

---

## 3.0 ERRATA DOCUMENT

---

### 3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

---

Page 2-2, second paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The maximum hours of operation would be from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with average *normal* hours from 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Page 2-2, third paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The maximum hours of operation would be from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with average *normal* hours from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Page 2-2, fifth paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The *primary* existing driveway approach from SR 89 would be upgraded to "Type C" standards of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which typically includes a deceleration right turn lane and an acceleration lane.

Changes affecting Table 2-1 in the Executive Summary are represented by the changes in the sections that follow.

### **3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Page 3-1, first paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The eastern boundary of McArthur Burney Falls Memorial State Park is located approximately ~~4.1~~ 1.3 miles northwest of the project site, and Lake Britton is approximately 3 miles north.

Page 3-4, first paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

Currently the site is owned by *Rim Rock Corporation*. Hat Creek Construction, Incorporated, who is the project applicant.

Page 3-11 of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

The height of the bluff is approximately 70 feet.

Page 3-14, first paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The hours of operation of the batch plant would also be from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with average *normal* hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Page 3-14, third paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The hours of operation would be from 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with the average *normal* hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Comment noted. Page 3-18 of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

Sewer service would be provided by septic systems. *Three separate septic systems were installed approximately 7 months ago to meet Shasta County specifications.* Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides both electricity and natural gas to the project site. The project would require the extension of existing electrical and gas lines onsite, by a distance of 600-1,800 feet.

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

No changes.

#### 4.2 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Page 4.2-1, third paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

In the vicinity of the project site, the main scenic attraction is Burney Falls, located within McArthur Burney Falls Memorial State Park approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  1.3 miles northwest of the project site.

#### 4.3 AIR QUALITY

Page 1, first paragraph is revised as follows:

This section evaluates the potential impacts of the project on air quality. Potential impacts include emissions of dust and other pollutants from the plants and other activities on the project site, and traffic emissions. The impact analysis is based upon an air quality study conducted by Air Permitting Specialists, which is attached to this document as Appendix C. *Additional air quality analysis was conducted as a part of a more aggressive "worst-case" scenario developed for the proposed project. This analysis is found in the Final EIR. However, conclusions reached in the DEIR regarding impacts have not changed, and in general mitigation measures remain the same.*

Page 4.3-13, Mitigation Measure 4.3.3a, is modified to read as follows:

- MM 4.3.3a** *On days when trucks and loaders are active, All areas with vehicle traffic, including unpaved roadways, shall be watered periodically or in the following manner:*
- *Normal days (winds below 25 mph) - Spray with water truck 2 times daily, once in the morning and again in the early afternoon.*

### **3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR**

---

- *Windy days (winds above 25 mph) - Spray with water truck 6 times daily, once in the morning and then 5 additional times in equal increments throughout the work day.*

*In addition, unpaved roadways shall have dust palliatives applied for stabilization of dust emissions.*

Page 4.3-14, Mitigation Measure 4.3.4a is revised to read as follows:

**MM 4.3.4a** If complaints are received regarding the emission of odors from the asphalt plant, the plant shall be required to use odor counteractants which shall be introduced into the stack flue gas to neutralize any odors that may be produced. *In the event that counteractants do not mitigate odors from the flue stack, the project proponent shall use a thermal oxidizer to control odors.* This mitigation shall be incorporated as a condition for approval of a "Permit to Operate" by SCAQMD.

#### **4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Page 4.4-8, fifth paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

A request for water quality certification (including WDRs) by the RWQCB would be required for any project which would need a Section 404 permit from the ACOE. *A request for water quality certification for the project was submitted to the RWQCB in September 1999. The RWQCB responded that the application would remain incomplete until a copy of the final environmental documentation for the project is received.* A Notice of Intent application for a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities is required for any project which would result in the disturbance of five or more acres.

Page 4.4-10, Mitigation Measure 4.4.1a, is modified to read as follows:

**MM 4.4.1a** The project applicant shall retain a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct an annual survey for active bald eagle and osprey nests within one-quarter mile of the active operational areas of the quarry. The survey shall be conducted ~~on~~ *from April 15 to May 15* of each year, *depending upon weather conditions.* If an active nest is found within one-quarter mile of the active operational areas of the quarry, no blasting shall occur until the young have fledged. The biologist shall submit a report to the Planning Division after completion of the

survey. This measure does not preclude blasting activities occurring prior to the survey date.

*Timing/Implementation: April 15 - May 15 of each year.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: Shasta County Department of Resource Management - Planning Division.*

Page 4.4-11, Impact 4.4.2 on of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

The wetland delineation conducted in 1999 concluded that there are 0.71 acres of wetland area that are classified as "waters of the United States". ~~Such~~ *Filling of wetlands are* ~~is~~ subject to the permitting process of *the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)*. The project applicant proposes to fill approximately 0.32 acres of ~~these~~ wetlands. Under ~~new~~ *current* ACOE regulations, ~~and because of the small area planned for fill~~, a fill permit for the *planned wetland fill* area is not required, but ACOE must be notified in advance of the fill. Nevertheless, since the project ~~would~~ result in an *additional* decrease in wetland area, the impacts ~~to jurisdictional wetlands associated with~~ of the project on ~~jurisdictional wetlands~~ *is are considered potentially* significant and subject to mitigation.

#### 4.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Pages 2-17, 4.5-12 and 4.5-13, Mitigation Measure 4.5.4a, is modified to read as follows:

##### MM 4.5.4a

The project applicant shall submit and receive approval of a grading plan ~~for the project activities located in the proposed C-M zone, with which all project grading and construction work shall be in compliance.~~ The Building *Environmental Health* Division shall review the grading plan and shall inspect the project site at the time grading work is performed and completed. The Planning Division shall conduct ongoing monitoring to ensure that the objectives of the grading plan have been met.

*Timing/Implementation: Grading plan to be submitted and approved prior to issuance of grading permit. Monitoring to be conducted during project implementation and thereafter as part of an annual mine inspection program.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: Shasta County Department of Resource Management - Planning Division, Building Environmental Health Division.*

#### 4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Page 4.6-3, last paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

### 3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

---

- Monitoring the installation, removal and leakage of both ~~aboveground and underground tanks~~. *The Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for oversight of aboveground tanks.*

Page 4.6-4, first and second paragraphs, is modified to read as follows:

~~The Environmental Health Division indicates that it is being equipped to provide hazardous materials identification services in Shasta County. As part of this service, the County will be able to respond to requests for assistance in identifying unknown materials to determine if they are dangerous.~~

#### OTHER AGENCIES

The Shasta County Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has regulations concerning the emission of certain substances. Large cases of hazardous material contamination and violations are referred to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The DTSC is responsible for much of the state regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and wastes. The Shasta County Fire Department has requirements pertaining to the containment of onsite hazardous materials. *It is also responsible for providing hazardous materials response and identification services for the County. As part of this service, the County will be able to respond to requests for assistance in identifying unknown materials to determine if they are dangerous.*

### 4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Page 4.7-1 of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

Within the proposed commercial-light industrial zone, drainage generally flows in a south to north direction. However, this flow is intercepted at the northern end of the zone by a drainage ditch, which sends flows it receives eastward *and then northward again where it settles in the undeveloped north end of the parcel site.*

Page 4.7-1, last paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The project site is within the Burney Creek watershed (**Figure 4.7-1**). The nearest stream to the project site is Burney Creek, approximately one mile to the west. Overflows from Burney Creek entered the project site during flood events in 1995 and 1997. In the flood of 1997, water accumulated a few feet deep along the north side of the former log pond and between the pond dike and the slope to the east. The water eventually exited the site to the northeast *northwest*, going back to Burney Creek under SR 89.

Page 4.7-11 of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

Several components of the projects would require the use of water, which would be provided by existing wells on the project site. The most significant water user would be the crushing and screening operation, which would use water to wash processed material. As stated in Section 3.0, Project Description, the operation *of the crushing and screening facility* would use approximately 900,000 gallons of water per year on average. *For impact analysis purposes, it is assumed that the quarry, the concrete plant, the asphalt plant, and the repair shop will use the same amount of water as the crushing and screening operation. Therefore, the maximum amount of water that would be consumed by the project per year would be approximately 4.5 million gallons (this is described in more detail in Impact 4.7.6, pg. 4.7-13/15). This amount includes water* ~~Water would also be required for dust control activities at the plant sites and on unpaved portions of the site.~~

Page 4.7-11 of the DEIR is modified to read as follows:

Wash water *from the crushing and screening operation* would be conveyed via pipeline to the retention basins.

Pages 4.7-11 and 4.7-12 of the DEIR are modified to read as follows:

~~The project site was once the location of a sawmill and a planing mill. A log pond, now empty, remains on the project site from these former operations. The pond is 21.93 acres in size. Assuming that three feet of water was maintained in the log pond, this would mean that the log pond held approximately 21.4 million gallons of water. The source of this water was from wells on the site. Not only was groundwater used to fill the log pond, but it was used to replenish pond water lost by evaporation and by percolation. In addition, groundwater was used to fill the former plywood pond south of the log pond. The plywood pond was approximately nine acres in size. Finally, water was consumed by lumber processing operations, although the amount consumed is not known.~~

Concern has been raised regarding project impacts on flows *to nearby falls, including at Burney Falls, wells, and natural springs* the water for which are supplied principally by underground springs. *Regarding the project site, the Carlson Report states that historically "a large pond (approximately 40 acres) . . . [was] supplied by the constant pumping of groundwater" (Carlson 11/4/86, p. 2). Not only was groundwater used to fill the log pond; it was used to replenish pond water lost by evaporation and by percolation. In addition, groundwater was used to fill the former plywood pond south of the log pond. And finally, water was consumed by lumber processing operations. According to Larry Mason, former manager of Louisiana Pacific, a 4,000 gallon per minute (gpm) pump ran 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the warmest 6 months of the year for the life of the saw mill project. The 4,000 gpm pump ran the other 6 months, but was not pumping 24 hours a day. To put this into perspective, this pump may have extracted 5.76 million gallons of groundwater per day. The proposed aggregate project intends to use 4.5 million gallons annually, or 1 million gallons less than the previous land use consumed in a single day.*

### 3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

---

*This comparison is not intended to dismiss the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, but simply provides a context in comparison to the site's historical use. Previous sawmill operations, with its large consumption of groundwater, have apparently not affected flows at the falls. Moreover, the main source of Burney Falls water appears to be the Burney Mountain-Crater Peak area, which would not be affected by the project.*

*Moreover, as discussed in more detail in Impact 4.7.6, the proposed project's maximum annual allowable groundwater extraction of 13.8 acre-feet (4.5 million gallons) represents 0.0000554 percent of the annual outflow in the water budget for the Burney Basin developed for the Three Mountain Power Plant project (see Table 4.7-1: Water Budget for Burney Basin) (Bond, 2000). The extraction of 13.8 acre-feet would represent 0.0001045 percent of the flow over Burney Falls utilizing the same water budget (Bond, 2000). In addition, pumping will primarily take place during the summer construction months, and will be sporadic depending on specific project demands and dust abatement requirements. The fact that minor groundwater level drops associated with project pumping should rebound to natural levels quickly is supported by permeability testing conducted by Carlson in his hydrogeologic investigation for the site. He noted during constant discharge pumping tests that "[d]espite the relatively high pumping rates (up to 700 gpm in [one pump]) almost all of the observed drawdown occurred in the first minute to 30 seconds. Likewise when the pump was turned off, recovery of groundwater levels was faster than could be measured" (Carlson 11/04/86, p. 8). Given the relatively low demand on groundwater resources for the proposed project compared to historical uses, and the generally quick recovery rate of groundwater levels after pumping ceases, and because the maximum allowable annual groundwater extraction of 13.8 acre-feet (4.5 million gallons) represents a minor percentage of the overall outflow of the Burney Basin water budget outflow, impacts on groundwater supplies are considered less than significant.*

Page 4.7-15, is modified to read as follows:

. . . the total amount of water that would be consumed by the project per year would be approximately 13.8 acre-feet, or 4.5 million gallons.

#### 4.8 NOISE

Page 1, first paragraph is modified to read as follows:

This section describes the noise environment at and near the project site, and it analyzes potential noise impacts generated by the proposed project. The analysis includes the potential impacts of noise generated by project construction, project operations and traffic on noise-sensitive areas, primarily residences. The evaluation is based upon a noise analysis conducted by Bollard and Brennan, Inc. *Additional noise analysis was conducted as a part of a more aggressive "worst-*

*case" scenario developed for the proposed project. This analysis is found in the Final EIR. However, conclusions reached in the DEIR regarding impacts have not changed, and in general mitigation measures remain the same.*

Page 4.8-6, Policy N-b, is modified to read as follows:

N-b                    Noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources shall ~~ne be~~ mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of **Table 4.8-2** as measured immediately within the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses.

Page 4.8-16, Mitigation Measure 4.8.8b, is modified to read as follows:

**MM 4.8.8b**            Blasting shall not create any vibration detectable without instruments ~~at or outside of~~ the parcel boundaries *of the nearest residence to the project site.*

Page 4.8-17, Mitigation Measure 4.8.8e, is modified to read as follows.

**MM 4.8.8e**            The project applicant shall notify all residents and businesses within 1.5 miles of the blast site at least 24 hours prior to each blast *by telephone.* The project applicant shall also notify the Fire Dispatch Center by telephone at 225-2411 *and the Planning Division* at least 24 hours prior to each blast. *The Planning Division shall verify that the project applicant has notified nearby residents and businesses, and shall enforce appropriate penalties if proper notification is not given.*

#### **4.9 RECREATION**

Page 4.9-1, second paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

*Approximately ¾ mile northwest of the project-site parcel within which the project is located* is McArthur Burney Falls Memorial State Park.

Page 4.9-2, third paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

A portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail is located north and east of the project site. The Pacific Crest Trail extends approximately 2,650 miles from Canada to Mexico, traversing the states of Washington, Oregon and California. Its closest approach to the project site is approximately ~~900~~ **5,000** feet east of the eastern boundary.

#### **5.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR**

---

No changes.

### **6.0 OTHER EVALUATIONS REQUIRED BY CEQA**

No changes.

### **7.0 REPORT PREPARERS AND REFERENCES**

No changes.

### **APPENDIX B - TRAFFIC VOLUME ESTIMATES**

Page A-2, first paragraph, is modified to read as follows:

The maximum annual *allowable* production capacity of the concrete plant would be 25,000 cubic yards. Assuming that all other conditions are the same as under average operating conditions, the number of daily truckloads generated by maximum production would be 20, which equals the estimate made by the project applicant. This means that 40 total truck trips would be made. If the amount of raw material required increases proportionately with the increase in end product, then 25,000 cubic yards of concrete would require approximately 4,063 cubic yards of cement, 9,375 cubic yards of sand, and 11,563 cubic yards of coarse aggregate. These amounts of raw materials would generate approximately 4 truckloads daily, or 8 total truck trips per day. Heavier truck traffic would likely occur only during limited times of the year, generally during the busiest time of the construction season. *The allowable capacity is the basis for the development of the worst case scenario for traffic impacts. Based upon conversations with the project applicant, it is estimated that approximately 100 truckloads of concrete could be loaded during times of maximum production, which equals 200 truck trips. The maximum number of permitted hours of operation for the concrete batch plant is 14 hours. Therefore, approximately seven truckloads could be loaded per hour, or one truckload could be loaded every 8.57 minutes. It must be noted that this circumstance would occur very infrequently, given the likely local market for the product. Also, it is assumed that raw materials such as aggregate and sand would be stockpiled in anticipation of increased production.*

Pages A-2 and A-3 are modified to read as follows:

The maximum *allowable* production capacity of the asphalt plant, including operation of a portable drum mix plant, would be 100,000 cubic yards annually, or an additional 90,000 cubic yards. This extra demand would be generated by a large paving project. Typically, such a project is anticipated to result in a higher level of activity for a time period of approximately six weeks (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 1999). Assuming the asphalt plant

operates six days per week during this six-week period, the daily production rate would be approximately 2,500 cubic yards, or 3,750 tons. Therefore, the number of daily truckloads generated by maximum production would be 150, or 300 truck trips per day. If the plant operated 12 hours per day, this would mean one truckload every five minutes. If the amount of raw material required increases proportionately with the increase in end product, then an additional 7,200 cubic yards of sand would be required. These amounts of raw materials would generate approximately 12 truckloads daily, or 24 total truck trips per day. *The allowable capacity is the basis for the development of the worst case scenario for traffic impacts. Based upon conversations with the project applicant, it is estimated that approximately 150 truckloads of concrete could be loaded during times of maximum production, which equals 300 truck trips. The maximum number of permitted hours of operation for the concrete batch plant is 16 hours. Therefore, approximately 9.5 truckloads could be loaded per hour, or one truckload could be loaded every 6.31 minutes. Again, it must be noted that this circumstance would occur very infrequently, given the likely local market for the product. Also, it is assumed that raw materials such as aggregate and sand would be stockpiled in anticipation of increased production.*

Page A-3, fourth paragraph is modified to read as follows:

Because the truck repair shop is *to* be used only for vehicles owned by Hat Creek Construction, the number of trips generated by this facility was not considered in this analysis.

Page A-4, Table A-1 is modified to read as follows:

Project Activity and Traffic Type	Daily Traffic Volumes	
	Average	Worst Case
Concrete batch plant truck	16	48 200
Asphalt plant truck	12	324 300
Other industrial activities truck	15	60
Commercial-Light Industrial Zone vehicle	47	70
Employee commute vehicle	50	74
Miscellaneous vehicle	30	45
<b>Total</b>	170	621 749

## APPENDIX C - AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS

Page 1 is modified to read as follows:

### 3.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

The project elevation is approximately 850 3,000 feet above sea level.

Table 4-1 is modified to read as follows:

<i>Regulation</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Specific Standard</i>
Rule 2.1	Permits required	Any new source must obtain an ATC prior to construction of the facility unless specifically exempt from the District Rules and Regulations
<del>Rule 2.13</del> <i>Rule 5</i>	Title V Permits	Misc. administrative requirements for major sources
Rule 4.2	Nuisance	Discharge of any air contaminant that causes injury, annoyance, discomfort or safety is prohibited
<del>Rule 4.4</del> <i>Rule 3.2</i>	Specific Air Contaminants	Limits of emissions of NOx, CO, SO <sub>2</sub> , PM and Fluorine compounds
<del>Rule 4.5</del>	Particulate Matter	<del>Limits on hourly PM emissions for a given process wt.</del>
Rule 4.12 <i>Rule 3.1</i>	New Source Performance Standards <i>State and Federal Laws</i>	Subpart I limits opacity and concentration of particulate matter
Rule 4.13	National Standards or Hazardous Air Pollutants	Limits on discharge of certain hazardous air pollutants
Rule 6.1	Standards for Permits to Construct	Misc. requirements related to BACT, emission calculations and offsets.
Rule 6.2	Standards for Permits to Operate	Misc. requirements.
AB 2588	Toxic "Hot Spots" Act	Facilities emissions <i>emitting</i> any regulated pollutant considered a toxic air contaminant must prepare an emissions inventory and possibly a health risk assessment