mitigated Negative Declaration. This means that all impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance. The Planning Commission and/or City Council can either accept the recommendation or find that there are potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated and direct staff to prepare an Environmental Impact Report.

4. The revised project still includes ingress/egress at Schober Avenue. A stop sign would be required at each of the two points of egress at Schober Avenue.

5. The Public Notices are sent to property owners within 300 feet of the boundaries of the project property. I’ve attached the radius map for your review.

6. The project proposal does not include new mitigation however staff will be recommending “No Parking” signs to be placed along both sides of Schober Avenue.

7. New Public Notices were mailed out on May 21st.
Attached are the revised site plans – there are no other new documents. Please let me know if you need printed copies – I can arrange for them to be mailed or picked up at City Hall.

Susan M. Peters, AICP
City Planner
City of Jackson
33 Broadway
Jackson, CA 95642
209.223.1646 ext. 111
speters@ci.jackson.ca.us

On Tue, May 19, 2020 at 1:18 PM JOHN JOHNSON <h2o@comcast.net> wrote:

Hello Ms. Peters,

Please address the following questions regarding the Coffee Kiosk Development Proposal for the parcel on the northwest corner of Highway 49 and Schober Ave. I need this information ASAP to prepare for the rescheduled June 15, 2020 Public Hearing:

1. In the previous Public Hearing the Planning Commission's stated the primary reason for deciding to forward a recommendation to reject the project proposal to the City Council was that the coffee drive through business was an inappropriate use for the parcel. To the Commission's credit, that was a correct appraisal, and it is still true now. Why then is this project coming forward again? Please clarify; did the City definitively determine that the public process, including the Public Hearing must be redone to be legal? Or, has someone in the City determine the proposed use is now appropriate for the parcel? (If so, who made this new determination and what is the rational?) Or, is this reboot being done to placate the applicant for some reason? (if so, what is the reason?)

2. Is there anything in the revised project proposal relative to the original proposal that would change the intensity of the use with the proposed business on the parcel? I do not believe that consolidating two kiosks into one kiosk equates to a less intensive use. There are many ways that one kiosk could do just as much business and create just as much traffic and nuisance as two kiosks.

3. Considering the re-application and reboot for the City processing of the project proposal, I presume you will be preparing an updated CEQA document for the revised project? If so, will you elevate the CEQA process to an EIR to properly address and correct the list of Negative Impacts so they accurately reflect (1.) the overall traffic impacts at the already problematic intersection of Highway 49 and Schober Ave.; (2.) the ingress and egress impacts to and from the Peek Hill residential neighborhood, including the limited egress from the neighborhood for residents, and access for firefighters, in the event of a major local fire; (3.) the significant light pollution/nuisance to nearby neighbors; (4.) the significant noise pollution/nuisance to nearby neighbors; (5.) the negative impact (property devaluation) to neighboring residential parcels;
(6) the interference with the established wildlife corridor from the west side of Highway 49 to the creek on the east side of Highway 49; (7) the plan for abatement/remediation of purported heavy metals contamination of soils on the parcel from previous historical uses including (but not limited to) a print shop and a metal plating/refinishing shop; and (8) the realistic impacts and recovery of costs for both the City's potable water supply capacity, demand, operation and capital infrastructure; and the City's wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal capacity and operations and capital infrastructure.

4. Does the revised project still include ingress/egress to/from Schober Ave. for the coffee drive through business? If so, does the project include or recommend any provision for any new or modified traffic controls on Shrober Ave. and at the affected intersections?

5. What is the extent of the physical range for the Public Hearing Notification Letter's addressees? Was it to a defined distance-radius or some geographical boundary? If so, what was the specified radius or geographical reference? How did you determine the range/radius? Did you send letters of Notice of the Public Hearings to residences on the east side of Highway 49? (if so, what streets and range of their addresses?)

6. Does the new project proposal include any other new mitigations for any of its negative impacts?

7. When will the Letter of Notice for the newly scheduled June 15 date for the relocated Public Hearing be going out?

Additionally, I would like to request a copy of the Developer's new application submission/package including the Project Site Plan (I understand copies would be provided to me at my expense of your standard document copying fees.) I would like the copies as soon as absolutely possible, so please get back with me ASAP with any precursory correspondence to processing my request.

Please don't hesitate to call me if you have and questions, or if you need anything from me in order to expedite your response to my questions and request. My home number is (209) 223-1063.

Finally, please enter my questions above (and your responses) into the official record for the Public Process related to this project proposal.

Thank you.

John Johnson
123 Eva Way
Jackson, CA 95642
Homeowner/Resident
(209) 223-1063
Patti Ungaro

From: Susan Peters <speters@ci.jackson.ca.us>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 2:50 PM
To: Christine O’Neill
Cc: Patti Ungaro
Subject: Re: Amendment/Variance APN 020-367-001-000

Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you for your comments - they will be added to the public record and provided to the Planning Commission.

Susan M. Peters, AICP
City Planner
City of Jackson
33 Broadway
Jackson, CA 95642
209.223.1646 ext. 111
speters@ci.jackson.ca.us

On Fri, Jun 5, 2020 at 12:30 PM Christine O’Neill <chrisoneill16@yahoo.com> wrote:
June 5, 2020
Attention Planning Commission

We are the owners of a property our daughter lives in on Anita Street. We had received a notice of a hearing in May (cancelled) and when discussing the issue with our daughter she raised her concerns about the proposed coffee kiosks on Highway 49 and Schober in Jackson. We have the same concerns. This is already an impacted merging of Highway 49, Schober, and CVS access. Can not imagine adding one/two more things to the mix. Our daughters fear is that Perry will become the easier access inlet/outlet. I believe that would be very impactful to the surrounding neighborhood. Please consider all of the above before reaching a final decision. We are opposed to this project.

Regards,
Christine O’Neill
Terrence O’Neill

Sent from my iPad
Thank you for your comments - they will be added to the public record and provided to the Planning Commission.

Susan M. Peters, AICP
City Planner
City of Jackson
33 Broadway
Jackson, CA 95642
209.223.1646 ext. 111
speters@ci.jackson.ca.us

On Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 4:50 PM Barbara Ragan <gonorth15@yahoo.com> wrote:

I vote against this coffee kiosk . NO

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad