ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

General Plan Amendment 09-002, Zone Amendment 09-013,
Use Permit 09-018, and Reclamation Plan 09-001

Moody Flats Quarry, LLC

April 12, 2011

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
References and Documentation

Prepared by
SHASTA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, California 96001

SHASTA COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY

1. Project Title:
General Plan Amendment 09-002, Zone Amendment 09-013, Use Permit 09-018, and Reclamation Plan 09-001, Moody Flats Quarry LLC

2. Lead agency name and address:
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001-1759

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Bill Walker, AICP, Senior Planner (530) 225-5532, bwalker@co.shasta.ca.us

4. Project Location:
The proposed project site is in the Mountain Gate area of Shasta County, approximately one mile west of the Old Oregon Trail / Interstate 5 interchange, and adjacent to the city boundary on the north side of the City of Shasta Lake. Access to the project would be via a proposed access road connecting to the east side of Wonderland Boulevard at a point approximately 0.4 miles south of the intersection of Wonderland Boulevard and Old Oregon Trail. The project site is also about one mile southeast of Shasta Lake. The Union Pacific Railroad runs in a general northeast to southwest direction through the project site.

5. Applicant Name and Address:
Moody Flats Quarry, LLC, 3M Center Building 224-5N-60, St. Paul, MN 55144

6. General Plan Designation:
Portions of the site have a General Plan land use designations of Mineral Resource (MR), Industrial (I), or Suburban Residential (SR). Areas along portions of Moody Creek and Rancheria Creek on the project site are designated as Significant Streamside Corridors.

7. Zoning:
Portions of the site are in the Mineral Resource Zone District (MR), the General Industrial Zone District (M), the Interim Rural Residential Zone District (I-R), or the Community Commercial Zone District combined with the Design Review Zone District (C-2-DR). Areas along Moody Creek and Rancheria Creek on the project site are also in the Restrictive Flood Zone District (F-2).

8. Description of Project:
1. Proposed General Plan Amendment 09-002 to change the General Plan land use designation of three parcels totaling 233.55 acres from Suburban Residential (SR) to Mineral Resource (MR); the designation of two parcels totaling 0.06 acres from Rural Residential A (RA) to Mineral Resource (MR); and the designation of one 512.7-acre parcel from Mineral Resource (MR) and Industrial (I) to Mineral Resource (MR).

2. Proposed Zone Amendment 09-013 to change the zoning of three parcels totaling 233.55 acres from the Interim Rural Residential Zone District (IR) to the Mineral Resource Zone District (MR); the zoning of of two parcels totaling 0.06 acres from the Community Commercial Zone District combined with the Design Review Zone District (C-M-DR) to the Mineral Resource Zone District (MR); and the zoning of one 512.7-acre parcel from the Mineral Resource Zone District (MR) and the General Industrial Zone District (M) to the Mineral Resource Zone District (MR).

3. Use Permit 09-018 for a proposed 345-acre quarry (including a 60-acre overburden fill area) with a 75-acre processing area including an aggregate crushing, screening, and washing plant, a Portland cement concrete plant, an asphalt concrete plant, a recycled construction materials processing plant, truck and railroad loading facilities,

and access roads. The quarry production would be about 2 million tons per year of which about 75% would be shipped by rail and 25% shipped by truck. The quarry would operate from 6 am to 10 pm, Monday through Friday, and 6 am to 3 pm on Saturdays. Processing, loading, and hauling would occur up to 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The proposed term of the use permit would be 100 years.

4. Reclamation Plan 09-001 to reclaim the proposed 345-acre quarry (including a 60-acre overburden fill area), the 15-acre primary processing plant area and the10-acre railroad cut area. The secondary and ancillary processing and loading area would remain for use as an industrial site. A total of about 430 acres would be disturbed, and about 370 acres would be reclaimed. The reclaimed areas would be used for open space and possibly water storage.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is located in a hilly area with a small valley about one mile south of Shasta Lake, about one mile west of Interstate 5, and adjacent to the north side of the City of Shasta Lake. The Union Pacific Railroad runs in a general northeast-southwest direction through the site. The site is currently undeveloped and includes oak and gray pine woodland and grassland. Surrounding land uses (with their direction relative to the project site) include:

North: Federal land managed by the U.S. Forest Service, including the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, and the Shasta Unit of the Whiskeytown Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area..

Northeast: Lehigh Southwest Cement Company's Falkenbury Shale Quarry.

East: Residences and commercial development on Wonderland Boulevard and the Interstate 5/Old Oregon Trail interchange. The closest residence in this direction (on Flintstone Avenue) is about 0.5 mile east of the proposed processing plant site.

Southeast: Vacant land in the City of Shasta Lake which is planned for a mix of highway-oriented commercial development as well as residential development.

South: Vacant land (owned by the applicant) and residences. The closest residence in this direction (on Black Canyon Road) is about 0.4 miles from the proposed south pit site.

Southwest: Vacant land (owned by the applicant) and residences. The closest residence in this direction (on Digger Bay Road) is about 0.5 miles from the proposed south pit site.

` West: Vacant land (owned by the applicant) and residences. The closest residence in this direction (on Lake Boulevard) is about one mile from the proposed north pit site.

Northwest: Federal land managed by the U.S. Forest Service, including the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, and the Shasta Unit of the Whiskeytown Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area. The Shasta Lake boat launching areas of Centimudi and Digger Bay Marina are approximately one mile from the proposed north pit site. Shasta Dam is about 1.6 miles northwest of the proposed north pit site.

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

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
Regional Water Quality Control Board
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Conservation, Office of Mine Reclamation
Shasta County Air Quality Management District
Shasta County Environmental Health Division
Shasta County Department of Public Works

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.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the 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.

X I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR of NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Bill Walker, AICP, Senior Planner at (530) 225-5532 or bwalker@co.shasta.ca.us.

_____ _____

Bill Walker, AICP
Senior Planner

Date

_____ _____

Richard W. Simon, AICP
Assistant Director of Resource Management

Date

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 parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if all 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 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.

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 (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) 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, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are "Less-than-significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," 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.

6) 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.

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 the following:

   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.

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The 700 foot-high southeast-facing high wall of the North Pit of the quarry would be visible from Interstate 5 in the Mountain Gate area near the south boundary of the Shasta Unit of the Whiskeytown Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area. The proposed South Pit of the quarry may be visible from Digger Bay Road and residential areas of the City of Shasta Lake. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project site is not visible from a designated scenic highway. However, Figure SH-1 of the Scenic Highways Element of the Shasta County General Plan, and the Shasta County Map of the California Scenic Highway Mapping System, show that the section of Interstate 5 from which the project site would be visible is a section of highway that is "Eligible for Official Scenic Highway Designation." This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The 700-foot-high southeast-facing rock face cut into the side of the hill in the proposed North Pit, and structures in the processing and loading areas, would be at least partially visible from sections of Interstate 5 and a number of other locations in Shasta County. The proposed South Pit would be visible from Digger Bay Road and residences to the southwest of the pit. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. There would be lighting from the proposed nighttime project operations, and there may also be security lighting. Glare could be caused by materials used for construction of structures on the project site. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the 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 Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	**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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2008. However, according to the soil survey maps prepared by Soil Conservation Service (now called the Natural Resource Conservation Service), there are two soil types found on the project site: Red Bluff loam 3 to 8% slopes, and Churn gravelly loam, deep, 0 to 3% slopes, which are considered prime farmland if irrigated; and one soil: Auburn loam 0 to 8 % slopes, which is considered "farmland of statewide importance." Some of these soils are found in areas proposed to be used for mining and for the processing and loading facilities. This issue is considered **potentially significant** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

c) The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

d) The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

e) The project could involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in

conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. As noted in a) above, the site has soils which are prime farmland if irrigated and a soil which is considered a soil of statewide importance. At least some of the roads and the mining, processing and loading facilities on the site would occur in these soil areas. This issue is considered **potentially significant** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 emission 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: Based on related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2009 Attainment Plan for Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan. Potential emissions may include, but are not necessarily limited to, particulate matter from the quarrying operations, crushing and screening equipment, from the Portland cement concrete plant, the recycled materials plant and loading of trucks and railcars; and nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, volatile organic compounds ,and diesel particulate matter, from on-site mobile equipment, on-site internal combustion engines used to power stationary equipment, the asphalt concrete plant, and from off-site mobile sources (e.g. trucks and railroad engines). This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could violate air quality standards. The project could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. See a) above. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of one or more criteria pollutants, including, but not limited to, ozone, ozone pre-cursors, or PM10 (particulate matter), the pollutants for which the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin is in non-attainment under the applicable State ambient air quality standard. See a) above. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The locations of sensitive receptors and pollutant concentrations have not yet been determined. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project could cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The proposed project includes an asphalt plant. Odor complaints have been associated with existing asphalt plants in other areas of Shasta County. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial 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 of 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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) One species identified as a special-status species by the California Department of Fish and Game, the Northern Clarkia (*Clarkia borealis ssp. borealis*), has been observed on the project site. A number of special status plants, fish and wildlife species have been know to occur in the region and have the potential to occur on the project site. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community on the project site or in the project area. There is riparian habitat in the area to be mined and in the area where the processing plant would be located. Parts of the streams which flow through the project site would be placed in culverts. Clearance of vegetation on the site for the quarry, processing areas and loading areas will also result in the removal of oak woodland. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands on the project site and in the immediate vicinity. The Delineation of Waters of the United States, prepared by Benchmark Resources, indicated the presence of Waters of the United States, including federally protected wetlands, on the project site. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project could interfere with native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project would result in the loss of various habitat types, which could affect fish and/or wildlife species. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project could conflict with ordinances and/or policies which protect biological resources. Significant effects to species and/or loss of habitat would conflict with polices in Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat of the Shasta County General Plan. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The applicants have submitted a copy of the survey titled "Archeological Inventory Survey, 3M Development Project, c.2,500 acres, Near Mountain Gate, Shasta County, California, December 15, 2006," Author: Sean Michael, Jensen, M.A. Genesis Society, Paradise, CA. This study states that the four historic sites on the project site are recommended not eligible under any of the relevant evaluative criteria, and no specific treatment or mitigative action is recommended in relation to potential impacts to the sites that might accompany proposed build-out of the 3M Project. However, this study should be peer reviewed as part of further analysis in an Environmental Impact Report. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The survey cited above states that future development plans could potential include impacts to one or more of the seven prehistoric sites, all of which are recommended as eligible for the National Register per National Register Criterion d because category(s) of data present at these sites remains unevaluated or incompletely evaluated. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) Upon review of the Minerals Element of the General Plan, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. However, this issue will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project site could be on, or adjacent to, a cemetery or burial area. Given the prehistoric sites on the project site, there is evidence to suggest that the project could disturb human remains. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publications 42.			**X**	
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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	**X**			

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) i) The project is unlikely to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps for Shasta County, there is no known earthquake fault on the project site. Other fault geologic maps do not indicate active (i.e. Holocene) faults on the project site or in the immediate area. This is

considered a **less than significant** impact, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

ii) The project is unlikely to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking: According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The entire County is in Seismic Design Category D. According to the Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, California, prepared by Woodward Clyde, dated July 6, 1995, the most significant earthquake at the project site may be a background (random) North American crustal event up to 6.5 on the Richter scale at distances of 10 to 20 km. This is considered a **less than significant** impact, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

iii) The project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, triggered by blasting, which could cause liquefaction. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

iv) The project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides, triggered by blasting which could cause landslides. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The quarry operation would include the removal of topsoil and subsoil to expose the rock to be quarried. This could result in substantial soil erosion and/or the loss of topsoil. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project is located in an area which could become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, or collapse. The overburden fill area has the potential slope failure. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project would not be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property. The site soils are not described as expansive soils in the "Soil Survey of Shasta County." This is considered a **less than significant** impact, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project could have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. The soils on the project site have not yet been tested for wastewater treatment and to demonstrate compliance with adopted sewage disposal criteria. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	**X**			
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	**X**			

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project will generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the

environment. The use of internal combustion engines for on-site mobile equipment, power generation for on-site stationary equipment, and for off-site transportation including trucking and rail transportation will generate carbon dioxide emissions. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Shasta County is in the process of developing a Regional Climate Action Plan. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	**X**			
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: Based on these comments, the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials to be used on site may include, but are not limited to, paints, fuels, lubricants, waste

lubricants, solvents, antifreeze, explosives, compressed gases, coolants, flocculants, asphalt, asphalt emulsion, Portland cement, Portland cement and admixtures. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could 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. See a) above. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project site is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. There is no historical evidence of any commercial activity on the site that would have used hazardous materials. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

g) The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

h) The project could 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. The project is located in an area which is designated a "VERY HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 new 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	**X**			

IX. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
offsite?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	**X**			
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	**X**			
g) Place housing within 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 risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	**X**			
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	**X**			

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could violate water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements. Erosion from exposed soils could result in significant off-site runoff water turbidity and sediment transport. In addition, hazardous material used on the site could result in pollution of surface water and/or ground water. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The application indicates that the project would use approximately 260 acre-feet of water per year. It is not clear how much of this water would come from on-site wells, and whether the withdrawal of groundwater would cause draw down in nearby wells or otherwise affect groundwater supplies in the area. It is also not clear whether the project could affect groundwater recharge. A water supply assessment is needed for this project. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which could result in substantial erosion and siltation on- or off-site. The excavation of the quarry area would significantly alter the topography of the site which would alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. Exposure of soils and rock could cause substantial erosion and siltation on-site and off-site. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, and could substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Removal of soil on the site would increase the amount of exposed rock surface on site, which would increase the impervious surface area and could result in increased surface runoff which could result in off-site flooding. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project could create or contribute runoff water which could exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. See a) through d) above. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

f) The project could substantially degrade water quality. Increased turbidity, sediment, and hazardous waste pollutants could substantially degrade water quality. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

g) The project would not place housing within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

h) The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. No structures are proposed in the 100-year flood hazard area. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

i) The project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. Increased runoff from the site could cause off-site flooding. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

j) The project would not result in inundation by seiche or tsunami, but could result in inundation by mudflow. The project is not located near a large lake or the ocean and so would not be subject to seiche or tsunami. However, disposal of overburden from the quarry would create a large hill of waste soil and rock material which could cause a mudflow. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not physically divide an established community. The project site is located north of the City of Shasta Lake and west of the community of Mountain Gate. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project would be consistent with the Mineral Resource (MR) and Industrial (I) General Plan land use designations and the Mineral Resource (MR) and General Industrial (M) zone districts of the project site. Other areas are proposed to be redesignated and rezoned from residential or commercial designations and zone districts to the Mineral Resource designation and Zone District. However, the project must be reviewed for consistency with other General Plan policies. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There are

no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed. The EIR prepared for this project will include a review of the project's consistency with the Shasta County General Plan and other applicable land use plans and regulations.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant 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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not 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. In fact the project would make available the mineral resources on the site, and the proposed use of rail for transporting aggregate material from the project site will make these mineral resources economically available to a significantly larger area of the region and the State than if truck transportation alone were available. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource, and there is no other land use plan which addresses minerals. However, the project will result in making the on-site mineral resources available as noted in Section a) above. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	**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				**X**

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				**X**

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Shasta County General Plan, or applicable standards of other agencies. The Shasta County General Plan Noise Element establishes standards for maximum allowed noise levels from industrial development. Analysis is needed of potential noise levels from the project including, but not limited to, the proposed quarry operations, including drilling, blasting, and movement of aggregate materials, washing, crushing and screening of the aggregate, the Portland cement concrete plant, the asphalt plant, the recycle plant, as well as the truck and rail loading facilities. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could result in exposure of persons to, and generation of, excessive groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels. The proposed quarry operation would include blasting which could cause significant groundborne vibrations which could affect local homes, businesses, and infrastructure. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The quarry would operate from 6 am to 10 pm, Monday through Friday, and 6 am to 3 pm on Saturdays. Processing, loading, and hauling would occur up to 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Analysis is needed of potential noise levels from project including, but not limited to, the proposed quarry operations, including drilling, blasting, and movement of aggregate materials, washing, crushing and screening of the aggregate, the Portland cement concrete plant, the asphalt plant, the recycle plant, as well as the truck and rail loading facilities. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. See c) above. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			**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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. The project could result in the creation of 25 to 50 jobs, which could result in a population increase of an estimated 63 to 126 people (based on a formula of one job per household and 2.52 persons per household). This increase in population would not induce a substantial population growth in the area. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project site is currently undeveloped, and the project does not include destruction of any existing housing. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project would not displace substantial numbers of people. The project site is currently undeveloped, and the project itself would not displace any people. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?			**X**	
Police Protection?			**X**	
Schools?			**X**	
Parks?			**X**	
Other public facilities?			**X**	

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

The project would not 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:

Fire Protection: The project is located in a "VERY HIGH / HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. However, no significant additional level of fire protection would be necessary. On-site fire protection equipment would be required to be installed according to the County Fire Safety Standards. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Police Protection: The County has a total of 147 sworn and 119 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff's deputies) for the County population of 71,091 (Calif. Dept. of Finance, Official State Estimates as of May 2009) persons in the unincorporated area of the County. That is a ratio of one officer per 267 persons. The project will result in 25 to 50 jobs, which could result in a population increase of an estimated 63 to 126 people (based on one job per household and 2.52 persons per household). This is not considered a significant number to warrant any additional sworn or non-sworn peace officers. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Schools: The resultant development from the project will be required to pay the amount allowable per square foot of construction to mitigate school impacts. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Parks: The County does not have a neighborhood parks system. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Other public facilities: No other public facilities would be significantly affected by this project. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

XV. RECREATION:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			**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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not significantly 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. The project could result in the creation of 25 to 50 jobs, which could result in a population increase of an estimated 63 to 126 people (based on one job per household and 2.52 persons per household). This increase in population would cause a less-than-significant increase in the use of local recreational facilities. Also, the County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities. This is a **less than significant** impact and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

XVI. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	**X**			
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	**X**			

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. The project could cause an increase in traffic (particularly truck traffic) which would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The project could reduce the level of service at intersections near the Interstate 5 / Old Oregon Trail interchange. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. The quarry would not have any features which would affect air traffic. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The potential impacts of the

proposed encroachment of the project access road on Wonderland Boulevard has not yet been analyzed, nor the potential need to upgrade the Interstate 5 / Old Oregon Trail interchange. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project could result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency access to the project is proposed to be provided by the following roadways: Digger Bay Road and possibly Black Canyon Road. These proposed emergency access routes have not yet be analyzed. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

f) The project could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Based on the potential impacts discussed above, the project could conflict with County policies, plans or programs. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				**X**
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	**X**			
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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project is not served by a public wastewater treatment system. On-site septic systems will be used. No other wastewater treatment system would be affected by the project, except that it is possible that the project may accept treated effluent from the City of Shasta Lake. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) The project could result in the construction of new public water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project may accept treated effluent from the City of Shasta Lake. The location and design of a line from the Shasta Lake wastewater treatment facility to the project site has not yet been determined. The project will also be served by individual wells. On-site septic systems will be used for sewage disposal. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) The project would require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. A significant stormwater drainage system will be required for this project. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

d) The project may not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements may be needed. The project will be served by individual wells, stormwater impoundments, recycled wash water, and possibly treated effluent from the City of Shasta Lake. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

e) The project would not result in a determination by a public 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. The project will not be served by a public wastewater treatment system. On-site septic systems will be used. No other wastewater treatment system would be affected by the project. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

f) The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The West Central Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the waste generated from this project and is in compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

g) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. There is **no impact** related to this environmental topic, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below the 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 the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects	**X**			

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	**X**			

Discussion:

a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the project could 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 the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Based on the discussion and findings in Section V. Cultural Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the project could have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is evidence to suggest that the project could have impacts that are cumulatively considerable. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

c) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is evidence to support a finding that the project could have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This is considered a **potentially significant impact** and will be further addressed in the EIR.

Mitigation/Monitoring: Additional project and environmental data, environmental impact analysis, recommendations for mitigations for potential impacts, and a mitigation monitoring plan, will be included in an Environmental Impact Report to be prepared for this project.

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 09-002, ZONE AMENDMENT 09-013, USE PERMIT 09-018, AND RECLAMATION PLAN 09-001, MOODY FLATS QUARRY LLC

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Special Studies: The following project-specific studies have been completed for the proposal and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Negative Declaration. These studies are available for review through the Shasta County Planning Division.

1. Moody Flats Quarry Project , Project Description, Revised February 2011, prepared by Benchmark Resources of El Dorado Hills, CA
2. Moody Flats Quarry Project , Reclamation Plan, Revised February 2011, prepared by Benchmark Resources of El Dorado Hills, CA
3. Moody Flats Quarry Project, Environmental Assessment, Revised February 2011, prepared by Benchmark Resources of El Dorado Hills, CA
4. Moody Flats Quarry Project, Botanical Survey Report, November 1, 2010, prepared by North State Resources, Inc, of Redding, CA
5. Moody Flats Quarry Project, Biological Resources Assessment, November 1, 2010, prepared by North State Resources, Inc, of Redding, CA
6. 3M Moody Flats Quarry, Shasta County, CA, Revegetation Plan, December 27, 2010, prepared by Biotic Resources Group of Soquel, CA
7. Moody Flats Quarry, Stormwater, Erosion Control, and Drainage Plan, Shasta County, California, May 2010, prepared by Trevor Crawford, Civil Engineer, 3M Facilities Engineering, St. Paul, MN
8. Slope Stability Evaluation, 3M Moody Flats Quarry, Shasta County, California, December 7, 2009, prepared by PETRA of Murrieta, CA
9. Air Quality Impact Analysis, Moody Flats Quarry Project - Redding, California, February 8, 2011, submitted by Golder Associates Inc., of Lake Oswego, OR
10. Moody Flats Quarry Project, Delineation of Waters of the United States, September 17, 2010, prepared by North State Resources, Inc, of Redding, CA
11. Moody Flats Quarry Project Shasta Salamander Surveys, May 6, 2010, prepared by North State Resources, Inc, of Redding, CA
12. Archeological Inventory Survey, 3M Development Project, c.2,500 acres, Near Mountain Gate, Shasta County, California, December 15, 2006, Author: Sean Michael, Jensen, M.A. Genesis Society, Paradise, CA
13. Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration, 3M Plantsite Development, Mountain Gate California, March 1981, prepared by CH2MHill, Redding, CA
14. Field Investigation Report, Hydrology Analysis, 3M Hard-Rock Aggregate Quarry, Shasta County, California, June 30, 2009, prepared by Brown and Caldwell, Rancho Cordova, CA
15. Hydrology and Water Quality Analysis of the Proposed 3M Moody Flats Quarry, Use Permit and Reclamation Plan, Shasta County, California, June 2005, prepared by 3M industrial Mineral Products Division, St. Paul, MN
16. Environmental Noise Assessment, Moody Flats Quarry, Shasta County, California, November 30, 2009, Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc., Newcastle, CA

Agency Referrals: Prior to an environmental recommendation, referrals for this project were sent to agencies thought to have responsible agency or reviewing agency authority. The responses to those referrals (attached), where appropriate, have been incorporated into this document and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Environmental Impact Report. Copies of all referral comments may be reviewed through the Shasta County Planning Division. To date, referral comments have been received from the following State agencies or any other agencies which have identified CEQA concerns:

1. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
2. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
3. U.S. Forest Service Shasta -Trinity National Forest
4. California Department of Fish and Game
5. California Department of Conservation, Office of Mine Reclamation
6. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
7. Caltrans
8. City of Shasta Lake Electric Utility
9. City of Shasta Lake Development Services
10. Shasta Lake Fire Protection District
11. Shasta County Fire Department
12. Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency
13. Shasta County Department of Public Works
14. Shasta County Air Quality Management District
15. Shasta County Environmental Health Division
16. Mountain Gate Community Services District

SOURCES OF DOCUMENTATION FOR INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All headings of this source document correspond to the headings of the initial study checklist. In addition to the resources listed below, initial study analysis may also be based on field observations by the staff person responsible for completing the initial study. Most resource materials are on file in the office of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001, Phone: (530) 225-5532.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

1. Shasta County General Plan and land use designation maps.
2. Applicable community plans, airport plans and specific plans.
3. Shasta County Zoning Ordinance (Shasta County Code Title 17) and zone district maps.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.8 Scenic Highways, and Section 7.6 Design Review.
1. Zoning Standards per Shasta County Code, Title 17.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands.
2. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.

III. AIR QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan Section, 6.5 Air Quality.
2. Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin, 2006 Air Quality Attainment Plan.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Air Quality Management District.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timberlands, and Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
2. Designated Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Plants and Candidates with Official Listing Dates, published by the California Department of Fish and Game.
3. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Game.
4. Federal Listing of Rare and Endangered Species.
5. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
6. State and Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, published by the California Department of Fish and Game.
7. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Game.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.10 Heritage Resources.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
   a. The Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico.
   b. State Office of Historic Preservation.
   c. Local Native American representatives.
   d. Shasta Historical Society.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.1 Seismic and Geologic Hazards, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands, and Section 6.3 Minerals.
2. County of Shasta, Erosion and Sediment Control Standards, Design Manual
3. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.
1. Alquist - Priolo, Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.4 Fire Safety and Sheriff Protection, and Section 5.6 Hazardous Materials.
2. County of Shasta Multi-Hazard Functional Plan
3. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
   a. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
   b. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
   c. Shasta County Sheriff's Department, Office of Emergency Services.
   d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
   e. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Regional Water Quality Control Board,

Central Valley Region.

\\admin\PNShare\Bill\Moody Flats Quarry\Initial Study\Moody Flats Quarry project.Initial Study.04-12-11.wpd

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.2 Flood Protection, Section 5.3 Dam Failure Inundation, and Section 6.6 Water Resources and Water Quality.
2. Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Shasta County prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, as revised to date.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Public Works acting as the Flood Control Agency and Community Water Systems manager.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Shasta County General Plan land use designation maps and zone district maps.
2. Shasta County Assessor's Office land use data.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

3. Shasta County General Plan Section 6.3 Minerals.

XI. NOISE

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.5 Noise and Technical Appendix B.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.1 Community Organization and Development Patterns.
2. Census data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
3. Census data from the California Department of Finance.
4. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.3 Housing Element.
5. Shasta County Department of Housing and Community Action Programs.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.5 Public Facilities.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
   a. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
   b. Shasta County Sheriff's Department.
   c. Shasta County Office of Education.
   d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

XIV. RECREATION

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.9 Open Space and Recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.4 Circulation.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
   a. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
   b. Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
   c. Shasta County Congestion Management Plan/Transit Development Plan.
3. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Rates.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
   a. Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
   b. Pacific Power and Light Company.
   c. Pacific Bell Telephone Company.
   d. Citizens Utilities Company.
   e. T.C.I.
   f. Marks Cablevision.
   g. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
   h. Shasta County Department of Public Works.