

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

PANORAMA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
General Plan Amendment 07001
Zone Amendment 07-004
Tract Map 1960

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:**
Panorama Planned Development - General Plan Amendment 07-001, Zone Amendment 07-004, Tract Map 1960
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:**
Kent Hector, Senior Planner (530) 225-5532
4. **Project Location:**
The project occupies 307 acres located in the northeast portion of the Cottonwood Planning Area, approximately 1 mile south of the City of Anderson. The project area is bounded by Locust Road to the west with Trefoil Lane and Balls Ferry Road to the south.
5. **Applicant Name and Address:**
Mark Rychlik
Romar Inc.
18540 Bywood Lane
Cottonwood, CA 96002
6. **General Plan Designation:**
Rural Residential A (RA), Rural Residential B (RB)
7. **Zoning:**
Rural Residential (R-R), Limited Residential - Mobile Home District (R-L-T)
8. **Description of Project:**
General Plan Amendment 07-001, to change the land use designation of the property from Rural Residential "A" (RA) and Rural Residential "B" (RB) to Suburban Residential (SR); Zone Amendment 07-004, to change the zoning from Rural Residential (RR) District and One Family Residential, combined with a Mobile Home (R-1T) District, to a Planned Development (PD) District; and Tract Map 1960 to subdivide the 307- acre site into 440 lots, ranging from 4,000 square feet to over 3 acres in size, along with 130 acres being preserved as open space.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project site is primarily surrounded by lands designated for rural residential development to the north, east, and west and suburban residential to the south. The City of Anderson is located approximately 1 mile to the north. Topography consists mainly of rolling foothills which slope down to open grassland south of the project area. Project elevation ranges from 450 to 600 feet above sea level.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):** California Regional Water Quality Control Board; California Department of Fish and Game; US Army Corps of Engineers; State Water Resources Control Board.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of the initial environmental study:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described 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 or 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 Kent Hector, Senior Planner at (530) 225-5532.

Kent Hector
Senior Planner

Date

Richard W. Simon
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?	✓			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	✓			
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	✓			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	✓			

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-c) The project is located in an area that is visible from the surrounding community and has ridge lines that would be developed with residences. The conversion of the current open space views of this property to views of residential development could result in a potentially significant adverse impact on scenic resources.
- d) Development of 440 residential parcels could potentially create a new source of substantial light or glare which could result in night sky illumination and/or other adverse effects on day and nighttime views in and around the area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

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 Mode (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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?				✓
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				✓
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				✓

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,b) According to the County’s General Plan, the project site is currently designated Rural Residential A and Rural Residential B and are not considered agricultural lands. The proposed general plan amendment and rezone would allow an increased density of residential development on property which is already primarily designated for residential uses. The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance according to the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2004. As such, the project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural uses.
- c) The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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?	✓			
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	✓			
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	✓			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	✓			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

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:

Short-term sources of air emissions from the project will be vehicles and construction equipment associated with the development of infrastructure, roads, and homesites. Long-term potential air emissions will result from substantial vehicle traffic and wood burning activity from future residential development of the proposed lots.

- a-d) The applicable air quality plan for the project area is the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin’s (NSVAB’s) 2003 Air Quality Attainment Plan (“Plan”). The Plan is primarily concerned with the pollutant ozone for which the NSVAB has been designated non-attainment. In particular the Plan presents strategies necessary to attain the California ambient air quality standard for the 1-hour ozone standard at the earliest practicable date. Further analysis is required to determine the extent to which increases in dust and NO_x generated from the proposed project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2003 Air Quality Attainment Plan as well as what, if any, mitigation measures should be incorporated to reduce the impacts to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, these impacts are considered potentially significant and will be addressed in an EIR.
- e) Due to the characteristics of the proposed development, it is unlikely that the project would cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u> 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?	✓			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓			
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?	✓			
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?	✓			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	✓			
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?				

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-c) The Draft Delineation of Waters of the United States study prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc. in August 2006, identified 2.5 acres of pre-jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. consisting of seasonal wetlands, riparian areas, vernal swale, and ephemeral and intermittent drainages within a portion (132.2 acre survey area) of the project site. Potentially significant impacts to existing riparian and wetland areas on the property could occur due to the removal or disturbance of vegetation and wildlife habitat resulting from the development of project access roads, driveways, and future home sites on the 307 acre site. In addition, increased surface water runoff mixed with sediments and various pollutants generated from future residential development and uses on the property may adversely impact water quality in wetland areas located on or adjacent to the property.
- d) Due to the large scale of the project, the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors may be significantly impacted from future development of the property.
- e) Shasta County Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 95-157 provides guidance regarding use and protection of oak trees on a voluntary basis. The Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc. in October 2006, identified Blue Oak Woodlands within the project site. Due to the large scale of the proposed development, the project has the potential to significantly impact this biological resource.
- f) No habitat conservation plans or other similar plans have been adopted for the project site or project area.

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.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> – 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?	✓			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	✓			
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	✓			
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	✓			

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:

Information about the project was sent to the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, which reviewed the project and commented that the project area is considered to be sensitive for prehistoric, protohistoric, and historic cultural resources. They state that a cultural resources survey is required in order to determine the potential impacts on these cultural resources.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> – 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides? 	✓			
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	✓			
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?	✓			

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	✓			
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?				✓

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 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;

According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps for Shasta County, there is no known earthquake fault on the project site.

ii) 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 project site is located in Uniform Building Code Zone 3, described as an area of “moderate seismicity.” 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. All future structures associated are required to be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Uniform Building Code.

iii, iv) See comments under VIc)

b) Construction and development of roads, residential sites, and driveways for the proposed development would result in substantial grading, soil compaction, removal of vegetation, and the creation of impervious surfaces; all of which could contribute to a significant increase in wind erosion and in the amount of surface water runoff, both of which would result in greater erosion of soils on and off the project site.

c) Information has not been submitted to show whether or not the proposed residential sites would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) There is no information available on whether the proposed project site contains expansive soils.

e) Sewage collection and treatment for the proposed project would be provided by Shasta County Service Area No. 17.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

VII. 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?				✓
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?				✓
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	✓			
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?				✓

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 would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed uses resulting from the project are residential and no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is anticipated as a result of the project.
- b) The project would not 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.
- c) The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 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.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) See response to 15 d,e).
- h) The project would not 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 Shasta County Fire Department has indicated that the project is located in an area which is designated a“VERY HIGH” Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Shasta County Fire Department regulations require that defensible space be provided by the removal of all

flammable vegetation within a minimum of 100 feet of all structures.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

VIII. 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?	✓			
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)?	✓			
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?	✓			
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 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?	✓			
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	✓			
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?				✓
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
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?				✓
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

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,c,d,e,f)

The tentative subdivision map shows numerous drainages throughout the project site. Construction and development of roads, residential sites, and driveways for the proposed development would require substantial grading, and result in soil compaction, removal of vegetation, and the creation of impervious surfaces; all of which could contribute to changes in drainage patterns and a significant increase in the amount of surface water runoff, erosion of soils and discharge of sediments into existing drainages and to riparian and wetland habitat located on and off the project site.

b) The Cottonwood Water District has indicated that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new infrastructure improvements to adequately serve the project with water for domestic uses and fire suppression purposes. The applicant has indicated that addition well(s) on site will be required to serve the project. Considering the potential quantity of water required to the serve 440 additional residences, impacts to groundwater supplies in the area could be significant.

- 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. The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.
- h) The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i) The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. There are no levees, dams, or impoundments within or upstream from the project area which would create flooding in the event of levee or dam failure.
- j) The project would not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project is not located near a large lake or the ocean so would not be subject to seiche or tsunami. It is not located on or near a mountainside or hillside which is subject to mudflows.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

IX. 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?				✓
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?	✓			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

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 does not include the creation of any road, ditch, wall, or other feature which would physically divide an established community.
- b) The proposed General Plan Amendment would change the land use designation of the property from Rural Residential “A” (RA) and Rural Residential “B” (RB) to Suburban Residential (SR). The zone amendment would change the zoning from Rural Residential (RR) District and One Family Residential, combined with a Mobile Home (R-1T) District, to a Planned Development (PD) District. The current General Plan designation and zoning for the subject property allows for the creation of approximately 138 residential parcels at an overall density of one dwelling unit (DU) for each 2.2 acres. The proposed General Plan designation, zoning, and tract map would significantly increase the number of residential parcels to 440 at an overall density of 1.4 DU per acre..
- c) Shasta County Board of Supervisors’ Resolution No. 95-157 provides guidance regarding use and protection of oak trees on a voluntary basis, however, there are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

X. 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?				✓
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?				✓

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. There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site.
- b) The project would not 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. The project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource. There is no other land use plan which addresses minerals.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XI. 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?	✓			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	✓			
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the 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?				✓

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,b) The project could result in generation of substantial additional vehicle and traffic noise exposing areas within the project adjacent to higher-speed roadways to noise exceeding the standards established in the general plan.
- c,d) A significant increase in periodic and permanent noise levels in the project vicinity could result from future construction activities and substantial number of potential new residents from the proposed development.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XII. 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)?	✓			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

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 result in substantial population growth in community of Cottonwood. The population growth resulting from 440 potential new residences and approximately 1154 persons, based on the County-wide average of 2.6 persons per household, is a substantial population increase for this area. The current General Plan designation and zoning for the subject property allows for approximately 138 residences or a population of 362 persons.
- b) The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project does not include destruction of any existing housing.
- c) The project would not displace substantial numbers of people.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XIII. 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?	✓			
Police Protection?	✓			
Schools?	✓			
Parks?	✓			
Other public facilities?	✓			

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 could 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 fire hazard severity zone. Significant additional levels of fire protection may be necessary.

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 70,508

persons in the unincorporated area of the County (Calif. Dept. of Finance, Official State Estimates as of May 2006). That is a ratio of one officer per 256 persons. The project will result in 440 additional residences, with an additional estimated population of 1154. The proposed project may warrant additional sworn or non-sworn peace officers.

Schools:

Due to the potential increase in population, this project may result in the need for more schools. The resultant development from the project will be required to pay the amount allowable per square foot of construction to mitigate school impacts.

Parks:

Although the County does not have a neighborhood parks system, the proposed project may impact parks in other jurisdictions.

Other public facilities:

Additional services may be needed as a result of this project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XIV. 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?	✓			
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?	✓			

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) Due to the substantial number of residents which could result from the proposed project, existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the area may be significantly impacted..
- b) The project would include passive outdoor recreational facilities such as bike trails/pedestrian walkways. The need for construction or expansion of additional on-of off-site recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment is not known at this time.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	✓			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highway?	✓			

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	✓			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	✓			
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				✓
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓

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) Construction of 440 additional residences in the area will result in a substantial increase in traffic in comparison to existing traffic loads on the street system. A traffic study will be necessary as part of the EIR.
- b) Changes in Level of Service (LOS) at affected intersections and along affected road segments, and its significance would need to be analyzed in the EIR as part of a detailed traffic study.
- c) The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. The project would result in the construction of single-family residences which would not affect air traffic patterns.
- d,e) The potentially significant increase in vehicular trips on existing roadways, could result in an increase in traffic hazards on roads and at intersections leading to and from the site. Access connections with Locust Road, Balls Ferry Road, and Jim Dandy Lane will need to be addressed in the EIR Traffic study. Other intersection and/or road segments may also be affected and would need to be addressed in the EIR.
- f) The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. The project design incorporates adequate area for off-street parking in accordance with County standards.
- g) The project does not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed Class 1 bicycle path proposed by the applicant for this project is consistent with the Shasta County General Plan Circulation Element policies for transit and pedestrian bicycle modes, the 1998 Shasta County Bikeway Plan, and with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XVI. 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?	✓			
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?	✓			

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	✓			
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project which serves or may serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	✓			
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?	✓			
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	✓			
g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓

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,b) The project will require off-site construction of a sewer forced main from the project site to Community Service Area No. 17. There are no indications at this time whether or not the proposed project would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- c) The project will 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.
- d) The Cottonwood Water District has indicated that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new infrastructure improvements to adequately serve the project with water for domestic use and fire suppression purposes.
- e) The project would result in a determination by Community Service Area No. 17 that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demands for wastewater treatment .
- f) At present, information has not been received indicating whether or not the West Central Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the waste generated from the potential 440 additional residences from the project.
- g) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project will not generate any solid waste other than common household waste. Recycling facilities are available in the major shopping areas available to the project site.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XVII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</u>	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?	✓			
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 of probable future projects)?	✓			
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	✓			

Discussion:

- a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the project would 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.
- b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is evidence to support a finding that the project would have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation/Monitoring: To be developed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

PROJECT NUMBER GPA 07-01; Z07-004; TR 1960 (Panorama Planned Development)

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. Draft Delineation of Waters of Waters of the United States, Panorama Point, Shasta County, California, prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc., August 2006.
2. Draft Delineation of Waters of Waters of the United States, Panorama Point Extension, Shasta County, California, prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc., October 2006.
3. Biological Resource Assessment, Panorama Point, Shasta County, California, prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc., August 2006.
4. Biological Resource Assessment, Panorama Point Extension, Shasta County, California, prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc., October 2006.
5. Preliminary Traffic Generation and Distribution Assessment, prepared for the proponent by Omni-Means, April 2007.
6. Preliminary engineering studies and correspondence with Shasta County regarding Domestic Water and Sewage Treatment system improvements, August, 2006 – January, 2007.

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 Negative Declaration. 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. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
2. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
3. Cottonwood Water District
4. City of Anderson
5. Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
6. Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District
7. Shasta Mosquito and Vector Control District

Conclusion/Summary: Based on a field review by the Planning Division and other agency staff, early consultation review comments from other agencies, information provided by the applicant, and existing information available to the Planning Division, the project could result in the creation of significant environmental impacts.

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.
2. 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, 1991 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.
4. 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.

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

1. 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.