

ATTACHMENT C



YOLO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

**INITIAL STUDY / NEGATIVE DECLARATION
ZONE FILE # 2024-006**

MULLER TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

JUNE 2024

Environmental Checklist Initial Study/Negative Declaration

- 1. Project Title:** Zone File #2024-006 (Muller Tentative Parcel Map)
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**
Yolo County Planning, Department of Community Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695
- 3. Contact Person, Phone Number, E-Mail:**
Tracy Gonzalez, Associate Planner
(530) 666-8803
tracy.gonzalez@yolocounty.org
- 4. Project Location:** The project site is located on agriculturally zoned land approximately 3.6 miles west of the City of Woodland, north of Cache Creek, bound by County Road-19 to the north, County Road 94B to the east, and County Road 20 to the south (APNs: 025-360-069 and 025-360-073). See Figure 1 (Vicinity Map).
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
Matthew K. Souza
Laugenour and Meikle
608 Court Street
Woodland, CA 95695
- 6. Land Owner's Name and Address:**
Thomas Muller and Michele T. Muller
15810 County Road 95
Woodland, CA 95695

Frank L. Muller and Nancy C. Muller Revocable Trust
35472 County Road 18A
Woodland, CA 95695

Louie and Marie Muller Family Trust, dated August 9, 2016
36359 County Road 18A
Woodland, CA 95695
- 7. General Plan Designation(s):** Agriculture (AG)
- 8. Zoning:** Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone
- 9. Description of the Project:** See attached "Project Description" on the following pages.
- 10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

Relation to Project	Land Use	Zoning	General Plan Designation
Project Site	Agriculture (orchards)	Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone	Agriculture (AG)
North	Agriculture (row crops) and rural residences	A-N zone / Agricultural Extensive (A-X) zone	AG
South	Agriculture (orchard) and open space	A-N zone / Public Open Space (POS)	AG /OS
East	Agriculture (orchard) and rural residences	A-N zone	AG
West	Agriculture (orchard)	A-N zone	AG

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Yolo County Public Works Division; Yolo County Planning Commission.

12. Other Project Assumptions: The Initial Study assumes compliance with all applicable State, Federal, and local codes and regulations including, but not limited to, County of Yolo Improvement Standards, the California Building Code, the State Health and Safety Code, and the State Public Resources Code. The project is reviewed and analyzed under the County’s Subdivision Ordinance.

Project Description

The project is a request for a tentative parcel map to create two parcels from one 126.402-acre parcel in the unincorporated area of Yolo County. Section 8-1.302 of the Yolo County Code requires a tentative map and a parcel map for all subdivisions creating four or fewer lots. Historically, the parcel has been farmed as two separate fields due to vast soil and drainage differences. Both fields are planted in permanent crops (almonds) and are currently undeveloped.

The project would allow the current property owners to create two parcels that more appropriately align with the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations along the Adams Canal which intersects the property from north to south. Parcel 1 will consist of approximately 68.329 acres and Parcel 2 will consist of approximately 58.073 acres. The project site is located approximately 3.6 miles west of the City of Woodland, and north of Cache Creek, bordered by County Road (CR) 19 to the north, CR 94B to the east, and CR 20 to the south. The property is zoned Agricultural Intensive (A-N) and is designated as Agriculture (AG) in the 2030 Countywide General Plan. The property is not enrolled in the Williamson Act.

The Project site is undeveloped, except for access roads, and no development is included in the project request. The property is planted in almond orchards and irrigated via surface water pumped from the Adams Canal and an agricultural well located at the southwest corner of APN 025-360-073. The existing agricultural well and pump currently serve both APNs and a new pump is proposed near the southeast corner of Parcel 1 to continue providing irrigation via surface water from the Adams Canal. The project will not result in any change to existing agricultural operations. Access to the site will continue from existing gravel and dirt roads from CR 19 and 94B. A 20-foot-wide access easement is proposed on Parcel 1 to ensure Parcel 2 has access to the equipment yard on the westerly side of the Adams Canal.

Any future development of the project site, including homesite development, will be required to meet the development standards set forth in Article 3 and Article 4 of Title 8, Chapter 2 of the Yolo County Code.

Figure 1
Vicinity Map




Figure 2. Project Assessor's Parcels



POR. OF RANCHO GUESISOSI, T. 10N., R. 1E., M.D.B. & M.

CAUTION - These maps ARE NOT to be used for legal descriptions.

25 - 36




Figure 3. Existing Project Site Aerial




Figure 4. Proposed Configuration





Figure 5
Proposed Tentative Parcel Map No. 5234



Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The proposed Project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <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 to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.

<i>Tracy L. Gonzalez</i>	06/20/2024	Tracy Gonzalez
Planner's Signature	Date	Planner's Printed name

Purpose of this Initial Study

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guideline Section 15063, to determine if the project as described herein may have a significant effect upon the environment.

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to 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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. 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.
4. “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.
5. Earlier analyses 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following: a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review. b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of 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. c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. 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.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify: a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

1. AESTHETICS.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point. If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- 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 along a scenic highway?; and**
- c) **In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?**

No Impact. For purposes of determining significance under CEQA, a “scenic vista” is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. There are no officially designated scenic vistas near the project area, and the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the surrounding vicinity, which includes open space to the south (Cache Creek Nature Preserve), and expansive views of flat agricultural lands with varying seasonal row crops and permanent crops to the north, east, and west. The project proposes no additional development, including residences.

- d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?**

No Impact. The project will not create a new source of light that would adversely affect views in the area. Although no development is proposed as part of the project, future construction of homes or agricultural buildings could produce additional sources of light to the surrounding agricultural area. However, any future development of the parcels will require a lighting plan before building permits are issued. Any new lighting would be required to be low-intensity and shielded and/or directed away from adjacent properties, public right-of-way, and the night sky.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.				
<p>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.</p> <p>Would the proposed project:</p>				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

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?

No Impact. Soils composition of the project site are identified as Brentwood silty clay, Sehorn clay, Sehorn cobbly clay, Sycamore complex (drained), and Yolo silt loam. These soils are identified by the US Department of Agricultural Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey and Brentwood silty clay, Sycamore complex, and Yolo silt loam are designated as "Prime Farmland" on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Department of Conservation. Per the FMMP, Sehorn clay is designated as "Farmland of Statewide Importance" and Sehorn cobbly clay is designated as "Unique Farmland". No agricultural use changes are expected to occur as a result of the map and the project does not propose any development and will not convert any of the soils listed above to a non-agricultural use.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located within the Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone and is not enrolled in the Williamson Act. The proposed project is a tentative parcel map, which requires a discretionary review for consistency with the Yolo County 2030 General Plan and Zoning Code. Policies in the General Plan prohibit the division of agricultural land for nonagricultural-related purposes or uses. The proposed map will create two parcels from one 126.402-acre parcel that more appropriately align with the boundaries of the existing farming operations. Each newly created parcel will be large enough to sustain viable agricultural operations and are expected to remain in agricultural production. No development is proposed as part of the project, and the two parcels will comply with minimum parcel size requirements in the Yolo County Zoning Ordinance, which require at least 40 acres of irrigated lands, planted in permanent crops, for the creation of new agriculturally zoned (A-N) parcels.

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

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

No Impact. The project site is not zoned for forest land or timberland, nor does it contain forest land or timberland. Therefore, the proposed tentative parcel map would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, or result in the loss or conversion of forest or timberland.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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?

No Impact. The proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use and the project site does not contain forest land. No development is proposed as part of the project. Therefore, the project would result in no impact.

3. AIR QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The tentative parcel map would not contribute to air quality impacts; no additional development or change in existing uses is expected to occur with the approval of a tentative parcel map to create two parcels from one approximately 126.402-acre parcel that more appropriately align with the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations along the Adams Canal which intersects the property from north to south.

Thresholds of Significance:

The project site is within the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD), and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin regulates air quality conditions within Yolo County. Yolo County is classified as a non-attainment area for several air pollutants, including ozone (O₃) and particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) for both federal and state standards, the partial non-attainment of the federal particulate matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5}), and is classified as a moderate maintenance area for carbon monoxide (CO) by the state.

Development projects are most likely to violate an air quality plan or standard, or contribute substantially to an existing or project air quality violation, through generation of vehicle trips.

For the evaluation of project-related air quality impacts, the YSAQMD recommends the use of the following thresholds of significance:

- Long-term Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants (ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀)**—The criteria air pollutants of primary concern include ozone-precursor pollutants (ROG and NO_x) and PM₁₀. Significance thresholds have been developed for project-generated emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀). Because PM_{2.5} is a subset of PM₁₀, a separate significance threshold has not been established for PM_{2.5}. Operational impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered significant if project-generated emissions would exceed YSAQMD-recommended significance thresholds, as identified below:

Table AQ-1 YSAQMD-Recommended Quantitative Thresholds of Significance for Criteria Air Pollutants	
Pollutant	Threshold
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	10 tons/year (approx. 55 lbs/day)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	10 tons/year (approx. 55 lbs/day)
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	80 lbs/day
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Violation of State ambient air quality standard
<i>Source: Handbook for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality impacts (YSAQMD, 2007)</i>	

- Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants (ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀)—Construction impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered significant if project-generated emissions would exceed YSAQMD-recommended significance thresholds, as identified in Table AQ-1, and recommended control measures are not incorporated.
- Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plan— Projects resulting in the development of a new land use or a change in planned land use designation may result in a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Substantial increases in VMT, as well as, the installation of new area sources of emissions, may result in significant increases of criteria air pollutants that may conflict with the emissions inventories contained in regional air quality control plans. For this reason and given the region’s non-attainment status for ozone and PM₁₀, project-generated emissions of ozone precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG and NO_x) or PM₁₀ that would exceed the YSAQMD’s recommended project-level significance thresholds, would also be considered to potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of regional air quality attainment plans.
- Local Mobile-Source CO Concentrations—Local mobile source impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered significant if the project contributes to CO concentrations at receptor locations in excess of the CAAQS (i.e., 9.0 ppm for 8 hours or 20 ppm for 1 hour).
- Toxic Air Contaminants. Exposure to toxic air contaminants (TAC) would be considered significant if the probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (i.e., maximum individual risk) would exceed 10 in 1 million or would result in a Hazard Index greater than 1.
- Odors. Odor impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered significant if the project has the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors.

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

No Impact. The tentative parcel map would not substantially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District Air Quality Attainment Plan (1992), the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (1994), or the goals and objectives of the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan.

The Yolo-Solano Region is a non-attainment area for state particulate matter (PM₁₀) and ozone standards, the federal ozone standard, and the partial non-attainment of the federal particulate matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5}). Approval of a tentative parcel map to create two parcels to a more practicable configuration that will follow the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations would not conflict or obstruct any 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?

No Impact. Development projects are considered cumulatively significant by the YSAQMD if: (1) the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., general plan amendment, rezone); and (2) projected emissions (ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) of the project are greater than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation. The project is a tentative parcel map, which could result in the future development of additional agricultural operations and/or new homesites. The air pollutants generated by any future construction would be primarily dust and particulate matter during construction. Dust generated by construction activity would be required to be controlled through effective management practices, such as water spraying, and would therefore be a less than significant impact.

The project does not envision any additional construction or significant change in farming operations. Any future construction will be reviewed by the Yolo County Department of Community Services to ensure compatibility with air quality standards. Any additional agricultural operations and/or the creation of new homesites would not exceed thresholds as indicated in the 2007 YSAQMD Guidelines, and there are no sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site, although there are a few nearby rural homesites. The property is generally surrounded by agricultural lands, bordered by Cache Creek Nature Preserve to the south, and CR 19, CR94B, and CR 20, west/northwest of the City of Woodland. Approval of a tentative parcel map to create two parcels to a more practicable configuration that will follow the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations would not contribute to air quality impacts.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No Impact. See discussion in (b) above. The project site is in an agricultural area west of the City of Woodland, bordered by CR 19, CR 94B, and CR 20 with no sensitive receptors nearby. ("Sensitive receptors" refer to those segments of the population most susceptible to poor air quality, i.e., children, elderly, and the sick, and to certain at-risk sensitive land uses such as schools, hospitals, parks, or residential communities.) The closest rural residence is located approximately 290 feet east of the project site on APN: 025-350-029 (County Road 94B LLC). The project proposes no development, including construction activities, or significant changes in farming practices.

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

No Impact. No development is proposed as part of the tentative parcel map and the project would not generate any new odors. Therefore, the project will result in no impact.

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

DISCUSSION

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**
- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The tentative parcel map would not affect any special status species, riparian habitat, or sensitive natural community because no development is proposed in conjunction with the project. The parcels will remain in productive agriculture use. The project site is relatively flat farmland and lands surrounding the 126.402-acre project site consists of agricultural uses, such as almond orchards and open space to the south. Adams Canal intersects the project site from north to south. If a future 2.5-acre homesite is established on the newly created parcel (Parcel 1), which is currently undeveloped, the potential exists for the disturbance of California Tiger Salamander upland habitat, Swainson's hawk natural foraging and habitat, Western Burrowing Owl primary habitat, Western Pond Turtle nesting and overwintering habitat, White Tailed Kite nesting habitat and primary foraging, Tri-Colored Blackbird foraging habitat, and aquatic habitat for Western Pond Turtle. Although such

construction is not currently envisioned, the project's conditions of approval will require payment of land cover fees established by the Yolo Habitat Conservancy if a new 2.5-acre homesite is developed on Parcel 1 as a result of approval of the tentative parcel map [payment of applicable land cover fees are due prior to issuance of building permit(s) for new residence(s)].

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The physical boundaries of the existing farming operations are bisected from north to south by the Adams Canal, which is identified as a freshwater emergent wetland per the Wetlands Mapper provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A wetlands delineation has not been prepared for the project. Although no development is proposed as part of the project and no wetlands will be affected, the potential exists for a future 2.5-acre homesite to be developed on each newly created parcel. If development occurs, Policy CO-2.22 of the County's 2030 Countywide General Plan prohibits development within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams to protect riparian areas. Thus, impacts from any future development as a result of the tentative parcel map are expected to be less than significant.

- 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?**

No Impact. The project will not interfere 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. No development is proposed as part of the project.

- e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**
f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, as no development is proposed. Nor would the project conflict with the provisions of the adopted Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Any potential future development resulting from the tentative parcel map would be required to comply with the provisions of the Yolo HCP/NCCP.

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

DISCUSSION

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**
- b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? and**
- c) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include land disturbance activities or propose development as part of the tentative parcel map that would cause any substantial adverse changes to the significance of any historical or archaeological resources. Standard conditions will be applied to the project to ensure that if new information or cultural items are found during land disturbance activities the affected Tribe's Cultural Resources Department shall be notified.

A records search with the Northwestern Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated April 15, 2024, did not identify any previous cultural resource field surveys for the project area. The records search identified the Adams Canal as a potential historical resource that could be impacted by project activities. However, no development is proposed as part of the tentative parcel map. As discussed previously, if any future 2.5-acre homesites were to be developed in the future, Policy CO-2.22 of the County's 2030 Countywide General Plan prohibits development within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams to protect riparian areas. Thus, impacts from any future development as a result of the tentative parcel map are expected to be less than significant and will not adversely affect the Adams Canal.

Additionally, no human remains are known or predicted to exist in the project area. However, the potential exists during any future construction to uncover previously unidentified resources. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that when human remains are discovered, no further site disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendation concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and the remains are recognized to be those of a Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

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

DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**
- b) **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

No Impact. The project does not propose any development that would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, nor will it conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)				
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
	iv. Landslides?				
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

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.)**

No Impact. The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Special Study Zone. No landforms are known to be on the project site that would indicate the presence of active faults. Several earthquake fault zones are present within the County, and the project is within proximity of the Dunnigan Hills Fault project site which is not active. Surface ground rupture along faults is generally limited to a linear zone a few yards wide. Because the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Special Study Zone, and no development is proposed, ground rupture that would expose people or structures at the site to substantial adverse effects is unlikely to result in any significant impacts. The approval of a tentative parcel

map to create two parcels to a more practicable configuration that will follow the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations would not result in any development.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact. Ground shaking occurs as a result of energy released during faulting, which could potentially result in the damage or collapse of buildings and other structures, depending on the magnitude of the earthquake, the location of the epicenter, and the character and duration of the ground motion. Because known active seismic sources are located fairly distant from the project site and no development is proposed, strong seismic ground shaking would not be anticipated and is unlikely to result in any impact.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Soil liquefaction occurs when ground shaking from an earthquake causes a sediment layer saturated with groundwater to lose strength and take on the characteristics of a fluid. Factors determining the liquefaction potential are the level and duration of seismic ground motions, the type and consistency of soils, and the depth to groundwater. Liquefaction poses a hazard to engineered structures, as the loss of soil strength can result in bearing capacity insufficient to support foundation loads. The potential for seismic ground shaking on the site is low, and there is a normal to moderate potential for seismic-related ground failure at the site.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. A landslide involves the downslope transport of soil, rock, and sometimes vegetative material *en masse*, primarily under the influence of gravity. Landslides occur when shear stress (primarily weight) exceeds shear strength of the soil/rock. The shear strength of the soil/rock may be reduced during high rainfall periods when materials become saturated. Landslides also may be induced by ground shaking from earthquakes.

The project site is flat and has a low landslide susceptibility due to the slope class and material strength. Mass movements are unlikely to occur at the site, and the tentative parcel map to create two parcels to a more practicable configuration to follow the physical boundaries of the existing agricultural operations will not change the site's susceptibility to landslides, particularly large landslides with enough force and material to expose people or structures on the project site to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.

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

No Impact. The land surface at the project site is relatively flat and no development is proposed. The project is located in an area with little potential for erosion; substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is unlikely to occur as the project proposes no change to existing uses. The proposed tentative parcel map would not be expected to result in any new impacts related to erosion.

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, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less than Significant Impact. The project is not located in an area of unstable geologic materials, and the project is not expected to significantly affect the stability of the underlying materials, which could potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The project area consists of soils rated as 'normal' to 'high' expansiveness. The project proposes no new development, including residences, and would not subject people to landslides or liquefaction or other

cyclic strength degradation during a seismic event. Any future development on either resultant Parcel 1 or resultant Parcel 2, would be required to comply with all applicable Uniform Building Code requirements.

e) 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?

No Impact. The tentative parcel map request is to create two parcels from one approximately 126.402-acre parcel and does not include any development on either resultant parcel requiring septic connections. Any new septic systems to accommodate future uses must meet the County requirements and be approved by the Yolo County Environmental Health Division.

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

No Impact. The project does not propose any ground disturbing activities or development that would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
8.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.				
Would the project:					
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Introduction

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would not be generated as part of the proposed tentative parcel map. Although no development is proposed as part of this application, the proposed tentative parcel map would allow for the potential addition of single-family homes (one primary and one ancillary dwelling for the newly created parcels) in the Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone.

The issue of combating climate change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) has been the subject of state legislation (Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bills 375, 32, and 100 and Executive Orders S-3-05, B-30-15, and B-55-18). Yolo County has adopted General Plan policies and a Climate Action Plan (CAP) which identifies strategies to reduce GHG emissions and combat climate change. To demonstrate project-level compliance with CEQA relevant to GHG emissions and climate change impacts, applications for discretionary projects must demonstrate consistency with the General Plan and CAP. The adopted 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan contains the following relevant policies and actions:

Policy CO-8.2: Use the development review process to achieve measurable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Action CO-A117: Pursuant to the adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP), the County shall take all feasible measures to reduce its total carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) emissions within the unincorporated area (excluding those of other jurisdictions, e.g., UC-Davis, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, DQ University, school districts, special districts, reclamation districts, etc.), from 648,252 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e in 2008 to 613,651 MT of CO₂e by 2020. In addition, the County shall strive to further reduce total CO₂e emissions within the unincorporated area to 447,965 MT by 2030. These reductions shall be achieved through the measures and actions provided for in the adopted CAP, including those measures that address the need to adapt to climate change. (Implements **Policy CO-8.1**)

Action CO-A118: Pursuant to and based on the CAP, the following thresholds shall be used for determining the significance of GHG emissions and climate change impacts associated with future projects:

- 1) Impacts associated with GHG emissions from projects that are consistent with the General Plan and otherwise exempt from CEQA are determined to be less than significant and further CEQA analysis for this area of impact is not required.
- 2) Impacts associated with GHG emissions from projects that are consistent with the General Plan, fall within the assumptions of the General Plan EIR, consistent with the CAP, and not exempt from CEQA are determined to be less than significant or mitigated to a less than significant level, and further CEQA analysis for this area of impact is generally not required.

To be determined consistent with the CAP, a project must demonstrate that it is included in the growth projections upon which the CAP modeling is based, and that it incorporates applicable strategies and measures from the CAP as binding and enforceable components of the project.

3) Impacts associated with GHG emissions from projects that are not consistent with the General Plan, do not fall within the assumptions of the General Plan EIR, and/or are not consistent with the CAP, and are subject to CEQA review are rebuttably presumed to be significant and further CEQA analysis is required. The applicant must demonstrate to the County's satisfaction how the project will achieve its fair share of the established targets including:

- Use of alternative design components and/or operational protocols to achieve the required GHG reductions; and
- Use of real, additional, permanent, verifiable and enforceable offsets to achieve required GHG reductions. To the greatest feasible extent, offsets shall be: locally based, project relevant, and consistent with other long term goals of the County.

The project must also be able to demonstrate that it would not substantially interfere with implementation of CAP strategies, measures, or actions. (Implements **Policy CO-8.5**)

DISCUSSION

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

Less than Significant Impact. No development is proposed as part of the tentative parcel map. The proposed tentative parcel map would allow for the potential addition of single-family homes (one primary and one ancillary dwelling for the newly created parcels) under the current zoning. As proposed, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact on the environment.

- b) **Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.**

No Impact. The proposed tentative parcel map would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions, including the numerous policies of the adopted 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan and Climate Action Plan.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?; and**
- b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

No Impact. The tentative parcel map will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or 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?**

No Impact. The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, and will not emit hazardous materials. No development is proposed.

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

No Impact. The project is not located on a site that has been included on a list of hazardous materials sites. No development is proposed.

- 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?**

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a public airport. There would be no safety hazard related to public or private airports that would endanger 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?**

No Impact. The location of the tentative parcel map would not affect any emergency response plan.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located in a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone and, therefore, would not be at significant risk from wildland fires.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed other capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

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

No Impact. The tentative parcel map does not propose any new development that would discharge any pollutants into the water system, nor result in any violations of existing requirements. No water quality standards or waste discharge requirements will be violated.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is a request for a tentative parcel map that would allow the property owner of approximately 126.402 acres to create two parcels that would more appropriately align with the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations. Parcel 1 would consist of 68.329 acres and Parcel 2 would consist of 58.073 acres. The property is planted in almond orchards and irrigated via surface water pumped from the Adams Canal and an agricultural well located at the southwest corner of APN 025-360-073. Although no new development is proposed as part of the application, the proposed tentative parcel map would allow for the potential addition of single-family homes (one primary and one ancillary dwelling) for the newly created parcels in the Agricultural Intensive

(A-N) zone. Any new future well systems would be reviewed by and adhere to the requirements imposed by the Yolo County Environmental Health Division. As proposed, the project will not affect any nearby wells and would not deplete groundwater supplies or otherwise interfere with groundwater recharge.

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 of siltation on- or offsite;
- ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
- iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed other capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
- iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. The project is a tentative parcel map to create two parcels from approximately 126.402 acres to align the existing farming operations more appropriately with the physical boundaries of the farm fields. Although no new development is proposed as part of the application, the proposed tentative parcel map would allow for the potential addition of single-family homes (one primary and one ancillary dwelling) for the newly created parcels in the Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone. Any future improvements would be reviewed by and adhere to the requirements imposed by the Yolo County Department of Community Services. The project would not alter drainage patterns or change absorption rates, or the rate and amount of surface runoff. No additional impacts to water quality are anticipated. Any future development proposal would be required to address erosion, drainage and runoff impacts.

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

No Impact. The project area is not within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. There is no development proposed as part of the application and any future development would be required to comply with the Uniform Building Code. The project would result in no impact since there is no risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation.

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

No Impact. The proposed tentative parcel map does not propose any development that would obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
11.	LAND USE AND PLANNING.				
Would the project:					
a.	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in the unincorporated area of Yolo County, approximately 3.6 miles west/northwest of the City of Woodland, and is surrounded by other agricultural uses (orchards) to the north, east, and west, and open space to the south. The project would not 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?

No Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project site is designated as Agriculture (AG) in the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan and is zoned Agricultural Intensive (A-N). Agriculturally zoned parcels may be divided, at the County's discretion, for agricultural purposes provided that the minimum acreages are met and the proposal is consistent with policies in the Countywide General Plan that seek to preserve agricultural land by maintaining viable agricultural parcels that are large enough to sustain agricultural activities.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
12.	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- 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?; and**
- 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?**

No Impact. The project area is located within an identified area of significant aggregate deposits, as classified by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology. Most aggregate resources in Yolo County are located along Cache Creek in the Esparto-Woodland area. The project site is located approximately 0.25 miles north of Cache Creek within proximity to Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-2, which is an area underlain by mineral deposits where geologic data show that significant measured or indicated resources are present, and MRZ-3, an area containing known mineral deposits that may qualify as mineral resources. No development is proposed as part of the tentative parcel map that would affect any known mineral resources. According to the California Geologic Energy Management Division’s (CalGEM) online mapping application, Well Finder, and the Well Statewide Tracking and Reporting System (WellSTAR) database, no evidence exists suggesting otherwise.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
13.	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 in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Yolo County has not adopted a noise ordinance, which sets specific noise levels for different zoning districts or for different land uses in the unincorporated area. Instead, the County relies on that State of California Department of Health Services' recommended Community Noise Exposure standards, which are set forth in the State's General Plan Guidelines (2003). These standards are included in the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan and used to provide guidance for new development projects. The recommended standards provide acceptable ranges of decibel (dB) levels. The noise levels are in the context of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) measurements, which reflect an averaged noise level over a 24-hour or annual period. The Countywide General Plan identifies up to 70 dB CNEL as an acceptable exterior noise environment for commercial land uses and up to 75 dB CNEL for agricultural land uses.

DISCUSSION

- a) **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?;**
- b) **Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?; and**
- c) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not increase the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No development is proposed as part of the application and the site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor would the implementation of the proposed project expose individuals to excessive noise levels associated with any nearby airstrip's aircraft operations.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
14.	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- 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 units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. The project area is currently undeveloped, and the application does not include any plans for development, nor will it displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units. Although up to two homes are allowed by-right on the newly created parcels within the Agricultural Intensive (A-N) zone, any future homesite development, including ancillary housing units, as a result of the proposed tentative parcel map would not cause a significant increase in population. For reference, the average household size in Yolo County (2018-2022) is 2.57 persons according to statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the 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 following public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Fire protection?;**
- b) **Police Protection?;**
- c) **Schools?;**
- d) **Parks?; and**
- e) **Other public facilities?**

No Impact. The project does not propose any new development, including housing, and thus would not generate any additional demand for fire and police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities such as libraries, hospitals, satellite County offices, etc. If any future development is proposed, such as agricultural support structures or new residences, prior to issuance of building permits at the project site, all applicable impact fees will be collected.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
16.	RECREATION.				
Would the project:					
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- 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?; and**
- b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact. The project is a tentative parcel map to create two parcels from one approximately 126.402-acre parcel that more appropriately align with the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations along the Adams Canal which intersects the property from north to south. The project would not require the construction of additional recreational facilities nor substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The roadway network within unincorporated Yolo County consists primarily of two-lane roads that are designed to serve small farming communities and agricultural uses. Thus, policies in the 2030 Countywide General Plan encourage inter-and intra-regional traffic to use State and federal interstates and highways, since the primary role of county roads is to serve local and agricultural traffic. The project site is located 3.6 miles west/northwest of the City of Woodland, north of Cache Creek, bordered by County Road (CR) 19 to the north, CR 94B to the east, and CR 20 to the south..

CEQA Section 15064.3 contains guidelines directing that transportation impacts of projects are, in general, best measured by evaluating the project's vehicle miles traveled. Methodologies for evaluating such impacts are already in use for most land use projects, as well as many transit and active transportation projects. Methods for evaluating vehicle miles traveled for roadway capacity projects continue to evolve, however, and so these Guidelines recognize a lead agency's discretion to analyze such projects, provided such analysis is consistent with CEQA and applicable planning requirements.

DISCUSSION

- a) **Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?; and**
b) **Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

No Impact. The proposed tentative parcel map would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, as no new development is proposed as part of the project. Additionally, the proposed project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.3(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts). The property is currently served by County Road (CR) 19 to the north, CR 94B to the east, and CR 20 to the south. No change will occur to vehicle miles traveled within the project area attributable to the proposed tentative parcel map.

- c) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact. No changes to the road system are proposed. There will be no increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, as the proposed tentative parcel map will not affect the roadways.

- d) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

No Impact. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The site will remain accessible from County Road (CR) 19 to the north and CR 94B to the east. The site does not propose any new development or change in uses.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.				

DISCUSSION

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

Less than Significant Impact. No development is proposed as part of the tentative parcel map. An invitation for tribal consultation was distributed to the local tribes on April 29, 2024, which included Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, Cortina Rancheria Band of Wintun Indians of California, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria, Wilton Rancheria, Lone Band of Miwok Indians, and Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. No responses were received within 30 days of the invitation, and no responses were received prior to the public release of this environmental analysis in June 2024.

The project site has been in, and will remain in, agricultural cultivation. The proposed tentative parcel map will not cause substantial adverse changes to the significance of tribal cultural resources, as the newly created parcel will remain under agricultural cultivation. There is no development associated with the tentative parcel map, so impacts are considered less than significant.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- 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 that would 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?**

No Impact. The project is not served by water, wastewater, or natural gas, and proposes no development. The project site is located approximately 3.6 miles west/northwest of the City of Woodland and has not been identified as an area for growth with the potential to connect to such services. The parcel currently has an adequate water supply (surface water and groundwater) to continue the existing agricultural practices. An approved tentative parcel map would have the potential to allow for the addition of homes (one primary and one ancillary dwelling) on the newly created parcels, as well as other compatible uses, which could result in future wells and onsite wastewater treatment systems. However, any decrease in groundwater supply or recharge from residential development would be less than significant.

New onsite septic and well systems would be required to serve any future residential development at the project site, and would be reviewed by and meet all the requirements of the Yolo County Environmental Health Division. Any solid waste resulting from future development as a result of the tentative parcel map will not significantly impact disposal capacity at the County landfill.

20. WILDFIRE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

INTRODUCTION

Areas where the state has financial responsibility for wildland fire protection are known as state responsibility areas (SRA). The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is responsible for fire prevention and suppression in SRA. Areas where local governments have financial responsibility for wildland fire protection are known as local responsibility areas (LRA).

The project site is not located in an SRA or a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ). The closest VHFHSZ is approximately 14± miles west near the County line in the foothills. The County and municipalities fight a large number of vegetation fires primarily along highways and roadways. Local fire stations are responsible for their districts, and CAL FIRE has equipment and staff available in Yolo County during the fire season.

DISCUSSION

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

No Impact. Yolo County Office of Emergency Services (OES) is the emergency management agency for Yolo County. OES coordinates the County government's response to disaster or other large-scale emergencies. The project site is located 3.6 miles west of the City of Woodland. The proposed project would not affect any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is not located in an SRA or a VHFHSZ.

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?

No Impact. The project site is located in a non-wildland/non-urban area, which is not considered to be located in an SRA or a VHFHSZ. The proposed site is largely level and irrigated and planted in almond

orchards. The division of land will not impact or exacerbate wildfire risk as the existing topography and grade, as well as agricultural irrigation, will remain intact.

- 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?**

No Impact. The proposed project will not require the installation or construction of any new facilities, as no development is proposed. Therefore, the project will not impact or exacerbate wildfire risks and all parcels will remain committed to agriculture and compatible uses. Additionally, the project site is not located in an SRA or a VHFHSZ.

- 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?**

No Impact. The proposed site is relatively flat and is not within proximity to slopes that could induce landslides or runoff as a result of fires. The division of land would not result in any new risk of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. No development is proposed and would, therefore, result in no impact.

21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?**

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study and the project’s required conditions of approval, the project would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project is a tentative parcel map to create two parcels from one approximately 126.402-acre parcel that more appropriately aligns with the boundaries of the existing farming operations along the Adams Canal that intersects the property from north to south. There is no development associated with the project approval. Overall approval of the tentative parcel map will result in no change to the existing use of the land. As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, the proposed project could potentially impact California Tiger Salamander upland habitat, Swainson’s hawk natural foraging and habitat, Western Burrowing Owl primary habitat, Western Pond Turtle nesting and overwintering habitat, White Tailed Kite nesting habitat and primary foraging, Tri-Colored Blackbird foraging habitat, and aquatic habitat for Western Pond Turtle if any future development were to occur as a result of an approved tentative parcel map. However, the project’s conditions of approval would reduce impacts to biological resources to less than significant levels through demonstrating compliance with the Yolo HCP/NCCP so that the habitat and/or range of any special status plants or animals are not endangered. No important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory in California were identified. Impacts to biological resources will be less than significant.

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.)**

No Impact. Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study, the project would have no significant cumulative impacts. The creation of two parcels could result in residential development. Homesite development on agricultural parcels were anticipated in the 2009 update to the 2030 Countywide General Plan.

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

No Impact. Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study, there would be no impacts to human beings resulting from the proposed project. The project proposes the division of agricultural land to more appropriately align the parcels with the physical boundaries of the existing farming operations along the Adams Canal, which intersects the property from north to south. No development is associated with the project. Any future development as a result of the project would be required to comply with all applicable Uniform Building Code requirements.

REFERENCES

- Project description and application materials provided by Applicant
- Yolo County, 2009. *Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan*, adopted November 2009 and *Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan Final EIR*, April 2009
- Yolo County Zoning Ordinance, *Title 8, Chapter 2 of the County Code*, 2014, as amended
- County of Yolo. 2011. *Climate Action Plan*. March 15, 2011.
- US Census Bureau. *Data Tools*. <https://www.census.gov/data.html>
- Yolo Habitat Conservancy Geomapper
- USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey
- US Fish and Wildlife Service Wetland Mapper: <https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory/wetlands-mapper>
- California Geological Survey, 2021. *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation, California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application*. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>
- Department of Conservation, 2019. *Seismic Hazards Mapping Act*. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/hazards/seismic-hazards-mapping-act>
- California Geologic Energy Management (CalGEM) Division, *Well Finder and Well Statewide Tracking and Reporting System (WellSTAR)* database: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/Pages/Wellfinder.aspx>
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. “DTSC’s Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List).” <https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/>