

# ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

---

Tierra Robles Planned Development  
Zone Amendment 10-002  
Tract Map 1996

Shasta Red, LLC

October 26, 2012

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:**

Tierra Robles Planned Development – Zone Amendment 10-002 & Tract Map 1996, Shasta Red 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:**

Kent Hector AICP, Senior Planner (530) 225-5532

**4. Project Location:**

The project site is located approximately five miles east of the City of Redding, between the unincorporated communities of Bella Vista and Palo Cedro. The 715.4-acre site is bounded by Old Alturas Road to the north and Boyle Road to the south and located 1.6 miles west of Deschutes Road.

**5. Applicant's Name and Address:**

Shasta Red LLC  
Geringer Capital  
9595 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 214  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

**Representative's Name and Address:**

Frank Lehmann  
Frank Lehmann & Associates Consulting  
1212 South Street, Suite B  
Redding, CA 96001

**6. General Plan Designation:**

Rural Residential 'A'

**7. Zoning:**

Rural Residential 5-acre minimum (RR-BA-5), Rural Residential 3-acre minimum (RR-BA-3), and Unclassified (U)

**8. Description of Project:**

The proposed project consists of a residential Planned Development requiring a Zone Amendment (Z10-002) to change the current zoning from Rural Residential 5-acre minimum (RR-BA-5), Rural Residential 3-acre minimum (RR-BA-3), and Unclassified (U) to a Planned Development (PD) zone district establishing a conceptual development plan covering the entire site; and a Tract Map (TR 1996) to divide the 715.4-acre property into 166 residential parcels ranging from 1.5 acres to 7.5 acres in size, and four open space parcels totaling 175.4 acres. As proposed, the project would include a non-contiguous annexation of the 715.4-acre property into County Service Area No. 8, for sewage treatment and disposal. The proposed annexation is considered in this Initial Study, but would be subject to a separate application and approval from the Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

The Planned Development proposes the following design features: (1) Inclusion of solar design in new homes which reduces annual energy usage by 15 percent or more; (2) Variation of housing design and setbacks with not more than 5 percent of the same building footprint or building design; (3) Class 1 public bikeways within the project site; and (4) pedestrian pathways and equestrian trails located along project roadways. The proposed Project would include four open space parcels, ranging in size from 2.62 acres to 150.4 acres, which contain sensitive habitat features and/or species. The largest open space parcel is generally located on steep slopes (>30% slope) adjacent to waterways in the eastern portion of the project site. This open space area would serve as both a conservation and recreation area for the proposed subdivision.

Primary access would be from Boyle Road at the south end of the project with a north-south oriented arterial roadway connecting to Old Alturas Road at the north end of the site. The internal street network would be built to applicable local street standards and would include two bridge crossings of Clough Creek with public utility easements for water, sewer, electricity, telephone and storm-drain improvements within the road right-of-way. Domestic and fire suppression water would be provided by the Bella Vista Water District. The project would require construction of approximately 1.3 miles of sewer line on-site and 3.4 miles of new force main sewer line off-site (and outside the boundary of the County Service Area) within the Boyle Road and Deschutes Road right-of-way. The new off-site sewer main line would extend from the southern portion of the project site to an existing County Service Area No. 8 manhole located near the intersection of Old 44 Drive and Deschutes Road in Palo Cedro. New on- and off-site sewer lines would be sized to meet the requirements of County Service Area No. 8 and LAFCO and upon completion would be dedicated to County Service Area No. 8, which would be responsible for on-going operation and maintenance.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

Surrounding properties are designated Rural Residential A (RA) and zoned Rural Residential (R-R). Adjacent properties to the east, south, and west consist primarily of 5 to 10-acre parcels used for residential and part-time agricultural uses. Properties to the north consist of 80-acre to 160-acre parcels used for residential and cattle grazing activities. A gun and rod club operation is also located on adjacent parcels northeast of the property. The 715.4-acre project site lies at an elevation of approximately 600 to 650 feet above mean sea level with the topography consisting of broad, nearly level meadows, steep hills, ridges, and gullies. The property is dissected by three major drainage systems which include Clough Creek, which flows southwest across the northwest corner of the property, an unnamed stream that flows south across the east central portion of the property, and a major unnamed drainage that flows from north to southeast across the eastern side of the property. In addition, there are two small streams with attached tributaries which drain the central portion of the property. Along Clough Creek there is a narrow belt of riparian habitat interspersed with upland vegetation with annual grasses. Common species found within this area are willows, black cottonwood, and occasional alders. There are also scattered pockets of riparian habitat located along the creek in the northeast portion of the property. California wild grape, Himalayan blackberry, spike rush are also present. The upland areas of the project site have a vegetative composition that is dominated by blue oaks with scattered gray pine over an annual grassland understory. Tree canopy cover ranges from 10 to 50 percent with the majority of the trees being greater than 6" dbh. Annual grasses and forbs comprise the understory with patches of manzanita, coffee berry, and poison oak being the predominant shrubs. Some occurrences of live oak are also found within the steeper draws of the drainage in the northeast corner of the property. Currently, the property is vacant, but has been used for ranching and cattle grazing activities in the past.

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit;  
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) (Region 5): CWA Section 401 Certification;  
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater General Construction Permit;  
California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG): Fish & Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement;  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS): incidental take permit under Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 10 or consultation under ESA Section 7; and  
State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): compliance with National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106.  
Shasta County Environmental Health Division  
Shasta County Department of Public Works  
Bella Vista Water District  
Shasta County Air Quality Management District  
Shasta Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

**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: (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.

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, AICP  
 Senior Planner

10/26/12  
 Date

  
 Richard W. Simon, AICP  
 Assistant Director of Resource Management

10/23/12  
 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.

<b>I. AESTHETICS:</b> 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,b) Scenic vistas are defined as expansive views of highly-valued landscapes from publicly accessible viewpoints. Scenic vistas include views of natural features such as topography, water courses, outcrops, and natural vegetation, as well as man-made scenic structures. The primary character of the project site proposed for development consists of broad, nearly level meadows interspersed with oak trees with a grassland understory. The project site is not located within a State scenic highway. However, development of approximately 540 acres of the project site for the proposed planned development would result in the removal of an undetermined number of oaks and other trees along with the introduction of roadways, bikeways, 166 residential dwellings and accessory buildings which could substantially change the visual character of the project site and potentially result in substantial adverse impacts to scenic vistas and resources.
- c) See previous comments under (a,b)
- d) The development of 166 parcels for residential buildings and uses 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:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> 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) The portion of the project site proposed for residential development is currently used for cattle grazing. Project implementation would result in the conversion of approximately 540 acres of grazing land to non-agricultural uses which would be considered to be a significant impact on agricultural resources.
- b) None of the parcels within the project site are under a Williamson Act contract. While agricultural uses occur on some adjacent properties, these properties are not zoned for agricultural uses, and are not under Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, project implementation would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning.
- c) See discussion under II.a above.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY:</b> 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:

a-d) The applicable air quality plan for the project area is the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin's (NSVAB's) 2009 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. Due to the scale of the proposed project, further analysis is required to determine the extent to which increases in Nitrogen (NOx), Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG), and Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM10) generated from project construction and operational activities may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2009 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 to be potentially significant and will need to be addressed in an EIR.

Another potential air quality impact is the project's incremental increase in emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). These gases, mainly water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), ozone, and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) all act as effective global insulators, reflecting back to earth visible light and infrared radiation. Scientists have theorized that human activities, such as burning coal to produce electricity and gasoline to run cars have accelerated the accumulation of these gases in the Earth's atmosphere which in turn has been causing the Earth's temperature to rise. Scientists predict a warmer Earth may lead to changes in rainfall patterns, smaller polar ice caps, and a rise in sea levels, along with the corresponding impacts on plants, wildlife and humans.

Individual development projects contribute relatively small amounts of greenhouse gases. However, when added to all other greenhouse gas producing activities around the world, the accumulation of these GHG's results in global climate changes. At this time, no state-wide standards or thresholds of significance has been established for what would constitute a cumulatively significant increase in greenhouse gases for individual development projects. In the absence of these thresholds, impacts from individual projects are considered to be less-than-significant if the project incorporates California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)

suggested mitigation measures and reduces its “business-as-usual” emissions levels by 15%, which is in accordance with the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) “Approved Scoping Plan” for reducing overall GHGs in California. Since the proposed project does not contain measures which would reduce its overall GHG emissions levels by 15%, these impacts are considered to be potentially significant and will need to 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. No impact has been identified.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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. <b><u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u></b> 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 wetlands delineation study prepared by Wildland Resource Managers Inc. in December 2008, identified 5.7 acres of Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. and 0.37 acres of Non-Jurisdictional Waters, both consisting of ephemeral and intermittent streams. 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 715.4-acre property. 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 Evaluation prepared by Wildland Resource Managers in January 2005, 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.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<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:

- a-d) An archaeological report prepared by Coyote and Fox Enterprises (July, 2004) for a previous project proposed on the project site indicates that there is at least one prehistoric site on the property which should be considered to be a potentially significant cultural resource. This archaeological report and any further studies necessary to determine the project's potential impacts on cultural resources will be discussed in the EIR.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> – 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</li> <li>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</li> <li>iv) Landslides?</li> </ul>	✓			
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?	✓			
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 may 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 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. All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Uniform Building Code.

iii, iv) The Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared by Brown & Mills, Inc, (December 18, 2006) for a previously proposed project on the project site does not contain sufficient information for determining whether or not all the residential sites would be subject to seismic-related ground failure and/or landslides. Further evaluation in the EIR is required.

b) Construction and development of roads, bikeways, 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. Further evaluation in the EIR is required.

- c) The Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared by Brown & Mills, Inc, (December 18, 2006) for a previously proposed project on the project site does not contain sufficient information for determining whether or not all the residential sites proposed under this planned development 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. Further evaluation in the EIR is required.
- d) The Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared by Brown & Mills, Inc, (December 18, 2006) for a previously proposed project on the project site does not contain sufficient information for determining whether or not all the residential sites proposed under this planned development contains expansive soils. Further evaluation in the EIR is required.
- e) Preliminary indications related to capacity are that sewage collection and treatment for the proposed project could be provided by Shasta County Service Area No. 8.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</b> 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) Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site and transported to and from the site during construction. In addition, some potentially hazardous construction waste may be generated during the construction phase. Construction wastes from the site would be disposed of in accordance with the Standard Specifications in the California Code of Regulations. Compliance with federal and state laws would reduce the potential for hazards related to construction waste to a less-than-significant level.

Operation of the project would not include the use or transportation of significant amounts of potentially hazardous materials, including fuels or other hazardous liquids. The project would therefore not result in a significant hazard to workers, the public, or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable regulations and hazardous materials plans sufficiently minimizes potential exposure and risk.

- b) Construction of the proposed project could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous materials through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site. Accidental releases of these substances could potentially contaminate soils and degrade the quality of surface water and groundwater, resulting in a public safety hazard. Compliance with standard safety procedures and hazardous materials handling regulations will reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- 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) There are no indications at this time that the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) Fire protection services for the project area are provided by the Shasta County Fire Department. The Shasta County Fire Department has indicated that the project is located in an area which is designated as "Moderate" fire hazard severity zone. The project site is considered to be at risk for wildland fires due to the rural character of the project site and existing on-site woodlands. Development of the project site would generally reduce fuels, and therefore fire hazards; however, the increased population would increase the potential for fires to be started.

All roadways, driveways, and buildings for the proposed planned development would be required to be constructed in accordance with the Shasta County Fire Safety Standards. These standards also require the clearing of combustible vegetation around all structures for a distance of not less than 30 feet on each side, or to the property line. The California Public Resources Code 4291 includes a "Defensible Space" requirement of clearing 100 feet around all buildings, or to the property line, whichever is less. In addition, the applicant would be required to prepare a Wildland-Fuel Vegetation Management Plan to address on-site vegetation management in areas within 100 feet of structures, and in open space areas. However, with the increased demand on the Shasta County Fire Department as a result of project build-out, there is a potentially significant impact as it could lead to an increased potential for loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</b> 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?	✓			

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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) 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) Water service for the project is to be provided by the Bella Vista Water District. The District has provided a Will Serve Letter and is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the proposed project.
- c,d,  
e,f) See discussion under a) above.
- 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. No structures are proposed in the 100-year flood hazard area.
- i) Aerial photos show an approximately 9-acre water impoundment located on the adjacent property to the north which in the event of dam failure may impact residential home sites downstream on the project site.
- 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:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> - 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 715.4-acre site is not located in any 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 planned development would require changes to the existing zoning of the 715.4-acre property. In addition, the project would require annexation of the project site, along with the 3.4 miles of force sewer main off-site, into County Service Area No. 8. for sewage treatment and disposal. Policies and regulations regarding both the rezone and annexation necessary to support the proposed project along with potential impacts to the community and County Service Area No. 8 will be evaluated further and discussed in the EIR.
- c) The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There is 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:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> - 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.

<b>XI. NOISE</b> – 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) Construction activities that could produce potentially significant noise levels include use of engine-powered equipment, power tools, impact sounds, and vehicles. The actual period of construction noise and impacts associated with the project would vary with the location of the sensitive receptor, and it should be noted that the noise exposure for a given receptor would not be constant over the construction period. Rather, there are likely to be relatively short intermittent periods (days or weeks) of intense activity. The overall time frame for noise exposure at a given sensitive receptor location would be limited. However, overall noise due to construction activities may result in a potentially significant impact. Additional automobile and truck traffic generated from the proposed project may also result in potentially significant noise impacts to residents along internal project roadways and along connecting roadways to project site. Noise associated with the gun club operation located on adjacent parcels northeast of the property may also significantly impact future residents on nearby parcels proposed in the Planned Development.
- b) The project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There is no identified source of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project area.
- c) See discussion under XI. a).
- d) See discussion under XI. a).
- 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:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> - 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) Project implementation could potentially induce off-site population growth. Off-site population growth may occur due to the proposed construction of approximately 3.4 miles of new force main sewer line within the Boyle Road and Deschutes Road right-of-way, from the southern portion of the project site to an existing County Service Area No. 8 manhole located near the intersection of Old 44 Drive and Deschutes Road in Palo Cedro, and the associate extension of the CSA No. 8 boundary through areas of the County currently not served, or within the existing boundary. The potential for growth inducement on properties adjacent to the 3.4 miles of new force main sewer line off-site may be significant.
- b,c) The project site is primarily undeveloped, and is being used for agricultural purposes. The project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to the displacement of housing and people.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:</b> 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 "Moderate" fire hazard severity zone. However, due to the size of the proposed planned development which includes 166 additional residential parcels, significant additional level of fire protection, including new facilities, 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 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 166 additional residences, with an additional population of 435 persons (use 2.621 persons per household per Calif. Dept. of Finance Official State Estimates as of January 1, 2003). The project may warrant additional sworn or non-sworn peace officers, or related facilities.

**Schools:**

The project area is currently served by The North Cow Creek Elementary District and the Columbia Elementary District. School related impacts will be addressed in the EIR

**Parks:**

See discussion under XIV. RECREATION a,b.

**Other public facilities:**

The proposed project would require construction of approximately 1.3 miles of sewer line on site and 3.4 miles of new force main sewer line off site (within the Boyle Road and Deschutes Road right-of-way) and would require annexation into County Service Area No. 8 for sewage treatment and disposal. County Service Area No. 8 would also be responsible for on-going operation and maintenance of this additional system. Impacts to County Service Area No. 8 from the proposed project will be addressed in the EIR.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>XIV. <u>RECREATION:</u></b>	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) The project would not 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 County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.
- 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. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding also has a number of recreational facilities. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public land available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by Bureau of Land Management.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None proposed

XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> : 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?	✓			
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,b) The project would result in the construction of 166 additional residences, which would be expected to generate ten vehicle trips per day, per residence. A traffic impact study prepared by Omni-means (February, 2008) for a previous project proposed on the subject property indicates that additional vehicle trips generated by the proposed project, along with anticipated traffic from other future development in the area, will require mitigation measures to provide additional capacity (e.g. intersection and roadway widening) and improved control and safety (e.g. intersection signals and roundabouts). This traffic study along with and changes to traffic on local street systems and affected intersections since this study was performed will need to be analyzed and addressed in the EIR.
- 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 Boyle Road and Old Alturas Road, along with other intersections and/or road segments that may be affected, will 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) Project design includes a Class I Bikeway along some of the roadways within the proposed Planned Development. However, the proposed Class I Bikeway does not provide any connection between the project site and school sites, other bikeways, or to shopping areas, and conflicts could result between automobiles, pedestrians, and bicyclists along existing roadways in the area.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</b> 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?	✓			
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) 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.
- b) The proposed project would require construction of approximately 1.3 miles of sewer line on site and 3.4 miles of new force main sewer line off site (within the Boyle Road and Deschutes Road right-of-way) and would require annexation into County Service Area No. 8 for sewage treatment and disposal. Shasta County Department of Public Works states that a sewer capacity study will be required to determine any necessary additional improvements to existing County Service Area No. 8 treatment facilities resulting from the proposed project.
- c) The project would introduce impervious surfaces (e.g. roads, building sites) to a currently undeveloped area and therefore may have the potential to alter long-term drainage and groundwater infiltration patterns on and off site. The location, size and maintenance of the storm water drainage system will be analyzed and discussed in the EIR.
- d) The project site is located within the Bella Vista Water District. Development of the proposed planned development will require extension of the District's water lines to serve the proposed residential parcels for domestic water use and fire protection purposes and will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) See discussion under b) above.
- f) At present, information has not been received indicating whether or not the project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- g) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** Additional project and environmental data, further discussion and analysis of environmental impacts, 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.

<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	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 potential environmental effects which may 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.  
  
Based on the discussion and findings in Section V. Cultural Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is 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 has potential environmental effects which may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

**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

PROJECT NUMBER Z10-002 & TR1996 – Shasta Red 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. *“Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Limited Geologic Hazards Evaluation of Proposed Residential Subdivision, Chatham Ranch, Shasta County, California”*, Brown & Mills, Inc., December 18, 2006.
2. *“Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch (820 Acres North of Boyle Road) between Deschutes Road and Old Alturas Road, Palo Cedro, Shasta County, California”*, Coyote and Fox Enterprises, July 28, 2004.
3. *“Additional Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch Development”*, Coyote and Fox Enterprises, April 3, 2006.
4. *“Chatham Ranch Biological Evaluation”*, Wildland Resource Managers, January 2005.
5. *“Wetlands Delineation for Chatham Ranch”*, Wildland Resource Managers, December 2008.
6. *“Chatham Ranch Development Traffic Impact Study”*, Omni-Means, February 2008.
7. *“Chatham Ranch Development Urbemis Air Quality Analysis”*, Omni-Means, January 2009.
8. *“Sewer System for Tierra Robles Subdivision”*, Lawrence & Associates, January 2011.
9. *“Chatham Ranch Wetlands Delineation Addendum”*, Wildland Resource Managers, May 2011
10. *“Wetland Delineation Addendum for Proposed Sewer Line Route”*, Wildland Resource Managers, May 2011 (On CD).

**Conclusion/Summary:** Based on a field review by the Planning Division and other agency staff, information provided by the applicant, and existing information available to the Planning Division, the project could potentially result in 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, 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.
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.