Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P. O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH # _____

Project Title: Parcel Map 18-001

Lead Agency: Shasta County Department of Resource Management – Planning Division Contact Person: Luis A. Topete, Associate Planner

Mailing Address: 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103 Phone: (530) 225-5532

City: Redding, CA Zip: 96001 County: Shasta

Project Location: County: Shasta County City/Nearest Community: Redding

Cross Streets: Power Line Road and Placer Road Zip Code: 96001

Lat. / Long.: 40° 33′ 13″ N/ 122° 25′ 49″ W Total Acres: 50.17

Assessor's Parcel No.: 203-160-019-000 Section: 9 Twp.: 31N Range: 5W Base: MDBM

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 299 Waterways: Jenny Creek Tadpole Creek; Olney Creek

Airports: Benton Airpark Railways: N/A Schools: West Redding Preschool; Saint Joseph; Early Foundations Children's Academy

Document Type:

CEQA:
- ☐ NOP
- ☐ Early Cons
- ☐ Neg Dec
- ☒ Mit Neg Dec
- ☐ Draft EIR
- ☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR (Prior SCH No.) _____
- Other _____

NEPA:
- ☐ NOI
- ☐ EA
- ☐ Draft EIS
- ☐ FONSI

Other:
- ☐ Joint Document
- ☐ Final Document
- ☐ Other _____

Local Action Type:

- ☐ General Plan Update
- ☐ General Plan Amendment
- ☐ General Plan Element
- ☐ Community Plan
- ☐ Specific Plan
- ☐ Master Plan
- ☐ Planned Unit Development
- ☐ Site Plan
- ☐ Rezone
- ☐ Prezone
- ☐ Use Permit
- ☒ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
- ☐ Annexation
- ☐ Redevelopment
- ☐ Coastal Permit
- ☐ Other _____

Development Type:

- ☒ Residential: Units 2 Acres 50.17
- ☐ Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
- ☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
- ☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____
- ☐ Educational _____
- ☐ Recreational _____
- ☐ Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____
- ☐ Transportation: Type _____
- ☐ Mining: Mineral _____
- ☐ Power: Type _____ MW _____
- ☐ Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD _____
- ☐ Hazardous Waste: Type _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

- ☐ Aesthetic/Visual
- ☐ Agricultural Land
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☒ Archeological/Historical
- ☒ Biological Resources
- ☐ Coastal Zone
- ☐ Drainage/Absorption
- ☐ Economic/Jobs
- ☐ Fiscal
- ☐ Flood Plain/Flooding
- ☒ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
- ☐ Geologic/Seismic
- ☐ Minerals
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Population/Housing Balance
- ☐ Public Services/Facilities
- ☒ Recreation/Parks
- ☐ Schools/Universities
- ☒ Septic Systems
- ☐ Sewer Capacity
- ☐ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
- ☐ Solid Waste
- ☐ Toxic/Hazardous
- ☐ Traffic/Circulation
- ☒ Vegetation
- ☐ Water Quality
- ☐ Water Supply/Groundwater
- ☒ Wetland/Riparian
- ☒ Wildlife
- ☐ Growth Inducing
- ☐ Land Use
- ☐ Cumulative Effects
- ☐ Other _____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Rural Residential (R-R) Zoning / Rural Residential A (RA) General Plan

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*

The request is to subdivide a 50.17-acre parcel into two residential parcels of 9.35 and 4.4 acres and a 36.42-acre remainder parcel. Should the parcel map be approved, the remainder parcel will be annexed into the City of Redding by pending LAFCO annexation proposal (Application #AN1-04). The remainder is proposed to facilitate the development of the Campo Calle Area – Westridge.

Note: The state Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "**X**".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "**S**".

_____ Air Resources Board
_____ Boating & Waterways, Department of
_____ California Highway Patrol
_____ CalFire
_____ Caltrans District # _____
_____ Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
_____ Caltrans Planning (Headquarters)
_____ Central Valley Flood Protection Board
_____ Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy
_____ Coastal Commission
_____ Colorado River Board
_____ Conservation, Department of
_____ Corrections, Department of
_____ Delta Protection Commission
_____ Education, Department of
_____ Energy Commission
X____ Fish & Game Region # 1____
_____ Food & Agriculture, Department of
_____ General Services, Department of
_____ Health Services, Department of
_____ Housing & Community Development
_____ Integrated Waste Management Board
_____ Native American Heritage Commission

_____ Office of Emergency Services
_____ Office of Historic Preservation
_____ Office of Public School Construction
_____ Parks & Recreation
_____ Pesticide Regulation, Department of
_____ Public Utilities Commission
X____ Regional WQCB # 5____
_____ Resources Agency
_____ S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
_____ San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers and Mtns Conservancy
_____ San Joaquin River Conservancy
_____ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
_____ State Lands Commission
_____ SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
_____ SWRCB: Water Quality
_____ SWRCB: Water Rights
_____ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
_____ Toxic Substances Control, Department of
_____ Water Resources, Department of

_____ Other _____
_____ Other _____

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date April 10, 2020 Ending Date May 11, 2020

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Contact: _____
Phone: _____

Applicant: Greenview Development Company
Address: 1822 Buenaventura Blvd. Suite 105
City/State/Zip: Redding CA 96001
Phone: 530-242-8000

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: Paul A. Hell **Date:** 4/8/20

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATEDNEGATIVE DECLARATION

Parcel Map 18-001
Greenview Development Company

April 8, 2020

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY &
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
WITH
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 & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. **Project Title:**
Parcel Map 18-001 (PM18-001)

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:**
Luis A. Topete, Associate Planner (530) 225-5532

4. **Project Location:**
The project is located in the west Redding area, adjacent to Powerline Road, approximately five-tenths of a mile southeast of the intersection of Placer Road and Powerline Road (Assessor Parcel Number 203-160-019).

5. **Applicant Name and Address:**
Greenview Development Company
1822 Buenaventura Blvd, Suite 105
Redding, CA 96001

6. **General Plan Designation:**
Rural Residential A (RA)

7. **Zoning:**
Rural Residential (R-R)

8. **Description of Project:**
The request is to subdivide a 50.17-acre parcel into two residential parcels of 9.35 and 4.4 acres and a 36.42-acre remainder parcel. Should Parcel Map 18-001 be approved, the remainder parcel will be annexed into the City of Redding by pending LAFCO annexation proposal (Application #AN1-04). The remainder is proposed to facilitate the development of the Campo Calle Area – Westridge.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project site is bounded of the east side by the Westridge Master Plan development (City of Redding) and on the south and west by Powerline Road and large rural residential parcels. The project area is undeveloped with predominately mixed chaparral in the areas designated for development and blue oak/foothill pine on the north and western most areas of the project site including three small ephemeral creeks and one small intermittent creek in areas exceeding thirty-percent slope.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):**
Centerville Community Services District
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Shasta County Department of Public Works

11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation?** On March 21, 2017, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California submitted a formal request for notification of projects

located within the Tribe's geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation. Information describing the project area was sent to the Tribal Representative on February 4, 2020 by certified mail. The letter was received February 6, 2020. No request for consultation was received within the 30-day referral time.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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		Energy
	Geology / Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous
	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population / Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities / Service Systems		Wildfire		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 of NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact XX (planner's name & title) at (530) 225-5532.

Luis A. Topete
Associate Planner

4-8-2020
Date

Paul A. Hellman
Director of Resource Management

4/8/20
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: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				✔
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) The project would not result in any adverse effect on a scenic vista. There is no view of the project site which includes a scenic vista. The project would not visually obstruct a scenic vista.

b) The project would not substantially damage any scenic resource. The project site is not visible from a designated scenic highway.

c) The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project surroundings are residential and rural residential. Construction of two residences and associated accessory structures is consistent with the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in a non-urbanized area. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The project lighting plan will be required to meet Shasta County Zoning Plan Section 17.84.040 which requires light to be contained on the project site and lighting fixtures to be shielded. All exterior lighting shall be fully shielded (bulb not visible) and fully cut-off (no light above horizontal). Glare would be eliminated by the use of non-reflective materials for construction of the project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✔
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				✔
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				✔
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✔
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✔

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

a) The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2016.

b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract.

c) The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). The project site is not forest land, timberland or zone Timberland Production.

d) The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site is not forest land.

e) The project would not result in any conflicts with existing or adjacent agricultural operations. The site is not located in an area of significant agricultural soils.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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) 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?				✔
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✔	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely 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) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area (NSVPA) 2018 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan for the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan. The construction of two single-family residences and possible accessory structures, along with other associated site improvements, such as driveways and landscaping, and potential for limited agricultural uses, would not conflict with or obstruct with implementation of the NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2018).

b) The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, including ozone, ozone pre-cursors or PM10 (particulate matter), the pollutants for which the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin is in non-attainment under the applicable State ambient air quality standard.

c) As a condition of approval, all construction equipment and vehicles expected to frequent the site will be required to meet the AQMD emission standards. In addition, the Shasta County General Plan requires Standard Mitigation Measures on all discretionary land use applications as recommended by the AQMD in order to mitigate both direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment pollutants.

The project will not significantly violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation increase in any criteria pollutant, including ozone, ozone pre-cursors or PM10 (particulate matter), and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2018) as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan.

d) The project would not cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would generate approximately 20 vehicle trips per day. This is an insignificant increase in traffic. The project is consistent with the Rural Residential General Plan designation and the air quality attainment plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✔		

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local of regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✔		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or Federally protected wetlands (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, a Biological Resource Assessment and Botanical Survey prepared by North State Resources, Inc. (2003), and a Delineation of the Waters of the U.S. prepared by North State Resources, Inc. (2016), the following findings can be made:

a-c) A Biological Resources Assessment was performed for the Westridge Master Plan and Annexation Area in 2003 and a Delineation of Waters of The United States was prepared for the project site in August 16, 2016 by North State Resources, Inc. (NSR). The current project area identified as Parcel Map 18-001 is consistent with the area to be annexed to facilitate the Westridge Master Plan.

Biological Resources Assessment was performed by NSR in 2003 identified 20 special-status animal species that could potentially occur on the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. No special status plants were found to occur in or around the project site. Mitigation measures are incorporated to reduce potential significant impacts to less-than-significant.

In 2016, a Delineation of Waters of The United States was prepared for the project site by NSR. The delineation identified riparian, vernal pool and seasonal wetland features as well as other waters including intermittent and ephemeral creeks. All wetland features are located on the northern portion of the project site in the designated remainder area, with the exception of the northern most portion of parcel one which will be maintained in an open space easement as shown on the parcel map. The designated remainder will not be developed as a part of this project. The remainder parcel will be annexed to the City of Redding, and the City of Redding as lead agency will initiate appropriate mitigation for this property at the time of development. The intermittent and ephemeral creeks located on the north and northeast portion of the project site will be designated with fifty-foot buffers and non-building, non-disturbance areas on the recorded map. Areas designated to be greater than thirty percent slope surrounding the creeks will also be designated as non-building, non-disturbance area on the recorded map.

d) Delineation of Waters of The United States was prepared for the project site in August 16, 2016 by North State Resources, Inc. (NSR) The project does not include any stream modification activities. The intermittent and ephemeral creeks located on the north and northeast portion of the project site will be designated with fifty-foot buffers and non-building, non-disturbance areas on the recorded map. The project may include the removal of trees located in the preferred building area as indicated on the parcel map. The project may potentially interfere with migratory birds and birds of prey and bats. Nesting habitat is present throughout the study area in trees, shrubs, ground and other structures. Mitigation measures are recommended to minimize impacts to migratory birds and birds of prey. No other activities are proposed with the project that would interfere with any native resident or migratory

fish or wildlife species, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) The project would not conflict with any ordinances or policies which protect biological resources. Shasta County Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 95-157 provides guidance regarding use and protection of oak trees on a voluntary basis.

f) No habitat conservation plans or other similar plans have been adopted for the project site or project area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

IV.a-c.1 A 50-foot buffer will be delineated on all intermittent and ephemeral creeks and will be designated as a non-building, non-disturbance area for parcels 1 and 2 on the recorded map.

IV.a-c.2 All areas greater than thirty percent slope will be designated as non-building, non-disturbance areas on the recorded map.

IV.a-c.3 An open space easement will be dedicated as delineated on the northern portion of parcel one. The easement will be recorded on the deed at the initial sale of parcel 1.

IV.a-c.4 Development is limited to the preferred building areas designated on parcel 1 and parcel 2. No development will be permitted on the remainder parcel as a part of this project.

IV.d.1 In order to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and Section 3503.5, including their nests and eggs, one of the following shall be implemented:

Vegetation removal and other ground-disturbance activities associated with construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 when birds are not nesting; or

If vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities occur during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify active nests in and adjacent to the work area. The survey shall be conducted no more than one week prior to the initiation of construction. If construction activities are delayed or suspended for more than two weeks after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed.

If nesting birds are found, the nest sites shall not be disturbed until after the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by a qualified biologist. Further, to prevent nest abandonment and mortality of chicks and eggs, no construction activities shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest, unless a smaller buffer zone is authorized by a qualified biologist in consultation the CDFW and the USFWS (the size of the construction buffer zone may vary depending on the species of nesting birds present). A qualified biologist shall delineate the buffer zone with construction tape or pin flags that shall remain in place until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by a qualified biologist.

The biologist shall monitor nests weekly during construction to evaluate potential nesting disturbance by construction activities. Guidance from CDFW will be requested if the nestlings within the active nest appear disturbed. The monitoring biologist shall have the authority to stop any work determined to be adversely affecting the nesting activity. The monitoring biologist shall report any "take" of active nests to CDFW.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✔
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✔
c) 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, and an Archeological Inventory Survey prepared by Jensen and Associates (2003), the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

b) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

c) The project site is not on or adjacent to any known cemetery or burial area. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would disturb any human remains.

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 highly sensitive for cultural resources. A field survey, conducted by Jensen and Associates in 2003 for the 410-acre Westridge Residential Development Project. The 51.17 acres of the current project site were included in the 2003 survey by Jensen and Associates. As a result of this survey eleven sites were identified and evaluated for significance in relation to CEQA significance criteria. Ten of the sites evaluated were determined to be insignificant, the eleventh which may have potentially significant prehistoric property is not located within the area designated for development of proposed parcels 1 and 2. The 36-acre remainder property is proposed to be annexed in the City of Redding and would be evaluated separately. Information describing the project area was sent to the Tribal Representative on February 4, 2020 by certified mail. The letter was received February 6, 2020. No request for consultation was received within the 30-day referral time.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to historical, archeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resource, or human remains, there is always the possibility that such resources or remains could be encountered. Therefore, a condition of approval will require that if, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, development activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?			✔	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				✔

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 a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. During grading, site preparation and construction of the residential structures and structures accessory to residences there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources required for the movement of equipment and materials. Compliance with local, State, and federal regulations (e.g., limit engine idling times, requirement for the recycling of construction debris, etc.) would reduce and/or minimize short-term energy demand during construction to the extent feasible, and construction would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Furthermore, through compliance with applicable requirements and/or regulations of the 2019 California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code, individual project elements (e.g., building design, HVAC equipment, etc.) would be consistent with State reduction policies and strategies, and would not consume energy resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner.

b) The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. State and local agencies regulate the use and consumption of energy through various methods and programs. As a result of the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) (the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) which seeks to reduce the effects of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, a majority of the state regulations are intended to reduce energy use and GHG emissions. These include, among others, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11– California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). At the local level, the City's Building Division enforces the

applicable requirements of the Energy Efficiency Standards and Green Building Standards in Title 24.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake, fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publications 42. 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?				✔
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect 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?			✔	
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✔

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, and an On-Site Sewage Disposal Analysis prepared by Mark Cramer (2019), the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not directly or indirectly cause 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. All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Building Code.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;

The currently adopted Building Code requires preparation and review of a site-specific soils report as part of the building design and approval process. The soils report must be prepared by a California registered professional engineer and would address potential seismic-related ground failure concerns, if any.

iv) Landslides;

The threat of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse is insignificant as the geology of the area demonstrates great stability. Based on records of construction in the area, there is no evidence to support a conclusion that the project is on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable.

b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. A grading permit is required prior to any grading activities. The grading permit includes requirements for erosion and sediment control, including retention of topsoil.

c) The project would not 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. Based on records of construction in the area, there is no evidence to support a conclusion that the project is on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable.

d) The project would not be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property. The site soils are not described as expansive soils in the "Soil Survey of Shasta County."

e) The soils on the project site have been tested for wastewater treatment. On-site waste water treatment systems shall be located only in the within the designated effluent dispersal area indicated for each parcel unless an alternative site is specifically approved by the Director.

f) The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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-b) In 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing that it is the State of California's goal to reduce statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emission levels. Subsequently, in 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act. In part, AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations to achieve a reduction in the State's GHG emissions to year 1990 levels by year 2020.

California Senate Bill 97 established that an individual project's effect on GHG emission levels and global warming must be assessed under CEQA. SB 97 further directed that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop guidelines for the assessment of a project's GHG emissions. Those guidelines for GHG emissions were subsequently included as amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. The guidelines did not establish thresholds of significance and there are currently no state, regional, county, or city guidelines or thresholds with which to direct project-level CEQA review. As a result, Shasta County reserves the right to use a qualitative and/or quantitative threshold of significance until a specific quantitative threshold is adopted by the state or regional air district.

The City of Redding currently utilizes a quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold based on a methodology recommended by the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) and accepted by the California Air Resources Board. According to CAPCOA's Threshold 2.3, CARB Reporting Threshold, 10,000 metric tons of carbon-dioxide equivalents per year (mtC02eq/yr) is recommended as a quantitative non-zero threshold. This threshold would be the operational equivalent of 550 dwelling units, 400,000 square feet of office use, 120,000 square feet of retail, or 70,000 square feet of supermarket use. This approach is estimated to capture over half the future residential and commercial development projects in the State of California and is designed to support the goals of AB 32 and not hinder it. The use of this quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold by Shasta County, as lead agency, would be consistent with certain practices of other lead agencies in the County and throughout the State of California.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies four primary constituents that are most representative of the GHG emissions. They are:

- Carbon Dioxide (C02): Emitted primarily through the burning of fossil fuels. Other sources include the burning of solid waste and wood and/or wood products and cement manufacturing.
- Methane (CH4): Emissions occur during the production and transport of fuels, such as coal and natural gas. Additional emissions are generated by livestock and agricultural land uses, as well as the decomposition of solid waste.
- Nitrous Oxide (N20): The principal emitters include agricultural and industrial land uses and fossil fuel and waste combustion.
- Fluorinated Gases: These can be emitted during some industrial activities. Also, many of these gases are substitutes for ozone-depleting substances, such as CFC's, which have been used historically as refrigerants. Collectively, these gases are often referred to as "high global-warming potential" gases.

The primary generators of GHG emissions in the United States are electricity generation and transportation. The EPA estimates that nearly 85 percent of the nation's GHG emissions are comprised of carbon dioxide (C02). The majority of C02 is generated by petroleum consumption associated with transportation and coal consumption associated with electricity generation. The remaining emissions are predominately the result of natural-gas consumption associated with a variety of uses.

Based on the threshold equivalents, the project, a two parcel land division for residential development will not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The project as proposed would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Shasta County, as lead agency, would be consistent with certain practices of other lead agencies in the County and throughout the State of California.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IX. 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				✔
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✔
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?			✔	

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. The project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. There is no historical evidence of any commercial activity on the site that would have used hazardous materials.

e) The project is located approximately 1.8 miles to the southwest of Benton Airpark and within the Westside Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The project site is not located in any of the safety zones for Benton Airpark; however, residential development located within the Westside Area Plan is recommended to record an overflight easement for new residential construction.

f) The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. A review of the project and the Shasta County and City of Anderson Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan indicates that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

There is no emergency response plan for the project site area.

g) The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. 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. All roadways, driveways and buildings for the proposed project 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 on each side or to the property line. The California Public Resources Code Section 4291 includes a "Defensible Space" requirement of clearing 100 feet around all buildings or to the property line, whichever is less. A Wildland fire/Vegetation Management Plan must be submitted for approval to the Shasta County Fire Department prior to recording the parcel map.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

X. 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				✔
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.				✔
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site: (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (iv) impede or redirect flows?				✔
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				✔
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management 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 violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Through adherence to construction standards, including erosion and sediment control measures, water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated. Nor would surface or ground water quality be otherwise substantially degraded. Grading will be needed for this project. A grading permit will be required. The provisions of the permit will address erosion and siltation containment on- and off-site.

b) The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Water service for the project is to be provided by the Centerville Community Services District. The District is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the project. The Centerville Community Services District provided a letter for the project applicant stating that water service would be provided to the project site when the owner pays all applicable connection fees.

c) The drainage pattern will not be altered for the construction of residential uses on parcels measuring 9.35 acres and 4.4 acres. Drainage will be dispersed to either the unimproved areas or landscape areas adjacent to the building and the parking areas. The runoff will sheet flow into the existing drainage channels on the site. This will preserve the existing drainage pattern and not require alteration of the natural drainage courses.

d-e) The project would not risk release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones due to project inundation, The project is not located in an area subject to flood hazard, or inundation. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XI. 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) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✔

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 project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project is consistent with the Rural Residential A (RA) General Plan land use designation and the Rural Residential (R-R) zone district of the project site.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XII. 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.

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				✔
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels				✔
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?			✔	

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 is not located in a high noise area that will result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of the standard. The project will result in the development of residential structures which will cause less-than-significant temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. There will be increased noise levels during residential construction, and increased noise levels caused by the daily activities of new residents. However, none of these increases are expected to be significant. It is likely that there will be an increase in noise levels from the ultimate development of two residential parcels. Noise sources include vehicles and human activities related to a residential lifestyle. However, there is no anticipated substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project resulting from the potential placement of two residences and structures accessory to the residential use at the project site.

b) The project does not include the use of equipment or conduct of activities that are commonly associated with potentially significant groundborne vibration and noise. Therefore, the project would not result in significant exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

c) The project is located approximately 1.8 miles to the southwest of Benton Airpark and within the Westside Area Plan. The project site is not located in any of the safety zones for Benton Airpark; however, residential development located within the Westside Area Plan is recommended to record an overflight easement for new residential construction.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed. With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, 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 not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. The proposal is consistent with the Rural Residential A (RA) General Plan land designation which allows a density which allows one dwelling unit per three acres within the Centerville Community Services District. The remainder parcel will be annexed into the City of Redding and will be evaluated in regard to the appropriate zoning and general plan for that jurisdiction.

b) The project would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project does not include destruction of any existing housing.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XV. 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 would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for:

Fire Protection: The project is located in a VERY HIGH fire hazard severity zone. However, no significant additional level of fire protection is necessary. Additional fire hydrants will be installed according to the County Fire Safety Standards.

Police Protection: The project will result in two additional residences, with an additional population of 5 persons. This is not considered a significant number to warrant any additional sworn or non-sworn peace officers.

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: The County does not have a neighborhood parks system.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVI. 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) 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.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?				✔
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				✔
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✔
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				✔

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 cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The Department of Public Works has indicated that the project would not produce a significant increase in traffic. The project would not generate enough traffic to significantly reduce the volume-to-capacity ratio of adjacent roadways to a reduced level of service. The Department of Public Works reviewed the project and determined that this project would not trigger the need for a specific traffic impact analysis or significant road improvements.

b) There is no County congestion management agency, and no level-of-service established by such an agency.

c) The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

d) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project has been reviewed by the Shasta County Fire Department which has determined that there is adequate emergency access.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			✔	

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, and an Archeological Inventory Survey prepared by Jensen and Associates (2003), the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as there is no evidence of historical resources at the site that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources; or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

The Wintu Tribe of Northern California have requested notification of proposed projects located within the Tribe's geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3(b), also known as AB52. The project site is located within the Tribe's geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation, and notification was sent via certified mail to the designated Tribal Representative on February 4, 2020 and received on February 6, 2020. Consultation was not requested by a representative of the Wintu Tribe of Northern California.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to historical, archeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resource, or human remains, there is always the possibility that such resources or remains could be encountered. Therefore, a condition of project approval will require that if, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, mineral exploration activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or				✔

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocations of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				✔
c) 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?				✔
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				✔
e) Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction 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-c) The project would not 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. The project will be served by the Centerville Community Services District. The Centerville Community Services District has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new water treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities. The project would be served by on-site septic.

d) The project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The West Central Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional residence and is in compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

e) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction 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: None proposed.

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✔	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				✔
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				✔

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				✔

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 substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project will be required by the Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD) to provide and offer for dedication an Emergency Fire Escape Road (EFER) which shall be reviewed and approved prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map.

b) The project is in the "VERY HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. The applicant shall submit a Wildland Fuel/Vegetation Management Plan for approval by the SCFD prior to recordation of the parcel map. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

c) The project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 no evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to substantially 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 substantially 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 no 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 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 no 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: With the mitigation measures being proposed for section IV. Biological Resources, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

PROJECT NUMBER Parcel Map 18-001 – Greenview Development Company

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. Archeological Inventory Survey, Jensen and Associates, June 9, 2003
2. Biological Resource Assessment and Botanical Survey, North State Resources, Inc., 2003
3. Delineation of Waters of the U.S., North State Resources, Inc., August 16, 2016
4. On-Site Sewage Disposal Analysis, Mark Cramer, May 22, 2019

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 Fish and Wildlife
2. Shasta County Fire Department
3. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
4. Centerville Community Water 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, as revised and mitigated, is not anticipated to result in any 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 AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands.
2. Shasta County Important Farmland 2016 Map, California Department of Conservation.
3. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timber Lands.
4. 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, 2018 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 Wildlife.
3. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
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 Wildlife.
7. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

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. ENERGY

1. California Global Warming Solutions Acto of 2006 (AB 32)
2. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code
3. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11 – California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)

VII. 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.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Shasta Regional Climate Action Plan
2. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (White Paper) CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act

IX. 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.

X. 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.

XI. 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.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

3. Shasta County General Plan Section 6.3 Minerals.

XIII. NOISE

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

XIV. 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.

XV. 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.

XVI. RECREATION

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

XVII. 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.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Tribal Consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1

XIX. 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.

XX. WILDFIRE

1. Office of the State Fire Marshall-CALFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

None

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM (MMP)
FOR PARCEL MAP 18-001 – GREENVIEW DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
IV.a-c.1 A 50-foot buffer will be delineated on all intermittent and ephemeral creeks and will be designated as a non-building, non-disturbance area for parcels 1 and 2 on the recorded map.	Prior to recording the map	Shasta County Planning Division	
IV.a-c.2 All areas greater than thirty percent slope will be designated as non-building, non-disturbance areas on the recorded map.	Prior to recording the map	Shasta County Planning Division	
IV.a-c.3 An open space easement will be dedicated as delineated on the northern portion of parcel one. The easement will be recorded on the deed at the initial sale of parcel 1.	Prior to transfer of deed	Shasta County Planning Division	
IV.a-c.4 Development is limited to the preferred building areas designated on parcel 1 and parcel 2. No development will be permitted on the remainder parcel as a part of this project.	Prior to issue of Development permits	Shasta County Planning and Building Divisions	
IV.d.1 In order to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and Section 3503.5, including their nests and eggs, one of the following shall be implemented: Vegetation removal and other ground-disturbance activities associated with construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 when birds are not nesting; or If vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities occur during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify active nests in and adjacent to the work area. The survey shall be conducted no more than one week prior to the initiation of construction. If construction activities are delayed or suspended for more than two weeks after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If nesting birds are found, the nest sites shall not be disturbed until after the young have fledged, as determined through	Prior to issue of Development permits	Shasta County Planning and Building Divisions	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
additional monitoring by a qualified biologist. Further, to prevent nest abandonment and mortality of chicks and eggs, no construction activities shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest, unless a smaller buffer zone is authorized by a qualified biologist in consultation the CDFW and the USFWS (the size of the construction buffer zone may vary depending on the species of nesting birds present). A qualified biologist shall delineate the buffer zone with construction tape or pin flags that shall remain in place until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by a qualified biologist. The biologist shall monitor nests weekly during construction to evaluate potential nesting disturbance by construction activities. Guidance from CDFW will be requested if the nestlings within the active nest appear disturbed. The monitoring biologist shall have the authority to stop any work determined to be adversely affecting the nesting activity. The monitoring biologist shall report any "take" of active nests to CDFW.			