

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILES: Z04-0016

PROJECT NAME: Village P Rezone

NAME OF APPLICANT: EDH 52

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 122-720-09 **SECTION:** 1 T: 09N R: 8E

LOCATION: Northeast corner of Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road in El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:** **FROM:** **TO:**
- REZONING:** **FROM:** One-Family Residential (R1) District **TO:** Commercial- Planned Development District (C-PD)
- TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP**
- SUBDIVISION**
- SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW:**
- OTHER:**

REASONS THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

- NO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS WERE IDENTIFIED DURING THE INITIAL STUDY.**
- MITIGATION HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH WOULD REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.**
- OTHER:**

In accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State Guidelines, and El Dorado County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, the County Environmental Agent analyzed the project and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Based on this finding, the Planning Department hereby prepares this NEGATIVE DECLARATION. A period of thirty (30) days from the date of filing this negative declaration will be provided to enable public review of the project specifications and this document prior to action on the project by COUNTY OF EL DORADO. A copy of the project specifications is on file at the County of El Dorado Planning Services, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667.

This Negative Declaration was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on _____.

Executive Secretary



**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES
2850 FAIRLANE COURT
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667**

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Project Title/Application No.: Village P Rezone (File No. Z04-0016)

Lead Agency Name and Address: El Dorado County, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Contact Person: Mel Pabalinas, Senior Planner **Phone Number:** (530) 621-5363

Property Owner's Name and Address: EDH 52, 7700 College Town Drive, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95826

Project Applicant's/Agent's Name and Address: Same as Owner's Information

Project Engineer's / Architect's Name and Address: CTA Engineering and Surveying, 3233 Monier Circle Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Project Location: Northeast corner of Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road in El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 122-720-09 (51.45 acre portion of 57.78 acre subject parcel)

Zoning: One-Family Residential (R1)/Exclusive Agricultural (AE)

Section: 1 T: 9N R: 8E

General Plan Designation: Adopted Plan (Commercial)- El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (C)/Low Density Residential (LDR)

Description of Project:
Rezone of northern 51.45-acre portion of subject property from One-Family Residential (R1) to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
The vacant property is within the El Dorado Hills Community Region of the County where it is surrounded by both existing uses and vacant properties (Attachment A). Table 1 below describes the existing designation and uses of the property and its surroundings.

Table 1. Land Use Information

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use/Improvements
Site	Adopted Plan (Commercial)- El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (C)/Low Density Residential (LDR)	One-Family Residential (R1)/Exclusive Agricultural (AE)	Vacant
North	Adopted Plan (Residential) - El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP)	One-Family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)	Oak Meadows Elementary School/Residential
South	Low Density Residential (LDR)	Exclusive Agricultural (AE)	Vacant
East	Adopted Plan (Residential) - El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP)/Medium	One-Family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)/ One-Acre Residential (R1A) District	Residential/Vacant lands

	Density Residential (MDR)/ Low Density Residential (LDR)		
West	Adopted Plan (Residential) - El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP)/Research and Development (R&D)	Open Space/ One-Acre Residential (RIA) District	Vacant

Briefly Describe the environmental setting:

The subject site is predominantly flat with minor areas of rolling hills. The elevation of the site is within the 800-foot range with a natural drainage toward the southwestern portion of the property. According to the technical studies for the Silva Valley Interchange project, which evaluated the setting of the entire property, the biological habitat within the site predominantly consist of annual grassland with small stands of Blue Oak Woodland, and slivers of riparian and wetland areas along the western perimeter. An Elderberry Bush, which hosts the protected Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle, has been identified along the northwestern perimeter of the property. Though mostly undisturbed, small portions of the site have been traversed by the existing paved section of Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

This consistency rezone is subject to a legislative action by the Board of Supervisors. Given that no specific development is proposed, no specific project conditions or mitigation measures would be imposed. There are no agencies involved in its approval. However, future development application proposal would be subject to further review and approval by various agencies including Department of Transportation (DOT), Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO), and El Dorado Hills Fire Department.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance


DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:


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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by Mitigation Measures based on the earlier analysis as described in 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: 12/20/11

Printed Name: Mel Pabalinas, Senior Planner For: El Dorado County

Signature:  Date: 12-28-11

Printed Name: Pierre Rivas For: El Dorado County

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed rezone.

Project Description

The rezone would change the northern portions (51.41 acre of 57.78 acre) of the property from its underlying zoning of One-Family Residential (R1) to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD) consistent with the Commercial land use designation under the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan and El Dorado County General Plan (Attachment B). No development or improvement is associated with the proposed zone change, therefore no physical impacts to the existing setting would occur; however, as discussed below, portions of the property would be affected as part of the recently approved county road project Silva Valley Interchange project (Attachment C). Ultimate configuration of the property that could be developable would be dependent on the final layout of the interchange.

The proposed Commercial zone district is regulated under Section 17.32.I of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance. In comparison with other commercial zone districts, Commercial zone typically allows for the least intense commercial uses. Uses allowed by-right within this zone range from office, retail, and entertainment to mixed use planned development, which integrates a combination of commercial, residential and/or institutional uses on one site. Combined with the Planned Development (PD) overlay zone, which is regulated under Section 17.04 of the Zoning Ordinance, future development of the site would require a submittal of a Planned Development Permit application subject to review by the County and affected agencies. Specifically, future development would be evaluated for site and design standards as well as potential environmental effects.

Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The subject property is located at the northeast area of Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road in El Dorado Hills. Recently recorded Record of Survey of the property identified that the actual legal property size total is 57.78 acres,

which consist of Tract 1 located north of Highway 50 and Tract 2 south of the highway (Attachment D). Specifically, Tract 1, which is owned by the applicant, consists of 1.38 acre sliver of land west of Silva Valley Parkway, and a 1.93 acre and 48.14 acre areas east of Silva Valley Parkway. This tract is within the Community Region of El Dorado Hills, has Commercial land use designation and inconsistent zone district of One-Family Residential. On the other hand, Tract 2, which measures 6.33 acres and is legally owned by others, is within the Rural Region Planning Concept Area, designated as Low Density Residential (LDR) with a consistent zoning of Exclusive Agriculture (AE). The zone change would only affect Tract 1 portion of the property totaling 51.45 acres.

As described in Table 1 above, though predominantly surrounded by vacant lands, other adjacent uses include existing single-family residential development and an elementary school are located to the north. The site affected by the rezone is largely vacant except for the disturbed portions of the site from the existing right-of-ways for Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road.

Project Characteristics

1. Transportation/Circulation/Parking

No development project is proposed with this rezone. However, future development project of the subject property could get direct access via Silva Valley Parkway and Tong Road. Details of road infrastructures would be further reviewed and verified during review of the actual development application.

2. Utilities and Infrastructure

No development project is proposed with this rezone. However, future development project of the subject property could be required to provide public utilities from existing public infrastructures adjacent the property. Details of utilities and infrastructures would be further reviewed and verified during review of the actual development application.

3. Population

The propose rezone would change the underlying zone to Commercial, which typically does not affect the population. However, the zone change could foster future commercial development that would provide services and goods that would serve the local area.

4. Construction Considerations

As there is no development is proposed with the requested rezone, no construction consideration is applicable. This application would require legislative action by the Board of Supervisors

5. Silva Valley Interchange Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

As applicable, this Initial Study for Village P Rezone references technical studies and reports utilized in the certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Silva Valley Interchange (SCH No. 1988050215). This county road project would affect a portion of the Village P property. Though no development or improvement is associated with this application, the studies would adequately provide a description of the setting of the subject property. The Silva Valley Interchange EIR can be viewed at the following website <http://edcgov.us/Government/DOT/CEQA.aspx> . The document is also available at:

Department of Transportation (DOT)
2850 Fairlane Court, 2nd Floor
Placerville, CA 95667

6. Initial Study Schedule

This Initial Study is being circulated for public and agency review for a 30-day period. Written comments on the Initial Study should be submitted to the project planner indicated in the Summary section above.

Following the conclusion of the comment period, the Initial Study will be considered by the Lead Agency in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. The Lead Agency will also determine whether to approve the project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is a fair argument that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of Mitigation Measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the Mitigation Measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
6. CEQA Section 15152. Tiering- El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR

As applicable, this Negative Declaration tiers off of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2009072001) in accordance with Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. The El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR is available for review at the El Dorado County Development Services Department located at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667. All applicable determinations that rely upon the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan EIR analysis are identified herein.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings?		X	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X	

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Visual Resources would result in the introduction of physical features that are not characteristic of the surrounding development, substantially change the natural landscape, or obstruct an identified public scenic vista.

- a. and b. **Scenic Vista and Resources.** The site is located along State Route Highway 50 in El Dorado Hills. According to the General Plan EIR, this highway corridor is not considered of important scenic resource. Future commercial development of the site would be evaluated for consistency with site and architectural design standards in effect at the time of the development application. No impact.
- c. **Visual Character.** The rezone would change the existing zoning from One-Family Residential to Commercial-Planned Development. Though no development is proposed with this application, this rezone would facilitate future commercial development of the site which, subject to a Planned Development permit, would be reviewed for applicable design and architectural standards including compatibility in the area and circulation. Impacts would be considered less than significant.
- d. **Light and Glare.** As discussed in subsection C. above, no development is proposed with this rezone; however, the resulting zone change would facilitate future commercial development of the site. A Development Plan would be required for future site development which would evaluate and minimize potential lighting effects from development. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

FINDING: Given that no development is proposed with this application, impacts to aesthetics either directly or indirectly could occur based on requested action. For this "Aesthetics" category, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:			
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Locally Important Farmland (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?			X
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect to Agricultural Resources would occur if:

- There is a conversion of choice agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land;
- The amount of agricultural land in the County is substantially reduced; or
- Agricultural uses are subjected to impacts from adjacent incompatible land uses.

- a. **Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.** The site is not identified to be within any mapping associated for farmland or lands containing prime farmland. No impact.
- b. **Williamson Act Contract.** The portion of property is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract nor is agriculturally zoned. The resulting rezone would facilitate commercial zone district consistent with the commercial land use designation anticipated in the area. No impact.
- c. **Non-Agricultural Use.** No conversion of agriculture land would occur as a result of the project. There would be no impact.
- d. **Loss of Forest land or Conversion of Forest land.** No forest land exists on site. No impact.
- e. **Conversion of Prime Farmland or Forest Land.** No prime farmland exists on site. No impact.

FINDING For this "Agriculture" category, there would be no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or			X

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

III. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>			
projected air quality violation?			
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		X	

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Air Quality would occur if:

- Emissions of ROG and NO_x, will result in construction or operation emissions greater than 82lbs/day (See Table 5.2, of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District – CEQA Guide);
 - Emissions of PM₁₀, CO, SO₂ and NO_x, as a result of construction or operation emissions, will result in ambient pollutant concentrations in excess of the applicable National or State Ambient Air Quality Standard (AAQS). Special standards for ozone, CO, and visibility apply in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of the County; or
 - Emissions of toxic air contaminants cause cancer risk greater than 1 in 1 million (10 in 1 million if best available control technology for toxics is used) or a non-cancer Hazard Index greater than 1. In addition, the project must demonstrate compliance with all applicable District, State and U.S. EPA regulations governing toxic and hazardous emissions.
- a. **Air Quality Plan.** There is no development or improvement proposed along with the request to rezone the property to commercial. Future development proposal on the site would be subject to review for conformance to applicable local plans enforced by Air Quality Management Plan. Impact is considered less than significant.
 - b. **Air Quality Standards.** No development is proposed with this rezone. Future development of the site would be reviewed for adherence to Air Quality standards. Impact is considered less than significant.
 - c. **Cumulative Impacts.** No development is proposed with this rezone. Along with other development projects, future development of the site would be reviewed for cumulative impacts to air quality in the area. Impact is considered less than significant.
 - d. **Sensitive Receptors.** Though no actual development is proposed, the rezone to commercial would result in future commercial development of the site. Given the predominant residential uses in the area, which are typically considered to sensitive receptors, future planned development air quality effects would require detailed analysis of its specific effects to sensitive receptors. Impact is considered less than significant.
 - e. **Objectionable Odors.** No development is proposed with this rezone. Regardless of actual uses proposed with the future commercial development on the site, that project would be further analyzed for specific effects involving emission of objectionable odors. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: Though no actual development is proposed, the resulting rezone to set forth various uses under Commercial-Planned Development district. Further air quality analysis would be required on future development. Impact is considered less than significant

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X
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?			X
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?			X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

Discussion:

A substantial adverse effect on Biological Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Substantially reduce or diminish habitat for native fish, wildlife or plants;
- Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- Threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community;
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species; or
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

The Biological Resource Analysis conducted for the Silva Valley Interchange Project details the existing biological conditions of the property. Specifically, the reports describe the portion of the site predominantly composing of annual grassland with areas of riparian and wetlands traversing the site from north to south along the central and western portions. These conditions provides for various types of potential habitat for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (with identified presence of the plant), Western Turtle Pond, California Red-Legged Frog, and select species of migrating raptors. As

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

discussed above, the proposed rezone does not include any specific development and, therefore, no physical impact to these habitat and/or species would occur. However, future commercial development of the site would be required to submit technical reports analyzing its specific impacts to these and other resources.

a-f. **Special Status Species, Riparian Habitat, Migration Corridors, and Local Policies.** The reports referenced above describe the potential habitats and its associated species. However, given no specific development is proposed, no impacts would occur. Future commercial development of the site would be required to evaluate its impacts.

The County currently does not have a Habitat Conservation Plan. Specific General Plan Policies and El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance standards provides for protection of biological resources including protection of rare plants, setbacks to riparian areas, and mitigation of impacted oak woodlands. Future development of the site would be reviewed for conformance to these policies and standards. Impact is considered less than significant.

FINDING: No physical impacts would occur with this rezone. For this 'Biological Resources' category, impact is considered less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>			
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X

Discussion:

In general, significant impacts are those that diminish the integrity, research potential, or other characteristics that make a historical or cultural resource significant or important. A substantial adverse effect on Cultural Resources would occur if the implementation of the project would:

- Disrupt, alter, or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property or historic or cultural significant to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study;
- Affect a landmark of cultural/historical importance;
- Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area; or
- Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located.

The updated Cultural Resource Study conducted for the Silva Valley Interchange Project details the existing cultural and historic resources on the affected portions property based on historical records and updated surveys. As discussed above, the proposed rezone does not include any specific development and, therefore, no physical impact would occur. However, future commercial development of the site would be required to submit technical reports analyzing its specific impacts to these and other resources