

# Negative Declaration/Initial Study



**For the proposed: Meeks Bay FPD Reorganization  
(Annexation & Detachment)**

**Prepared by:  
Darcy Goulart**

**On behalf of:  
Meeks Bay Fire Protection District**

**January 4, 2010**



## 1. Purpose of Initial Study

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project. The document may rely on previous environmental documents and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

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

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

## 2. Project Information

- a. Project title: Meeks Bay FPD Reorganization (Annexation & Detachment)
- b. Lead agency name and address: Meeks Bay FPD P.O. Box 189, Tahoma, CA 96142
- c. Contact person and phone number: Darcy Goulart (209) 224-4546
- d. Project sponsor's name and address: Meeks Bay FPD P.O. Box 189, Tahoma, CA 96142

## 3. Background & Project Description

The project consists of the annexation of 38 parcels and detachments of 14 parcels to better align the boundaries of the Meeks Bay Fire Protection District (MEK) with its first response area, as described in the Countywide Fire Suppression and Emergency Services Review (Municipal Services Review or MSR) prepared and adopted by LAFCO (August 2006). The proposal is consistent with the Sphere of Influence Update, LAFCO Project No. 2007-04 and Resolution number L-2007-20 (Amended).

MEK has a long-standing mismatch between its boundary and its first response area. The first response area is much larger than the district boundary. An area owned by the United States Forrest Service (USFS) contains homes and year-round residents to the south of the district. During certain months, specifically

many days in the winter, no other emergency service provider can reach those residents. State park areas with campgrounds are also outside the district but create a high demand for services.

The annexation would align the functional boundary area of the district with its legal services boundary. Service units and capacity will not change with the proposal. The annexation will bring areas into the district where MEK currently is the first or only responder available for emergencies. The total district full time population may increase by residents who currently reside in the area proposed for annexation, but as previously mentioned this territory is already within the first response area for MEK and receives services from the district on that basis. The annexation reflects LAFCO's analysis and determination contained in the MSR. Extending services outside of the boundaries creates a fiscal and equity dilemma for the district.

The project also includes the detachment of 14 parcels from the District. The parcels are undeveloped and are owned by the state and federal government. Fire suppression and emergency services in these lands are the responsibility of state and federal agencies and is currently being provided to these parcels by them. The reorganization will not change the service capacity of MEK or any other agency. The USFS and/or CALFIRE will continue to have responsibility in the detachment area.

While the reorganization could be considered under the exemption described in Section 15320, the El Dorado LAFCO Environmental Coordinator (Executive Officer) found that the proposed reorganization should beneficially undergo the review of an initial study to ensure that all potential environmental effects are disclosed and considered.

#### **4. Project Location**

The project involves the annexation of 38 parcels owned by Federal and State entities as well as private property owners into the Meeks Bay Fire Protection District boundaries. The annexation includes APN's 016-600-04, 07, 08, 10, 13, 19, 20 and 21, 017-061-10, 017-081-01, 017-101-01, 017-121-01, 018-011-04, 018-020-01 through 018-020-11, 018-030-01 through 018-030-14.

The 14 parcels proposed for detachment from MEK are owned by Federal and State entities. The detachment includes APN's, 014-021-01, 02 and 014-021-06 through 10, 014-031-01, 014-031-02, 016-071-11 through 016-071-013, 016-121-08 and 016-121-11.

A map and parcel list is attached.

**5. Surrounding Characteristics**

North	Developed & Undeveloped parcels within MEK
East	Lake Tahoe & State Park land receiving USFS services
South	Emerald Bay (Lake Tahoe) & State Park lands receiving USFS services
West	Desolation Wilderness

**Evaluation of Environmental Impacts**

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire 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 [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:

- **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**A. Aesthetics –**

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

**Discussion**

a) – d) **No Impact:** The reorganization (annexation and detachment) of properties associated with this project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources, degrade existing visual character or quality of the properties and surroundings or create a new source of light or glare. The action of reorganization of the District's boundaries does not involve the construction of new structures or light sources that would degrade the existing aesthetic value and character of the properties and surrounding areas. The action involves the adjustment of district boundary to annex parcels that are already receiving services from the District in a first response area. There are no impacts to Aesthetics associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**B. Agricultural Resources –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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				X

California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
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?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – c) **No Impact:** The reorganization (annexation and detachment) of properties associated with this project would not convert any agricultural farmland of importance at the State or local level, conflict with zoning of lands under Williamson Act contracts or involve the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The reorganization will not affect timberland or timber production efforts in the area. The action of reorganization of the District's boundary does not involve the construction or rezoning of land uses on the subject parcels, and will not trigger a change in the use of the land. The action involves the adjustment of the boundary to the first response service area of the District. There are no impacts to Agricultural Resources associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**C. Air Quality -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X

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

**Discussion:**

a) – e) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not have an adverse environmental impacts on air quality, violate air quality standards, or emit objectionable odors. The action of reorganization of the District’s first response service boundary does not involve construction of new housing, commercial or industrial development nor does it induce traffic trips to the area that would increase auto emissions emitted. The action involves a change in the legal boundary of Meeks Bay Fire Protection District to include land already within its first response service area. A change from state and federal fire suppression and protection agencies to a local government provider in the annexation area will not alter the available resources to extinguish wildland fires under the existing arrangements for cooperative response to fire emergencies in the Tahoe Basin. Likewise, the change from local agency to state or federal fire provider in the detachment area will not alter fire resources available to extinguish future wildland fire in the area. There are no impacts to Air Quality associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**D. Biological Resources -**

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



community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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) – f) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not convert any agricultural farmland of importance at the State or local level, conflict with zoning of lands under Williamson Act contracts or involve the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The action of reorganization of the District’s boundary to conform to the first response service area does not involve the construction or rezoning of land uses on the subject parcels. The action would modify the legal boundary to annex parcels that are already receiving services from the District. There are no impacts to Biological Resources associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

A change from state and federal fire suppression and protection agencies to a local government provider in the annexation area will not alter the available resources to extinguish wildland fires under the existing arrangements for cooperative response to fire emergencies in the Tahoe Basin. Likewise, the change from local agency to state or federal fire provider in the detachment area will not alter fire resources available to extinguish future wildland fires in the area.

**E. Cultural Resources -**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §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:**

a) – d) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not cause a change in historical resources, archaeological resources, destroy directly or indirectly unique paleontological resources or geographic features, nor would it disturb human remains. The action of reorganization of the District’s boundaries does not involve construction or excavation that would disturb land which could in turn unearth the above mentioned cultural resources or human remains on the subject parcels. There are no impacts associated with Cultural Resources associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**F. Geology and Soils –**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the Project:				
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 evidence of a				X

known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong Seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – e) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects such as injury or death due to seismic ground shaking, landslides, and ground failure. The proposed change in the boundary area would not cause substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil and would not locate new structures on unstable soils. The action of reorganization of the District’s boundary does not involve the construction or rezoning of land uses that could result in new construction on the subject parcels. There are no impacts to Geology and Soils associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials –**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine				X

transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – h) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials would not be used or emitted with the proposed reorganization. The subject parcels are not included on the hazardous materials list or located within an airport land use plan. The reorganization would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The reorganization of the District’s boundary does not

involve the construction or rezoning of land uses that could result in new construction on the subject parcels. The reorganization would not involve any construction related materials or equipment that would result in an impact on the environment due to hazards or hazardous materials. There are no impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**H. Hydrology and Water Quality**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - - Would the project:				X
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
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?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant				X

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?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – j) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of parcels that are receiving first response services inside and outside of the Meeks Bay FPD would not have an impact on hydrology and water quality in and around the project vicinity. The proposed project does not include the construction of new development that would impact the existing groundwater supply, increase runoff into the storm water drainage system, or degrade the existing water quality of the area. The project also would not expose persons to injury or death due to flooding, tsunami's or by locating housing in an established 100 year floodplain. There is no impact to Hydrology and Water Quality associated with the proposed project and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

**I. Land Use and Planning**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – c) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not physically divide an established community. The reorganization proposes to include those properties in the MEK boundary that

are already benefiting from first response services. The reorganization does not conflict with applicable land use plans or regulations of entities that may have jurisdiction in the boundary area. Annexing the subject parcels in the boundary area would not induce development because other governmental agencies and regulatory constraints remain in place. The reorganization would better align the legal boundaries of Meeks Bay Fire Protection District with its first response area and functional service area. The reorganization would therefore not conflict any known habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans, which will remain in effect unchanged. There are no impacts to Land Use and Planning associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**J. Mineral Resources**

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				X
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?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – b) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of properties associated with this project would not result in the loss of mineral resources of value to the region and residents, nor would it result in the loss of locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on a local general plan. The reorganization proposes to include those properties into the MEK boundary that are already benefiting from first response services. The proposed reorganization does not include new development and would not cause the alteration or loss of valuable mineral resources as no construction and/or excavation processes are included in the project. There are no impacts to Mineral Resources associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.



**K. Noise**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
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?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – f) **No Impact:** The proposed reorganization would not subject persons to excessive noise levels established by a local general plan or noise ordinance. While short term noise could be caused by sirens from emergency apparatus responding to a call for service, the reorganization will not alter the emergency response services which are already provided, and this is not considered an impact. Additionally, the noise generated by emergency response apparatus is short term and does not occur in long enough intervals to permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, the parcels proposed for annexation are currently receiving services from MEK and short term/temporary noise from sirens is already known and accepted by residents in the project vicinity.

There are no known airports or airstrips in the project vicinity. The reorganization does not have any impact in terms of airport land use plans and noise that may be generated by air traffic in the area. The proposed boundary change does not include the construction of new residential or commercial/office uses that might be impacted by noise generated by day to day airport operations. There are no impacts to Noise associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**L. Population and Housing**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion:

a) – c) **No Impact:** The proposed reorganization does not proposed the construction of new homes or businesses which would directly induce population growth. The boundary change does not propose to displace existing housing nor a substantial number or people living in the area. There is no impact to Population and Housing and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**M. Public Services**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a).Fire protection?			X	
b). Police protection?				X
c). Schools?				X
d). Parks?				X
e). Other public facilities?				X

**Discussion:**

a) **Fire Protection -Less than Significant Impact:** Meeks Bay FPD currently provides services to the 38 parcels that would be annexed into the District’s boundary as part of the proposed project and does not receive financial compensation for such service. This causes a strain on resources. The annexation of these parcels will not cause a greater demand for service or impact response times because services are already provided by the district. The reorganization will have a minor positive financial impact to the District and will help offset some of the financial impacts associated with servicing the area outside its current boundary. The effect of the project will be to offset a long standing boundary service mismatch and the impacts to fire protection services associated with the proposal are considered less than significant and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

b) – e) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of parcels that receive

services from Meeks Bay FPD would have no impact on police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. The reorganization does not affect current services that are provided by these entities nor does it increase a demand for these public services. There is no impact to police protection, schools, parks and other public services associated with the proposed project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**N. Recreation**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – b) **No Impact:** New development is not included as part of the annexation and detachment of parcels into Meeks Bay FPD. A change in the fire district boundary does not trigger an increase in the use of recreational facilities such as parks nor does it require the construction of new facilities. There are no impacts to Recreation associated with the project and therefore mitigation measures are not required.

**O. Transportation/Traffic**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
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				X

intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

**Discussion**

a) – g) **No Impact:** The proposed project would not increase traffic generation in the annexed areas, nor would it increase the level of service standards established for the area. MEK currently provides first response services to the parcels proposed for annexation which are not included in its boundary area. MEK utilizes existing roadways to service these areas that are outside of the established boundary. No new development is proposed with the project that would increase the existing traffic counts or change air traffic patterns. New roadways, parking facilities and modifications to existing roadways are not a part of the proposed project. There are no impacts to Transportation/Traffic associated with the project and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

**P. Utilities and Service Systems**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of				X

new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

**Discussion:**

a) – g) **No Impact:** The annexation and detachment of parcels that are receiving first response services inside and outside of the Meeks Bay FPD would not have an impact on utilities and services systems in and around the project vicinity. The proposed project does not include the construction of new development that would impact existing facilities such as a water treatment plant, storm water drainage facilities, water supply or landfill nor would it require the construction of new facilities. When responding to calls for service outside the boundary area, MEK utilizes the existing facilities such as fire hydrants for water supply. There is no impact to Utilities and Service Systems associated with the proposed project and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
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?				X
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)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

**Discussion**

a) – c) **No Impact:** The proposed project involves the annexation of parcels into the Meeks Bay FPD that already benefit from responses to services calls but are not located in the boundary of the District. It also includes the detachment of several large wilderness areas owned by the state and federal government where service is not needed. No new development is proposed with the reorganization of the Districts' service boundary that would degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat of wildlife species, cause cumulative impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, directly or indirectly

