

# NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

## MADERA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the County of Madera, State of California, will hold a PUBLIC HEARING to consider the following:

The application of a tentative subdivision map (**Liberty Village Subdivision, S #2007-008**) for **Russ Shaw**. This proposal is a division of Tract 247, which would divide 114.77 acres into 9 commercial/industrial lots and 3 outlots. The development proposes to utilize public water and sewer systems. The property is located on the north side of Highway 49, approximately 260 feet west of its intersection with Oak Park Way, Oakhurst. APN's: 064-140-082, 064-140-084, and 064-140-085. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND #2007-72) has been prepared for the project in compliance with provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is available together with the Initial Study for public review at the Madera County Planning Department. Written comments concerning this Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND #2007-72) may be submitted to the Madera County Planning Department until January 3, 2008 which will be the end of a 21 day review period. For more information regarding this project, please contact Jamie Bax at (559) 675-7821.

This PUBLIC HEARING will be held at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission on **Tuesday, January 8, 2008, at 6:00 p.m.** at the **Coarsegold Community Center**, 35610 Highway 41, Coarsegold, California. Also, a public hearing will be held at the regular meeting of the Oakhurst Community Advisory Council on Thursday, January 3, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. in the Oakhurst Community Center, 39800 Road 425B, Oakhurst, California. The staff report for this item will be viewable on-line seven days prior to the hearing date on the Madera County website:

[http://www.madera-county.com/rma/planning\\_commission/planning\\_commission\\_agendas.html](http://www.madera-county.com/rma/planning_commission/planning_commission_agendas.html)

---

RAYBURN BEACH, Planning Director  
Madera County, California

Publication Date: December 12, 2007

\*\*\*\*\*  
This NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING concerns property in the area of which you are a neighboring property owner or owner. If you have any comments concerning this PUBLIC HEARING, please write to the Planning Department, 2037 W. Cleveland Avenue, Madera, California 93637-3593, or call (559) 675-7821, or attend the meeting at the time and date stated on the notice. Any court challenge of the proposed action may be limited to those issues raised in written or oral testimony presented at the public hearing described in this notice.

PLEASE TURN THIS PAGE OVER FOR AN AREA MAP WHICH IDENTIFIES THE LOCATION OF THE REQUEST.

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND

RE: S #2007-008 – Liberty Village

## LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

The project site is located on the north side of Highway 49, approximately 260 feet west of its intersection with Oak Park Way, Oakhurst.

West Oaks Sierra, L.P. is proposing to subdivide 57.68 acres into 7 lots and 3 outlots with an average density of 9.61 acres per lot. The project is proposing to utilize public water and sewer systems.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

No adverse environmental impact is anticipated from this project. The following mitigation measures are included to avoid any potential impacts.

## BASIS FOR NEGATIVE DECLARATION:

1. Any lighting related to the property shall be hooded and directed away from neighboring residences and riparian corridors.
2. In the event that unanticipated buried archaeological deposits are encountered during project-related activities, work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery must cease until the finds can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. Should human remains be encountered within the project area, the County Coroner must be contacted immediately; if the remains are determined to be Native American, then the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted as well.
3. Applicant will pay fair share of a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 49 and Westlake Drive as well as the 4 lane build out on State Route 49.
4. Applicant to initiate a recycling program on site to remove recyclable materials from the solid waste stream leading to the County landfill at Fairmead.
5. Fire apparatus access roads required for this project per CFC 901 and 902.
6. Prior to building permits, approved fire hydrants shall be installed.
7. The development shall have two points of ingress and egress.
8. Any gated access shall be approved by the fire department and emergency access arrangements made prior to occupancy.
9. Construction activities on or related to the property development shall occur only during the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm so as not to produce noise issues at early morning and late evening hours.
10. Easements or setbacks of at least 25 feet from the high water mark of the intermittent drainage shall be imposed, permanently restricting development in that easement

setback.

11. The elderberry bushes shall be protected by setbacks or easements as specified by the US Fish and Wildlife Service mitigation guidelines.
12. A Fuel Modification/Vegetation Management Plan prepared by an experienced Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Professional or qualified forester and approved by the Fire Marshal shall be required for all new subdivision developments within State Responsible Areas designated as Wildland Urban Interface. The Fire Protection Plan shall include mitigation measures resulting from the location, topography, geology, flammable vegetation, and climate of the proposed site. The Fire Protection Plan shall address water supply, access, building ignition and resistance fire protection systems and equipment, defensible space and vegetation management. The Plan shall be submitted to the County Fire Marshal for approval prior to acceptance of the Final Map.
13. Removal of valley and blue oaks from the specified property is strongly discouraged. Any oaks that must be removed should be replaced at the ratios specified by the California Department of Fish and Game according to the recently implemented oak conservation legislation (Section 21083.4 of the Public Resource Code).
14. All activities (excavation, paving, watering, etc.) should be strictly limited under the "driplines" of the remaining oaks according to the established CEQA and California Department of Fish and Game guidelines.
15. The use of impenetrable fencing on the proposed project parcels should be strongly discouraged to not unduly restrict wildlife movement across the area.
16. Any businesses occupying the development that handle any form of hazardous materials in the course of operations shall submit a Hazardous Materials Management Plan and associated documentation with the County's Environmental Health Department prior to commencing operations.
17. This subdivision shall connect to the Hillview Water System and Sewer District 22B.
18. Applicant shall implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) for the project site.
19. Applicant shall submit to the Engineering Department a drainage study and plan, prepared and signed by a registered Civil Engineer, which considers runoff from residential and commercial parcels. Storm drainage collection and conveyance and disposal facilities shall be developed using industry-accepted methods of engineering design.
20. Applicant shall provide for efficient cost effective and environmentally sound storm drainage facilities.
21. Applicant/developer shall pay fair share towards infrastructure improvements, including but not limited to sewer and water facility improvements.

---

Madera County Environmental Committee

A copy of the negative declaration and all supporting documentation is available for review at the Madera County Planning Department, 2037 West Cleveland Avenue, Madera, California.

DATED:

FILED:

PROJECT APPROVED:

## Environmental Checklist Form

**Title of Proposal:** S #2007-008 – Liberty Village

**Date Checklist Submitted:** December 4, 2007

**Agency Requiring Checklist:** Madera County

**Agency Contact:** Jamie Bax, Planner I

**Phone:** (559) 675-7821

---

**Description of Project:**

West Oaks Sierra, L.P. is proposing to subdivide 57.68 acres into 7 lots and 3 outlots with an average density of 9.61 acres per lot. The project is proposing to utilize public water and sewer systems.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have significant effects on the environment. In the case of the proposed project, the Madera County Planning Department, acting as lead agency, will use the initial study to determine whether the project has a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with CEQA, Guidelines (Section 15064[a]), an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if there is substantial evidence (such as results of the Initial Study) that a project may have significant effect on the environment. This is true regardless of whether the overall effect of the project would be adverse or beneficial. A negative declaration (ND) or mitigated negative declaration (MND) may be prepared if the lead agency determines that the project would have no potentially significant impacts or that revisions to the project, or measures agreed to by the applicant, mitigate the potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines Section 15062[f]).

The initial study considers and evaluates all aspects of the project which are necessary to support the proposal. The complete project description includes the site plan, operational statement, and other supporting materials which are available in the project file at the office of the Madera County Planning Department.

**Project Location:**

The project site is located on the north side of Highway 49, approximately 260 feet west of its intersection with Oak Park Way, Oakhurst.

**Applicant Name and Address:** West Oaks Sierra, L.P.  
Russell Shaw  
P.O. Box 1569  
Oakhurst, CA 93644

**General Plan Designation:** MDR (Medium Density Residential)  
HDR (High Density Residential)  
LI (Light Industrial)

**Zoning Designation:** RUS (Residential Urban Single Family)  
OS (Open Space)  
IA (Institutional Area)  
IL (Industrial Light)

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Commercial, Residential, Open Space

**Other Public Agencies whose approval is required:** None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

I. AESTHETICS -- 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 within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Discussion:**

Visual resources are classified into two categories: scenic views and scenic resources. Scenic views are elements of the broader viewshed such as mountain ranges, valleys, and ridgelines. They are usually middle ground or background elements of a viewshed that can be seen from a range of viewpoints, often along a roadway or other corridor. Scenic resources are described in the CEQA Environmental Checklist as specific features of a viewing area (or viewshed) such as trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings. They are specific features that act as the focal point of a viewshed and are usually foreground elements.

Aesthetic effects are somewhat subjective and are influenced by such factors as the location of the viewer, duration of exposure, and the status of the viewer in relation to the project. "Status of the viewer" is a reference to the fact that a resident of a property that has a direct view of the project site from an adjacent property is likely to feel differently about the new development than a non-resident who catches a brief glimpse of the project site from the roadway. Light and glare effects also are somewhat subjective; they are more likely to disturb permanent residents than transient highway travelers.

Light and glare effects must be evaluated from two viewpoints: (1) the viewpoint from the project site toward surrounding uses and (2) the viewpoint from surrounding uses toward the project site. The degree of impact is proportional to the perceived negative effect on surrounding land uses. If there is a continuous light or glare that is visible from nearby residences, and if it creates a nuisance to residents, the impact is potentially significant. The sensitivity of viewers to changes in the viewshed can be measured by the extent and nature of general plan provisions that address visual resources in relation to development proposals.

The project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. Viewers are limited to motorists on perimeter roadways and residents of surrounding facilities and operations.

While there are no officially recognized scenic vistas or scenic highways within the Oakhurst area, the Oakhurst Area Plan identifies Road 222 and Highway 41 as areas of particular importance when considering scenic views and aesthetic impacts.

The proposed project will not create a substantial new amount of light as an individual project, but will contribute to the amount of light in the area as a whole. With mitigation measures, the impact of this new light source will not be significant. Lights used during construction will also be mitigated as to not cause a significant impact to surrounding properties and habitats.

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

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

A number of resulting impacts of agricultural land use incompatibilities include:

- Theft of high-value farm equipment and supplies;
- Vandalism to farmland, including trespass, crop pilferage, and damage to irrigation equipment;
- Personal injury liability, occurring from trespass accidents and consuming of crop products recently sprayed with pesticides;
- Traffic congestion and hazards due to conflicts between vehicular traffic and low-speed farm equipment;
- Airborne hazards to adjacent developments from agricultural practices that produce dust, smoke and pesticide drift;
- Damage to crops from vehicular emissions;
- Spread of crop to ornamental landscaping in adjacent developments;
- Noise effects from agricultural operations from spraying, cultivating, and harvesting equipment, especially at night and early morning; and
- Effects on water quality for adjacent developments due to leached chemical and biological agents (pesticides, coli forms, fertilizers) into groundwater supplies.

As currently zoned, the subject properties are not in agricultural use. None of the properties are in the Williamson Act.

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

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

**Discussion:**

Impacts in air quality are addressed by the San Joaquin Unified Air Pollution Control District.

The entire San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is designated non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ ). This project could contribute to the overall decline in air quality due to increased operational emissions; however, by itself, would not generate significant air emissions. However, the increase in emissions from the project, and others like it, cumulatively reduce the air quality in the San Joaquin Valley.

Particulate matter can be divided up into two size categories,  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ .  $PM_{10}$  refers to particulate matter that is 10 microns or less (1 micron is one-millionth of a meter) in diameter and is sometimes referred to as inhalable or coarse-particulate matter.  $PM_{2.5}$  refers to particulate matter that is 2.5 microns or less in diameter and is referred to as fine-particulate matter. The size of the particulate matter is directly linked to their potential for causing health problems. Small particles pose the greatest health problems, because they can get deep in the lungs, and some may even get into the bloodstream. Both  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  are small enough to bypass the body's defense mechanisms and become lodged in the lungs. In fact,  $PM_{2.5}$  is small enough to reach the alveoli, the portion of the lung where the oxygen/carbon dioxide exchange occurs. Exposure to such particulates can affect both the lungs and the heart. Large particulates are less of a concern, although they can irritate one's eyes, nose and throat.

In 2005, paved and unpaved road dust particulate matter (within the range of  $PM_{10}$ ) contributed to approximately 33% if the total  $PM_{10}$  for the entire Madera County region.

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) has established a three-tiered approach to determining significance related to a project's quantified ozone precursor emissions. Each tier or level requires a different degree of complexity of emissions calculation and modeling to determine air quality significance. The SJVUAPCD pre-calculated the emissions on a large number and types of projects to identify the level at which they have no possibility of exceeding emissions thresholds. The District's Guide for

Assessing Air Quality Impacts provides this information in terms of vehicle trips required to exceed the threshold for five general land use categories (residential housing, commercial, office, institutional and industrial) and the sizes of various specific development types meeting these criteria. Projects falling under these size thresholds qualify for what the SJVUAPCD refers to as the Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL). No quantification of ozone precursor emissions is needed for projects less than or equal to the sizes listed; however, other factors, such as toxic air contaminants, hazardous materials, asbestos, and odors still need to be analyzed. Agricultural projects are exempt from SJVUAPCD regulations, and agriculture is not one of the five general land use categories listed.

Sensitive receptors are facilities that “house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors.” (GAMAQI 2002).

Construction activities associated with the project will temporarily contribute dust to an air mass in the San Joaquin Valley that currently exceeds the state and federal health standards for PM-10. Initially, during the construction phase of the project, additional traffic beyond that occurring at the project site would be generated which would add to an increase in vehicle emissions in the area. Compliance with existing regulations (SJVUAPCD Regulation VIII- Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions) would constitute reasonable efforts and reduce the impact of the project to less than significant levels with regards to air quality. The proposal would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Emissions of CO (Carbon Monoxide) are the primarily mobile-source criteria pollutant of local concern. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed and delay. Carbon monoxide transport is extremely limited; it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Under certain meteorological conditions, however, CO concentrations close to congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting local sensitive receptors (residents, school children, hospital patients, the elderly, etc.). As a result, the SJVAPCP recommends analysis of CO emissions of at a local rather than regional level. Local CO concentrations at intersections projected to operate at level of service (LOS) D or better do not typically exceed national or state ambient air quality standards. In addition, non-signalized intersections located within areas having relatively low background concentrations do not typically have sufficient traffic volumes to warrant analysis of local CO concentrations.

### Global Climate Change

Climate change is a shift in the “average weather” that a given region experiences. This is measured by changes in temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Global climate is the change in the climate of the earth as a whole. It can occur naturally, as in the case of an ice age, or occur as a result of anthropogenic activities. The extent to which anthropogenic activities influence climate change has been the subject of extensive scientific inquiry in the past several decades. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), recognized as the leading research body on the subject, issued its Fourth Assessment Report in February 2007, which asserted that there is “very high confidence” (by IPCC definition a 9 in 10 chance of being correct) that human activities have resulted in a net warming of the planet since 1750.

The project is within the Oakhurst Area Plan. While the planning area for the Oakhurst Area Plan does not encounter or generate the air quality impacts to the magnitude that the San Joaquin Valley does, development within the area plan does contribute to the overall decline in air quality.

Although some air quality problems (i.e. ozone pollution and particulate matter) are predominately in the Valley, they impact the foothill and mountain planning areas. Ozone is formed by photochemical reaction to organic exhaust emissions; it is a spring and summer pollution problem. The particulate matter usually caused by wind, farming operations and road dust; it is prevalent in the dry summer and fall.

Two air quality issues are unique to mountain and foothill communities. The first is related to the long-distance commutes of the area residents to jobs in the Valley or Fresno area. This contributes to the ozone and PM-10 problems of the entire basin. The second issue is the residential wood burning; mountain residents often use wood stoves and heaters as their primary heating sources. On nights and mornings when strong inversion occurs, the small mountain valley can fill with smoke from wood burning. Wood smoke may also cause a localized neighborhood problem if the wood burning device is operated incorrectly or wood with excessive moisture content is burned.

IV. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

This project will not result in the loss of any known mineral resources. No such resources are known to exist in significant quantities on the project site.

V. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Discussion:

The Oakhurst area is part of the interior oak, pine and mixed chaparral biotic habitat characteristic of the Sierra Nevada foothills, with important corridors of riparian habitat along creeks and rivers. These foothill habitats have been modified by grazing, and rural residential development. However, they remain viable for native wildlife for breeding and foraging, especially as wintering refuge for deer and various predators. The riparian corridors are particularly important movement corridors for migratory species.

Valley oaks and blue oak woodland areas are encompassed by blue oak-digger pine mix. This pine mix has a shrub understory of manzanita, chaparral and patchy grassland. Much of the area slopes are covered with mixed chaparral.

Of these habitats, riparian corridors and a few localized scattered meadow wetlands and oak woodlands are considered sensitive. These resources are adequately protected by state and federal laws.

According to the California Department of Fish and Game, there is the potential of special, threatened and endangered species in the area. In addition, potential impacts to intermittent drainages on the site may include increased sediment input from structure and road runoff, toxic runoff, toxic runoff from household chemicals and septic systems and impairment of wildlife movement along stream corridors. There are also plant species identified as being within the region of the project site. These species have the potential of contributing to the riparian and migratory habitats of threatened, endangered or species of special concern.

The State has identified the following species as being in the project vicinity and potentially being impacted and is asking for the completion of a biological study for the area prior to approval. The species of concern are:

- *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (valley elderberry longhorn beetle). Federal status: **threatened**
- *Calyptridium pulchellum* (Mariposa pussypaws). Federal status: **threatened**. California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 1B listed.
- *Clemmys marmorata* (western pond turtle) California status: **Species of Special Concern**
- *Rana boylei* (foothill yellow legged frog) California status: **Species of Special Concern**
- *Collomia rawsoniana* (flaming trumpet): California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 1B listed.
- *Mimulus gracilipes* (slender-stalked monkeyflower): California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 1B listed.

A biological study was also conducted on the site by John C. Stebbins that has identified other potential species and plant life that would have impacts if the site is to be developed.

Plant life include:

- *Calycadenia hooveria* (Hoover's calycadenia)
- *Linathus serrulatus* (Madera Linanthus)
- *Quercus lobata* (Valley Oak)

Species include:

- *Lytta moesta* (Moesta blister beetle); Candidate for listing
- *Ambystoma tigrinum californiense* (California Tiger Salamander); USFWS Status: **threatened**
- *Rana aurora draytonii* (California Red Legged frog); USFWS Status: **threatened**
- *Scaphiopus hamondii* (Western spadefoot toad)

Sensitive birds potentially being in the area:

- *Accipiter cooperii* (Cooper's hawk); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- *Accipiter striatus* (Sharp-shinned hawk); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- *Aquila chrysaetos* (Golden eagle); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special**

**Concern**

- Buteo swainsoni (Swainson’s hawk); Department of Fish and Game **Threatened**
- Circus cyaneus (Northern harrier); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- Dendroica petechia brewsteri (Yellow warbler, nesting); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- Empidonax traillii (Willow flycatcher); Department of Fish and Game **Endangered**
- Falco mexicarrus (Prairie falcon); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- Haliaeetus leucocephalus (Bald eagle); Department of Fish and Game **Endangered**
- Pandion haliaetus (Osprey); Department of Fish and Game **Species of Special Concern**
- Vireo belli pusillis (Least Bell’s vireo); Department of Fish and Game **Endangered**

The Department of Fish and Game also has regulatory authority with regard to activities occurring in streams and/or lakes that could adversely affect any fish or wildlife resource. A USGS topographical map shows an on-site pond and drainage that flows through the Project area. For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, the Department of Fish and Game may require a Stream Alteration Agreement (SAA), pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. These activities may include but are not limited to: rerouting of streams, construction of bridges over streams, installation of culverts within streams, and trimming or removal of any vegetation associated with streams.

Intermittent drainages are present on the properties. The most prominent is a seasonal drainage that flows in a southerly direction from a pond to the north that is not in the described property location. This drainage has been flowing continuously during the spring of 2006 but dries up during the summer months according to the property owner. This drainage supports a few hydrophytic plant species such as willows (Salix), and rushes (Juncus), as well as many nonnative wetland plant species (Rumex, Urtica, Polypogon).

The project area is best described as gray pine and blue oak woodland habitat with significant clearings and openings especially on the more level or disturbed sites. The dominant tree and shrub species present include blue oak (Quercus douglasii), gray pine (Pinus sabiniana), interior live oak (Quercus wislizenii), valley oak (Quercus lobata), buckeye (Aesculus californica), manzanita (Arctostaphylos viscida), buckbrush (Ceanothus cuneatus), and coffeeberry (Rhamnus californica). The understory is characterized by herbs and grasses typical to the foothill plant community in the region.

VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The south-central Sierra Nevada foothills in the Oakhurst/Coarsegold vicinity are the traditional homelands of the Chukchansi, northernmost of the Foothill Yokuts. Chukchansi lands are bordered on the north by the

Southern Sierra Miwok and to the east by the North Fork Mono.

A cultural survey was conducted on the property by Sierra Valley Cultural Planning. This organization conducted a records search at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System to identify areas previously surveyed and identify known cultural resources present within or in close proximity to the project area. One previous survey was conducted within the project area, and 11 surveys have been conducted within ½ mile of the project area. There are no recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area; however eight archaeological sites have been identified within ½ mile radius of the project area. All of the previously recorded resources are prehistoric archaeological sites, most of which include bedrock mortar features, midden soils, and flake stone debris and tool scatters.

The Native American Heritage Commission was contacted in order to determine whether Native American sacred sites have been identified either within or in close proximity to the project area. No such sites were identified. In 2000, a cultural resources study was conducted in support of a Hillview Water Company project, a portion of which is in close proximity to the present project area. During this effort, consultation with representatives of Native American groups including the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians and the North Fork Mono. While it was recognized that archaeological sensitivity is high in the area, particularly along the Fresno River, no traditional cultural properties or other areas of concern were identified as a result of Native American consultation.

There is no indication that an archaeological dig was performed in the project area. It would appear that only a visual inspection for obvious indications of Native American inhabitation and/or use was conducted along with the records search.

No sites of archaeological or historical significance are known to exist on or in the vicinity of the subject property. Though the majority of the project site may have been disturbed by previous activities, grading and excavating of the areas in question could result in disturbance of unknown cultural resources. Policy 4.D.3 of the Madera County General Plan provides for that “[T]he County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological and cultural sites and their contributing environment.” Impacts on previously undiscovered cultural resources are potentially significant, but can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant through incorporation of the mitigation measure(s) stipulated in the Negative Declaration.

Most of the archaeological survey work in the County has taken place in the foothills and mountains. This does not mean, however, that no sites exist in the western part of the County, but rather that this area has not been as thoroughly studied. There are slightly more than 2,000 recorded archaeological sites in the County, most of which are located in the foothills and mountains. Recorded prehistoric artifacts include village sites, camp sites, bedrock milling stations, pictographs, petroglyphs, rock rings, sacred sites, and resource gathering areas. Madera County also contains a significant number of potentially historic sites, including homesteads and ranches, mining and logging sites and associated features (such as small camps, railroad beds, logging chutes, and trash dumps).

No known unique geological features in the vicinity of the project site exist. There are no known fossil bearing sediments on the project site. No impact has been identified.

VII . LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

**Discussion:**

The project would not divide any existing communities, or conflict with any adopted plans, policies, or regulations designed to avoid environmental impacts.

The proposal has been distributed to all agencies which are believed to have an interest in the project. These agencies have provided comments, where appropriate. No significant conflicts have been noted. The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan

VIII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Madera County is divided into two major physiographic and geologic provinces: the Sierra Nevada Range and

the Central Valley. The Sierra Nevada physiographic province in the northeastern portion of the county is underlain by metamorphic and igneous rock. It consists mainly of homogenous types of granitic rocks, with several islands of older metamorphic rock. The central and western parts of the county are part of the Central Valley province, underlain by marine and non-marine sedimentary rocks.

The foothill area of the county is essentially a transition zone, containing old alluvial soils that have been dissected by the west-flowing rivers and streams which carry runoff from the Sierra Nevadas.

Seismicity varies greatly between the two major geologic provinces represented in Madera County. The Central valley is an area of relatively low tectonic activity bordered by mountain ranges on either side. The Sierra Nevadas, partly within Madera County, are the result of movement of tectonic plates which resulted in the creation of the mountain range. The Coast Ranges on the west side of the Central Valley are also a result of these forces, and continued movement of the Pacific and North American tectonic plates continues to elevate the ranges. Most of the seismic hazards in Madera County result from movement along faults associated with the creation of these ranges.

There are no active or potentially active faults of major historic significance within Madera County. The County does not lie within any Alquist Priolo Special Studies Zone for surface faulting or fault creep.

However, there are two significant faults within the larger region that have been and will continue to be, the principle sources of potential seismic activity within Madera County.

San Andreas Fault : The San Andreas Fault lies approximately 45 miles west of the county line. The fault has a long history of activity and is thus a concern in determining activity in the area.

Owens Valley Fault Group: The Owens Valley Fault Group is a complex system containing both active and potentially active faults on the eastern base of the Sierra Nevada Range. This group is located approximately 80 miles east of the County line in Inyo County. This system has historically been the source of seismic activity within the County.

The *Draft Environmental Impact Report* for the state prison project near Fairmead identified faults within a 100 mile radius of the project site. Since Fairmead is centrally located along Highway 99 within the county, this information provides a good indicator of the potential seismic activity which might be felt within the County. Fifteen active faults (including the San Andreas and Owens Valley Fault Group) were identified in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation*. Four of the faults lie along the eastern portion of the Sierra Nevada Range, approximately 75 miles to the northeast of Fairmead. These are the Parker Lake, Hartley Springs, Hilton Creek and Mono Valley Faults. The Remaining faults are in the western portion of the San Joaquin Valley, as well as within the Coast Range, approximately 47 miles west of Fairmead. Most of the remaining 11 faults are associated with the San Andreas, Calaveras, Hayward and Rinconada Fault Systems which collectively form the tectonic plate boundary of the Central Valley.

In addition, the Clovis Fault, although not having any historic evidence of activity, is considered to be active within quaternary time (within the past two million years), is considered potentially active. This fault line lies approximately six miles south of the Madera County line in Fresno County. Activity along this fault could potentially generate more seismic activity in Madera County than the San Andreas or Owens Valley fault systems. However, because of the lack of historic activity along the Clovis Fault, there is inadequate evidence for assessing maximum earthquake impacts.

Seismic ground shaking, however, is the primary seismic hazard in Madera County because of the County's seismic setting and its record of historical activity (General Plan Background Element and Program EIR). The project represents no specific threat or hazard from seismic ground shaking, and all new construction will comply with current local and state building codes. Other geologic hazards, such as landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and liquefaction have not been known to occur within Madera County.

According to the Madera County General Plan Background Report, groundshaking is the primary seismic hazard in Madera County. The valley portion of Madera County is located on alluvium deposits, which tend to experience greater groundshaking intensities than areas located on hard rock. Therefore, structures located in the valley will tend to suffer greater damage from groundshaking than those located in the foothill and mountain areas.

Liquefaction is a process whereby soil is temporarily transformed to a fluid form during intense and prolonged

ground shaking. According to the Madera County General Plan Background Report, although there are areas of Madera County where the water table is at 30 feet or less below the surface, soil types in the area are not conducive to liquefaction because they are either too coarse in texture or too high in clay content; the soil types mitigate against the potential for liquefaction.

When ground disturbance occurs on the project site there is the possibility for erosion of soil on and around building sites. With the creation of new roads and other construction activities, storm water may be directed into other areas and could potentially increase erosion. Hazardous materials such as oil and grease may enter into the soil as a result of using heavy machinery and creating new runoff. With mitigation measures from the Madera County Engineering Department of submitting a detailed Drainage Study Plan, damage to the soil would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project would not result in interference with any emergency response plan. No component of the project site would constitute a threat or hazard to any existing or planned airport or airstrip. The project is located outside of the County’s Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.

Some parcels in the project area are zoned Light Industrial and Institution Area. These designations allow for uses that have the potential of using, manufacturing, distributing or otherwise handling hazardous material. Any such use has the potential for spills, releases or other such disturbance that could harm the environment or injure people.

While not in dense wildlands, the project area is surrounded by vegetation. With mitigation measures from the Madera County Fire Department, danger from wildland fires would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss,				

injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**Discussion:**

The project site is located within Flood Zone “X”, which is determined to be located outside of the 500-year flood plain.

The groundwater supply within the area is generally limited and unpredictable as a result of the geologic formations which characterize the mountain and foothill regions of Madera County. These areas are generally underlain by impervious bedrock and “groundwater” is available only through water bearing fractures within these formations. The Hillview Water company is the largest provider of community water service with the area with at least 1,350 connections. Smaller community systems include a variety of mutual water companies and County water maintenance districts.

The county operates the largest sewer collection, treatment and disposal facility in the planning area, with Maintenance District 22a providing collection lines, lift pumps, sewage treatment plant, effluent storage and spray irrigation disposal facilities. The maintenance district serves central Oakhurst including the Yosemite High School campus. Outside the boundaries of the district, including several commercial establishments and residential developments at the north end of Oakhurst, properties are dependant on private septic systems, none of which are subject to regular monitoring or maintenance. Lack of adequate sewer and septic facilities has caused apparent surface and groundwater pollution and contamination in developed portions of the Oakhurst Planning Area. Inadequate and failing septic facilities are known to generate public health risks, as well as environmental degradation problems.

The area depends on wells for its water. No “water table” exists; the water is obtained from fractures in the underlying rock which are frequently unconnected. The recharge is unknown and there is evidence from abandoned wells in the region that some may never recharge. Due to these concerns regarding the uncertainty of groundwater, the Oakhurst Area Plan for the area outlines the need to both understand groundwater availability for the area, and to examine opportunities to develop a source of surface water for the community.

Intermittent drainages are present on the properties. The most prominent is a seasonal drainage that flows in a southerly direction from a pond to the north that is not in the described property location. This drainage has been flowing continuously during the spring of 2006 but dries up during the summer months according to the property owner. This drainage supports a few hydrophytic plant species such as willows (Salix), and rushes (Juncus), as well as many nonnative wetland plant species (Rumex, Urtica, Polypogon).

Rainfall cannot percolate through paved areas, thus causing an increase of stormwater flows, potentially leading to localized flooding. Pollutants associated with parking lots (oil & grease predominately) will be found in high quantities after the first rain of the season. These pollutants have the potential of contaminating ground and surface water sources.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Discussion:**

The Noise Element of the Madera County General Plan (Policy 7.A.5) provides that noise which will be created by new non-transportation noise sources shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the Noise Element noise level standards on lands designated for noise-sensitive uses. However, this policy does not apply to noise levels associated with agricultural operations. All the surrounding properties, while include some residential units, are designated and zoned for agricultural uses. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.

Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the nature or phase of construction (e.g. demolition/land clearing, grading and excavation, erection). The United States Environmental Protection Agency has found that the average noise levels associated with construction activities typically range from approximately 76 dBA to 84 dBA Leq, with intermittent individual equipment noise levels ranging from approximately 75 dBA to more than 88 dBA for brief periods.

Short Term Noise

Noise from localized point sources (such as construction sites) typically decreases by approximately 6 dBA with each doubling of distance from source to receptor. Given the noise attenuation rate and assuming no noise shielding from either natural or human-made features (e.g. trees, buildings, fences), outdoor receptors within approximately 400 feet of construction site could experience maximum noise levels of greater than 70 dBA when onsite construction-related noise levels exceed approximately 89 dBA at the project site boundary. Construction activities that occur during the more noise-sensitive eighteen hours could result in increased levels of annoyance and sleep disruption for occupants of nearby existing residential dwellings. As a result, noise-generating construction activities would be considered to have a potentially significant short-term impact. However with implementation of mitigation measures, this impact would be considered less than significant.

Long Term Noise

Mechanical building equipment (e.g. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, and boilers), associated with the proposed structures, could generate noise levels of approximately 90 dBA at 3 feet from the source. However, such mechanical equipment systems are typically shielded from direct public exposure and usually housed on rooftops, within equipment rooms, or within exterior enclosures.

Landscape maintenance equipment, such as leaf blowers and gasoline powered mowers, associated with the proposed operations could result in intermittent noise levels that range from approximately 80 to 100 dBA at 3 feet, respectively. Based on an equipment noise level of 100 dBA, landscape maintenance equipment (assuming a noise attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source) may result in exterior noise levels of approximately 75 dBA at 50 feet.

Excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels are not anticipated during either construction or operations.

The project is proposing a portion of the subdivision to be for industrial use. This may cause noise levels that are higher than in residential or commercial areas. Noise levels may also be higher during times of construction. With mitigation measures of limiting hours of operation of using loud machinery, impacts will be less than significant for surrounding property owners and residents.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

**Discussion:**

The project as mitigated would not result in population growth, and would not displace existing housing or people.

The proposed project is not designed to induce population growth, and will not result in substantial direct or indirect growth inducement. No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No people will be displaced as a result of the project.

The population within Madera County as of January 1, 2006, according to the California Department of Finance was 144,396 persons and 46,639 dwelling units. In the unincorporated County (outside the cities of Madera and Chowchilla), the total as of January 1, 2006 was 74,723 persons and 28,289 dwelling units. These numbers average to 3.1 persons per dwelling unit in the County and 2.64 persons per dwelling unit in the unincorporated area. The lower number in unincorporated areas is somewhat attributable to the vacation homes in the mountain areas of the County.

According to the California Department of Finance, in October 2006, there were 59,400 jobs in Madera County. Of those, 23,800 jobs were in the cities of Madera and Chowchilla, and 23,800 were in the unincorporated areas. This leads to a jobs/housing ratio of 1.27:1 for the County and 1.19:1 for the unincorporated areas.

The average number of employees per acre for office uses is 48.53, while the average is 37.69 per acre for neighborhood commercial uses.

The commercial segment of the project will bring in additional workers who may choose to live in the community in which they work in.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed project site is within the jurisdiction of the Madera County Fire Department. Fire protection is provided by one CDF/County Fire Department station, located east of Highway 41 on Civic Circle in central Oakhurst. By mutual aid agreements, the single station is complimented by the CDF/County Fire Department station on Highway 49 in central Ahwahnee, and the U.S. Forest Service's Batterson Station, west of Highway 41 and north of Road 222 (Bass Lake Road), near Sky Ranch Road, during summer and fall. County services such as fire and law enforcement, however, continue to remain inadequate and seriously under funded. While not normally an environmental concern, new residential and commercial development in the foothills represents a heightened potential for fire risks, risks that the County does not have the resources to counter. While new development is required to maintain a fire safe area around each home site, little if any efforts are extended to the majority of large rural home sites to maintain a fire safe perimeter.

Crime and emergency response is provided by the Madera County Sherriff's Department. County Sherriff's Department personnel are strapped for resources as well. With new development, the potential for criminal activity (including but not limited to: home burglaries, assaults, auto thefts) increases.

An agreement exists between the applicant and the County in regards to citing a fire station and sheriffs' station on the property. The agreement in part states that the applicant will provide the land while the County funds the fire and sheriffs' stations.

Ambulance and paramedic service within the community is provided by Sierra Ambulance. Emergency medical care services are privately provided from commercial facilities in Oakhurst, and 12 hour emergency treatment is available at the medical clinic (an extension of Community Hospital in Fresno) at Highway 41 and Victoria Lane in Oakhurst. While 24 hour emergency treatment facilities have undergone trial operations, this service has not yet been proven to be financially feasible. A source or provider of permanent 24 hour emergency care has not been identified.

The proposed project will have no impact on local parks and will not create demand for additional parks.

The area's public schools are provided by Yosemite Union High School District and Bass Lake Elementary School District; each head-quartered in Oakhurst adjoining the Oak Creek Intermediate School. The high school has an approximate attendance of 1000 students from ninth to twelfth grade. A bond issue was passed to assist in the expansion of school facilities including, but not limited to: addition of new classrooms, new multi-use buildings, new performance arts building, parking and recreation facilities. The Oak Creek Intermediate school provides enrollment for grades 6-8 and has a student population of approximately 225, while Oakhurst Elementary serves grades K-6 and has a student population of approximately 400. Wassuma Elementary School in Ahwahnee provides k-8 facilities for approximately 360 students. The remainder of student enrollments for the area is in Mountain Home K-10, Bass Lake -5 and Wawona K-6 schools.

Most facilities within the district rely on portable classrooms to accommodate current enrollment with little or no reserve space. Both Yosemite Union High School District and Bass Lake Elementary School district report a trend towards declining enrollment. Long term forecasts for enrollment are not available.

XIV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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:**

The project would have no discernable impacts to existing parks or require the provision of new or additional facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or				

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers (7<sup>th</sup> Edition, pg. 268-9) the trips per day for one single-family residence are 9.57.

There was a traffic analysis completed for this project.

The project is expected to generate approximately 2,204 trips daily with 217 trips occurring in the p.m. peak hour. Development of the entire project would generate 6,017 daily trips with 548 trips occurring in the a.m. peak hour and 623 trips in the p.m. peak hour. Without improvements, the addition of project traffic will result in traffic volumes in excess of adopted standards at the State Route 49/Westlake Drive intersection. The addition of traffic from this development will impact the State Route 49/Village Drive intersection.

**State Route 49:** The most recent traffic counts suggest that State Route 49 carries an *Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)* volume of 8,600 vehicles per day north of the State Route 41 intersection. The reported volume drops to 8,200 AADT in the area of the County Road 600 intersection north of the project site.

**Westlake Drive/Bollinger Place:** Westlake Drive provides access to the Kaiser Medical offices and Mountain Christian Church. The existing intersection has been improved to provide a separate left turn lanes on State Route 49, and traffic is controlled by stop signs on the Westlake Drive Bollinger Place approaches. Based on the volume of traffic observed during peak traffic hours, it appears that Westlake Drive carries about 1,000 average daily trips, while Bollinger Place carries less than 150 average daily trips.

**Village Drive:** this is a minor local street that intersects State Route 49 towards the eastern end of the project site. The existing interchange features a two-way left turn lane on State Route 49, and traffic is controlled by a stop sign on the Village Drive approach. This two lane street carries fewer than 100 average daily trips.

**Red Bud Lane:** This is a local street that intersects State Route 49 in the area between the Westlake and Village Drive intersections. Red Bull Lane provides access to the existing residential area south of State Route 49.

As with most rural areas, Eastern Madera County is served by limited alternative transportation modes. Limited transit service has been provided in the past in the form of a "Dial-a-Ride" service provided by the Madera County Action Committee. In addition, an "Escort" program has existed whereby senior citizens rideshare with reimbursed private citizens for shopping/medical appointments and trips. However neither service is currently offered in the rural Eastern Madera County area today.

In the area around the proposed project, opportunities for bicycles and pedestrians, especially as an alternative to the private automobile, are significantly limited by lack of developed shoulders, sidewalks or pavement width accommodating either mode. The condition is not uncommon in rural areas where distances between origins and destinations are long and the terrain is either rolling or mountainous. In the locations outside urbanized portions of the County, the number of non-recreational pedestrians/cyclists would likely be low, even if additional facilities were provided.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

**Discussion:**

According to the Madera County General Plan Background report, all solid waste generated in the unincorporated area is currently disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill, which is owned by the County and operated by Madera Disposal Systems, Inc. The facility is located on 48 acres at the southeast corner of Road 19 and Avenue 22. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) the Fairmead Solid Waste Disposal Site is a Class II landfill with a total permitted capacity of 3,204,349 cubic yards. As of July 2, 2001, the disposal site had 2,667,557 cubic yards of remaining capacity. Considering the permitted throughput of 395 tons per day, the landfill is expected to reach capacity in 2013. If additional waste can be diverted, the life of the expansion area could be increased.

According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board, the generation rate per resident is 0.63 pounds per day of trash.

This project will be hooking into an existing maintenance district and existing water service. With mitigation measures of requiring this, impacts on water treatment facilities and water resources will be less than significant. The project site will be served by the Madera County Landfill in Fairmead.

The county operates the largest sewer collection, treatment and disposal facility in the planning area, with Maintenance District 22a providing collection lines, lift pumps, sewage treatment plant, effluent storage and spray irrigation disposal facilities. The maintenance district serves central Oakhurst including the Yosemite High School campus. Outside the boundaries of the district, including several commercial establishments and residential developments at the north end of Oakhurst, properties are dependant on private septic systems, none of which are subject to regular monitoring or maintenance. Lack of adequate sewer and septic facilities has caused apparent surface and groundwater pollution and contamination in developed portions of the Oakhurst Planning Area. Inadequate and failing septic facilities are known to generate public health risks, as well as environmental degradation problems.

According to a letter submitted by the applicant, the subject property is within Maintenance District 22b which provides sewer services. Regional Water Quality Control indicates that the district is indeed MD 22a.

The Hillview Water Company is the largest water supply entity within the area, serving parts of Oakhurst, including the high school campus and southern portions of Ahwahnee. Broadview Terrace Mutual Water Company, many County Water Maintenance Districts and smaller community systems serve other existing subdivisions. The Hillview Water System has experienced difficulty in providing a constant level of service for existing connections.

The area depends on wells for its water. No “water table” exists; the water is obtained from fractures in the underlying rock which are frequently unconnected. The recharge is unknown and there is evidence from abandoned wells in the region that some may never recharge. Due to these concerns regarding the uncertainty of groundwater, the Oakhurst Area Plan for the area outlines the need to both understand groundwater availability for the area, and to examine opportunities to develop a source of surface water for the community.

Solid waste/garbage disposal is provided by Eastern Madera County Disposal Company (EMADCO), which has a franchise agreement with the County to provide solid waste pickup from both residential and commercial addresses with the area of this project. Residents arrange curb-side pickup with EMADCO on an individual and voluntary basis. Some newer developments within the Oakhurst Area Plan area may have been required to arrange curb-side pickup as a condition of approval. EMADCO operates a transfer station in Oakhurst, located adjacent to the sewer treatment plant, where garbage is collected and condensed for transport to the County landfill. No recycling or specific sorting activity occurs at the transfer station. All such efforts occur at the material recycling facility at the County landfill in Fairmead. While no formal or mandatory recycling programs operate within the planning area, several privately operated facilities allow residents to recycle materials such as aluminum, glass and plastic.

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company provides power for the area. There is no natural gas service; however propane is used in residential areas.

The build-out of the area will require expansion of existing facilities and the construction/installation of new facilities to serve new development. Each development will assume the cost of providing infrastructure and public facilities for the new development. The existing deficiencies with water and wastewater disposal systems within the area will require community wide efforts in order to be resolved, including conducting evaluations for expanding these essential services.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

directly or indirectly?

**Discussion:**

If historic growth trends continue into the future, then the problems on State Route 49 will become more pressing and the need for a four-lane facility will become more acute.

Solid waste generation is an ongoing situation that continuously needs to be addressed as development, both residentially and commercially, increase throughout the County.

Air quality issues tend to run with transportation issues, as vehicular traffic contribute towards PM10 and PM2.5 standards.

Crime and emergency response is provided by the Madera County Sherriff's Department. County services such as fire and law enforcement continue to remain inadequate and seriously under funded. While not normally an environmental concern, new residential development in the foothills represents a heightened potential for fire risks, risks that the County does not have the resources to counter. While new development is required to maintain a fire safe area around each home site, little if any efforts are extended to the majority of large rural home sites to maintain a fire safe perimeter.

The area depends on wells for its water. No "water table" exists; the water is obtained from fractures in the underlying rock which are frequently unconnected. The recharge is unknown and there is evidence from abandoned wells in the region that some may never recharge. Due to these concerns regarding the uncertainty of groundwater, the Oakhurst Area Plan for the area outlines the need to both understand groundwater availability for the area, and to examine opportunities to develop a source of surface water for the community.

According to the Madera County General Plan Background report, all solid waste generated in the unincorporated area is currently disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill, which is owned by the County and operated by Madera Disposal Systems, Inc. The facility is located on 48 acres at the southeast corner of Road 19 and Avenue 22. The landfill is expected to reach capacity in 2020. If additional waste can be diverted, the life of the expansion area could be increased. There is no indication of the amount of solid waste that will be generated on site that will need to be sent to the Fairmead disposal site.

Most of the archaeological survey work in the County has taken place in the foothills and mountains. This does not mean, however, that no sites exist in the western part of the County, but rather that this area has not been as thoroughly studied. There are slightly more than 2,000 recorded archaeological sites in the County, most of which are located in the foothills and mountains. Recorded prehistoric artifacts include village sites, camp sites, bedrock milling stations, pictographs, petroglyphs, rock rings, sacred sites, and resource gathering areas. Madera County also contains a significant number of potentially historic sites, including homesteads and ranches, mining and logging sites and associated features (such as small camps, railroad beds, logging chutes, and trash dumps).

According to the California Department of Fish and Game, there is the potential of special, threatened and endangered species in the area. In addition, potential impacts to intermittent drainages on the site may include increased sediment input from structure and road runoff, toxic runoff, toxic runoff from household chemicals and septic systems and impairment of wildlife movement along stream corridors. There are also plant species identified as being within the region of the project site. These species have the potential of contributing to the riparian and migratory habitats of threatened, endangered or species of special concern.

**Documents/Organizations Consulted  
In Preparation of this  
Initial Study**

Madera County General Plan

California Department of Finance

California Integrated Waste Management Board

California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines

United States Environmental Protection Agency

California Department of Fish and Game

Madera County Engineering Department

Madera County Fire Department

Madera County Environmental Health Department

Madera County Road Department

Madera County General Plan, October 12, 1995.

Curtin Jr., Daniel J. 2002. *2003 Subdivision Map Act*. Point Arena, California: Solano Press Books

Curtin, Daniel J. 2004. *Curtin's California Land Use and Planning Law*. Solano Press Books

Bass, Ronald E. *CEQA Deskbook*.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

California Department of Transportation

Stebbins, John C. August 1, 2006. *Biological Resources Assessment Report For Proposed Westlake Rezone and General Plan Amendment Project Area*.

K.D. Anderson Transportation Engineers. October 21, 2003. *Traffic Impact Analysis for SR 49 Mixed Use Development*.

Oakhurst Area Plan Initial Study. February 1, 2002.

Sierra Valley Cultural Planning. March 13, 2006. *A Cultural Resources Survey of Three Parcels Located at Westlake Drive and Highway 49, Oakhurst, Madera County, California*.

Shaw, Russell. Letter dated May 1, 2006 addressed to Rayburn Beach, Planning Director.