RECOMMENDED ACTION & JUSTIFICATION:

Adopt a Resolution adopting a Negative Declaration for County Acquisition of portions of properties in the Mariposa Town Planning Area for future use and development of a multi-use recreational park site (locally known as the “Field of Dreams” project). The initial study was written to address potential impacts of purchasing portions of two sites: APNs 012-142-009, 012, 017, 018, 020, and 021 (the BC or Baptist Church Site); and/or portions of APNs 012-350-007 and 009 (the YM or Yosemite Motels Site).

The environmental review document only addresses the potential impacts of the County's purchase of portions of the property, as detailed design work has not been started. The actual design, development and construction of the park will undergo more site-specific and project-specific environmental review in the future, if property is purchased. The County will need to undergo additional public hearings for this environmental review and needed land use and zoning changes in the future.

The County is reviewing optional sites for purchase, as negotiations with property owners are not complete. The County will not purchase all parcels addressed by the environmental review document. This action doesn’t commit the Board to purchasing any parcels.

The item is being brought for action because of deadlines for a Roberti-Z’berg-Harris – Non Urban Needs Basis Grant Program. The environmental determination must be completed prior to May 28, 2003.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS: None, relative to the environmental determination.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Alternatives include postponing the environmental determination until the final negotiations on the property purchase are complete and the Board has given direction to staff for acquiring specific property for the project. The consequences of this action are that the County would potentially lose the grant funding for the project.
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Revised Dec. 2002
TO: ERIC TOLL, Planning Director
FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROPERTY PURCHASE FOR THE RECREATIONAL SPORTS COMPLEX FIELD OF DREAMS
Resolution No. 03-162

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on May 13, 2003

ACTION AND VOTE:

11:56 a.m. Eric Toll, Planning Director;
PUBLIC HEARING to Consider Environmental Determination (Proposed Negative Declaration) for Field of Dreams Property Purchase Options in the Town of Mariposa; County of Mariposa, Project Proponent
BOARD ACTION: Eric Toll presented the staff report, and he advised that only two comments were received during the public review period: 1) from Mariposa Public Utility District (MPUD) relative to annexation; and 2) a purchaser of an adjoining parcel to see what information was available. The public portion of the hearing was opened and there was no public input. The public portion was closed, and the Board commenced with deliberations. Jeff Green, County Counsel, responded to a question from the Board relative to the requested action. (M)Parker, (S)Stetson, Res. 03-162 was adopted adopting a Negative Declaration for the property purchase for the recreational sports complex/field of dreams. Supervisor Balmain commented on the number of projects that Public Works is working on, including those that are needed to comply with State law, and he noted that he receives more input relative to the condition of the roads. Jim Petropulos, Public Works Director, advised that a grant was obtained from the State that is specifically earmarked for property for recreational/parks activities. Ayes: Unanimous.

cc: Jim Petropulos, Public Works Director
Rich Begley, Deputy Director Parks & Recreation
Jeff Green, County Counsel
File
1. **Project Title:** County Acquisition of portions of APNs 012-142-009, 012, 017, 018, 020, and 021 (BC Site); and/or portions of APNs 012-350-007 and 009 (YM Site)

2. **Initial Study Work Sheet**
   - **Prepared by:** Eric Jay Toll, Planning Director
     (by Debbie Vreeland, consultant)
   - PO Box 2039
   - 5100 Bullion Street
   - Mariposa, CA 95338
   - (209) 966-0302

3. **Project Sponsor:** Mariposa County Board of Supervisors

4. **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” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [ ] Land Use and Planning
- [ ] Population and Housing
- [ ] Geophysical
- [ ] Water
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Energy and Mineral Resources
- [ ] Hazards
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities and Service Systems
- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Circulation

5. **Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

   **A. Land Use and Planning. Would the proposal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Be incompatible or substantially alter the existing and planned land uses in the vicinity?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:** 1 - 3) The proposal is a purchase of property that in and of itself will not change the actual land use of this property at this time. However, zoning for this property is Single Family Residential (1/2 acre minimum), anticipated for
private development. Since this is a property purchase by the County, any future
development and usage of this property will alter land use in the vicinity from
private to public. In anticipation of future development as a county multi-use
recreational park project, mitigation in the form of an amendment to the Town Plan
and a rezoning to Public Sites would be required. 2) The proposal does not conflict
with any environmental policies adopted for the County, including those in the
Conservation or Open Space elements of the General Plan. 4) This proposal will
have no effect upon agricultural resources or operations. 5) The transfer of
ownership of this property will not result in a disruption or division of the existing
community.

B. Population and Housing. Would the proposal:

1) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or
indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or
extension of major infrastructure)?  ☒
2) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?  ☒
3) Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the
human population of an area?  ☒

DISCUSSION: 1, 2, 3) This proposal is a property purchase only. Therefore, the
change in ownership will not induce substantial growth, will not displace existing
housing, nor generate human population density changes. Any future project
specific application should be re-evaluated for potential population and housing
effects.

C. Earth/Geologic. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential
impacts involving:

1) Fault rupture or seismic ground shaking or failure including
liquefaction?  ☒
2) Landslides or mudflows?  ☒
3) Change in topography or ground surface relief features?  ☒
4) Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or over-covering of
the soil?  ☒
5) The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique
gologic or physical features?  ☒
6) A substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either
on or off the site?  ☒
7) Unstable earth conditions, subsidence of land, or changes in
gologic substrata?  ☒
8) Changes in deposition or erosion of soil, or changes in
siltation, deposition, or erosion that may modify the channel
of a river or stream?  ☒

DISCUSSION: 1 - 8) This proposal is a property purchase only. No changes to the
physical environment are proposed by this purchase and, therefore, no impacts have
been identified. However, in anticipation of future use of this land as a county-owned multi-use recreational park, further evaluation will be required to understand specific ramifications of park development with potential to alter topography or ground surface relief features.

D. Water. Would the proposal result in:

1) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?  □  □  □  ×
2) Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?  □  □  □  ×
3) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?  □  □  □  ×
4) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?  □  □  □  ×
5) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?  □  □  □  ×
6) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?  □  □  □  ×
7) Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?  □  □  □  ×
8) Impacts to groundwater quality?  □  □  □  ×
9) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?  □  □  □  ×

DISCUSSION: 1 - 9) No physical development or alterations to the property, specifically the ground surface or subsurface, are anticipated by this proposal. It is a property purchase only. Therefore, no impacts to water resources have been identified. It will be necessary, however, to re-evaluate potential water impacts when, in the future, a project proposal for a multi-use recreational park is initiated.

E. Air Quality. Would the proposal result in:

1) Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?  □  □  □  ×
2) Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?  □  □  □  ×
3) The creation of objectionable odors?  □  □  □  ×

DISCUSSION: 1 - 3) No air quality impacts have been identified as a result of the proposed property purchase, and although no air quality impacts are anticipated with the potential future development of a multi-use recreational park in the project area, a re-evaluation would be undertaken at the time a project specific application is initiated.

F. Transportation/Circulation. Would the proposal result in:

□  □  □  ×
DISCUSSION: 1 - 5) No site development is anticipated at this time, as this is a property purchase only. When a specific project proposal is submitted for future development of a county-owned multi-use recreational park at the site, further review and evaluation of potential transportation/circulation impacts will be necessary. It should be noted that successful acquisition of both parcels could provide access to the site from both Highway 49 and Highway 140. Additionally, both sites have frontage along Hospital Road. The Mariposa Specific Plan Section IV, Public Improvement Program, proposes future routes for anticipated traffic increases in Mariposa TPA. A portion of one proposed route runs across the southeasterly tip of the BC Site. A larger portion of this same route runs directly through the entire east-west length of the YM Site.

G. Biological Resources. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

1) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish insects, animals, and birds)?
2) Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees) or natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?
3) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?
4) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

DISCUSSION: 1 - 4) No impact upon biological resources at the site or in the vicinity of the site is expected, as no physical change to this property will occur as a result of this proposal. This proposal is for transfer of ownership of the land only. However, in the future when a project proposal for a multi-use recreational park is submitted for this potential development, a re-evaluation and additional environmental review (pursuant to CEQA and County Environmental Review procedures) will be necessary.

H. Energy and Mineral Resources. Would the proposal:

1) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?
2) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?
3) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and residents of the State?
DISCUSSION: 1) No conflicts with adopted energy conservation plans have been identified as a result of this proposal to purchase property. 2 - 3) The purchase of this property will not result in the inefficient and wasteful use of non-renewable resources, and no known loss of availability of a known mineral resource will result by this change of ownership.

I. Hazards. Would the proposal involve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION: 1 - 4) No explosive materials or hazardous substances are proposed as a part of this property purchase and, therefore, no risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances would result. Additionally, until such time as a development proposal for a multi-use recreational park is initiated, no interference with emergency response or emergency evacuation plans, increased health or fire hazards are anticipated from this property transfer. Once a specific project application for a multi-use park is initiated, further evaluation of potential hazards should be undertaken.

J. Noise. Would the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Increases in existing noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION: 1 - 2) No identified changes in noise levels will occur as a result of this property purchase. However, future development of a multi-use recreational park will require additional review of potential noise generation and noise impacts.

K. Public Services. Would the proposal have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered, government services in any of the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Other governmental services?

**DISCUSSION:** 1 - 5) This proposal is for the purchase of property only and, therefore, no effect on or need for new or altered government services would result. However, once an application for development of a county-owned multi-use recreational park is initiated, it will be necessary to re-evaluate fire protection, police protection, maintenance of public facilities, roads and possibly other governmental services in light of that proposal.

**L. Utilities and Service Systems.** *Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Power or natural gas?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Communications systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Sewer or septic tanks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Storm water drainage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Solid waste disposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Local or regional water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:** 1 - 7) This proposal is for the purchase of property only and, therefore, no impact to existing utilities and service systems is expected. However, once an application for development of a county-owned multi-use recreational park is initiated, it will be necessary to re-evaluate all of the above listed utilities and service systems in light of that proposal. It should be noted, however, that this property is not in the Mariposa Public Utility District (MPUD) that services the Mariposa TPA. Therefore, any future development on this property will require annexation into MPUD for sewer, water, and fire services, as well as a use permit for the development.

**M. Aesthetics.** *Would the proposal:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Create light or glare?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:** 1 -3) The change in land ownership will not impact the aesthetics in or around the property nor create any light or glare. Future development of this property as a multi-use recreational park will require re-evaluation of all potential aesthetic effects in consideration of the proposed project.

**N. Cultural Resources.** *Would the proposal:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6
1) Disturb paleontological or archaeological resources? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]
2) Affect historical resources? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]
3) Have the potential to cause a physical change that would affect unique ethnic cultural values? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]
4) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]

**DISCUSSION:** 1 - 4) The change in land ownership as a result of this property transfer will not create a disturbance to paleontological or archaeological resources, will not affect historical resources or unique ethnic cultural values, and will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the area. Further, it is not anticipated that potential future development as a multi-use recreational park would have an effect on these resources; however re-evaluation of these resources should be undertaken at the time a specific project proposal is initiated.

O. **Recreation. Would the proposal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]
| 2) Affect existing recreational opportunities? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X] |

**DISCUSSION:** 1 - 2) This proposal is for purchase of property only and, therefore, no increase in the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would result. This proposal would not affect existing recreational opportunities either. However, since the future anticipated use for this property is as a county-owned multi-use recreational park, a re-evaluation of the specific park proposal could indicate that a beneficial impact would result.

6. **Mandatory Findings of Significance:**

A. **Potential to Degrade:** 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. **Short-term:** Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental
goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time. Long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

C. **Cumulative:** Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect on the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)

D. **Substantial Adverse:** Does the project have environmental effects that will cause adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

7. **Determination:**

On the basis of this initial study:

- It is found that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared and adopted.

- It is found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in this initial study have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared and adopted.

- It is found that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Prepared for
Mariposa Planning

[Signature]

Eric Jay Toll
Director,
Debbie J. Vreeland
Consultant
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