# 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:** Zone Amendment 19-0003 & Parcel Map 18-0003

Lead Agency: Shasta County Department of Resource Management – Planning Division Contact Person: David Schlegel, AICP – Senior 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: Palo Cedro

Cross Streets: Deschutes Road and Palo Way Zip Code: 96073

Lat. / Long.: 40° 33′ 15.95″ N/ 122° 13′ 54.034″ W Total Acres: 16.3

Assessor's Parcel No.: 059-110-082 & 059-110-083 Section: 8 Twp.: 31N Range: 3W Base: MDBM

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 44 Waterways: Cow Creek

Airports: None Railways: N/A Schools: Junction Pre, Elementary & Middle, Foothill High, Chrysalis Charter, Redding Christian

**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 _____ Acres _____
- ☐ 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: Commercial-Light Industrial - 10.81 acres

**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:**

Undeveloped / Zone Districts: Community Commercial combined with Design Review (C-2-DR); C-2-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-2-DR-F-2); Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (C-M-DR); C-M-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-M-DR-F-2); and Designated Floodway (F-1) / Commercial (C) General Plan designation.

**Project Description:** The proposal consists of amending the zoning of a 5.83-acre portion of the 16.3-acre undeveloped project site from the Community Commercial combined with Design Review (C-2-DR) and C-2-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-2-DR-F-2) zone districts to the Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (C-M-DR) and C-M-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-M-DR-F-2) zone districts and subdividing the project site into 10 lots, ranging in size from 0.5 to 3.92 acres, to facilitate commercial-light industrial development.

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 | ____ | Office of Emergency Services |
| ____ | Boating & Waterways, Department of | ____ | Office of Historic Preservation |
| ____ | California Highway Patrol | ____ | Office of Public School Construction |
| ____ | CalFire | ____ | Parks & Recreation |
| X | Caltrans District # 2 | ____ | Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| ____ | Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | ____ | Public Utilities Commission |
| ____ | Caltrans Planning (Headquarters) | X | Regional WQCB # 5 |
| X | Central Valley Flood Protection Board | ____ | Resources Agency |
| ____ | Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy | ____ | S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission |
| ____ | Coastal Commission | ____ | San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers and Mtns Conservancy |
| ____ | Colorado River Board | ____ | San Joaquin River Conservancy |
| ____ | Conservation, Department of | ____ | Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy |
| ____ | Corrections, Department of | ____ | State Lands Commission |
| ____ | Delta Protection Commission | ____ | SWRCB: Clean Water Grants |
| ____ | Education, Department of | ____ | SWRCB: Water Quality |
| ____ | Energy Commission | ____ | SWRCB: Water Rights |
| X | Fish & Game Region # 1 | ____ | Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| ____ | Food & Agriculture, Department of | ____ | Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| ____ | General Services, Department of | ____ | Water Resources, Department of |
| ____ | Health Services, Department of | | |
| ____ | Housing & Community Development | ____ | Other _____ |
| ____ | Integrated Waste Management Board | ____ | Other _____ |
| ____ | Native American Heritage Commission | | |

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

Starting Date May 7, 2020 Ending Date June 5, 2020

**Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):**

Consulting Firm: DKM Engineering
Address: PO Box 1307
City/State/Zip: Anderson, CA 96007
Contact: Duane K. Miller
Phone: 530-365-5610 ext.101

Applicant: Lawrence & Mary Jane Foster
Address: 413 Teakwood Drive
City/State/Zip: Redding CA 96003
Phone: 530-941-8668

**Signature of Lead Agency Representative:** Paul A. Hell **Date:** 5/6/20

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

# ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

Zone Amendment 19-0003 and Parcel Map 18-0003
(Foster)

May 6, 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:**
Zone Amendment 19-0003 and Parcel Map 18-0003 (Foster)

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:**
David Schlegel, AICP, Senior Planner (530) 225-5532

4. **Project Location:**
The project site is located in the Palo Cedro area south of State Highway 44, approximately 0.23 miles east of the Palo Way and Deschutes Road intersection. Assessor Parcel Numbers 059-110-082 & 059-110-083.

5. **Applicant Name and Address:**
Larry Foster
413 Teakwood Drive
Redding, CA 96003

6. **General Plan Designation:**
Commercial (C)

7. **Zoning:**
Community Commercial combined with Design Review (C-2-DR), C-2-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-2-DR-F-2), Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (C-M-DR), C-M-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-M-DR-F-2), and Designated Floodway (F-1).

8. **Description of Project:**
The proposal consists of amending the zoning of a 5.83-acre portion of the 16.3-acre project site from the Community Commercial combined with Design Review (C-2-DR) and C-2-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-2-DR-F-2) zone districts to the Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (C-M-DR) and C-M-DR combined with Restrictive Flood (C-M-DR-F-2) zone districts and subdividing the project site into 10 lots, ranging in size from 0.5 to 3.92 acres, to facilitate commercial-light industrial development. The project would extend Palo Way approximately 690 feet from its current terminus and would have a cul-de-sac design while connecting elsewhere with an existing emergency fire escape road access and connection with Grand Estates Drive.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project site is vacant and undeveloped. The property has a very gentle eastward slope with increased slopes near cow creek and an existing ephemeral wet swale. There are several oak trees on the property and roughly 0.76 acres of wetlands. The project site's northern boundary is adjacent to State Highway 44 with the eastern boundary being adjacent to Cow Creek. The land to the west is developed for Community Commercial (C-2) purposes and the property to the south has been subdivided and partially developed for one-family residential purposes.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):**
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

**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 that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

On March 21, 2017, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California submitted a formal request for notification of projects located in the Wintu Tribe of Northern California's geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation. Information detailing the proposed project was sent to the Tribal Representative on October 10, 2019 by certified mail. No request for consultation was received within the 30-day referral time for this project.

**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 David Schlegel, Senior Planner at (530) 225-5532.

David Schlegel, AICP
Senior Planner

05/06/2020
Date

Paul A. Hellman
Director of Resource Management

5/6/20
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 publically 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.

b) The project would not substantially damage any scenic resource. The project site is visible from a corridor recognized by the Shasta County General Plan as having eligibility for a scenic highway designation. Development without specific review and guidelines beyond typical County Development standards could be considered to have a significant impact. However, the project site's Design Review (DR) combining district along with the same district existing in the surrounding area, ensures that development would contrast the natural and manmade scenery along this corridor and, under the provisions of the DR district, would not be substantially damaging to any potential scenic resource designation.

c) The project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality of an urbanized area. While the site is currently undeveloped, the project surroundings are primarily urban and the purpose of the General Plan and Zoning for the project site is consistent with future urban development. The project does not propose any buildings or site construction beyond the minimum parcel map requirements for road access and dedications. The existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings are safeguarded for future projects on the proposed lots through the implementation of the provisions of the DR combining district. These provisions ensure that construction of commercial-light industrial facilities and development of the proposed lots would be consistent with the existing design themes of buildings, would be sensitive to the natural scenic context and would require higher standards in landscaping standards from public vantage points. Therefore, any impact that could potentially degrade the existing visual character is considered to be less than significant.

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 commercial core district in Palo Cedro has urban services and is considered to be an urbanized area. Although the project is not proposing development beyond infrastructure improvements, development permits could be submitted after the project is complete. For such development, Shasta County Code requires light and glare to be shielded from adjacent properties and roadways as well as oriented downward to the areas that must be lit. Furthermore, mitigation measure IV.b.2 requires that light be shielded and oriented so that it does not shine on biologically sensitive areas as well. Glare would be eliminated by the use of non-reflective materials for construction of the buildings that are proposed on the subsequent lots. All of these requirements ensure that new light or glare sources from potential construction, as a result of the project, will be less than significant.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None proposed. The mitigation measure (IV.b.2) referenced above is to mitigate biological impacts and is not necessary as mitigation to aesthetic impacts. The reference is for discussion purposes only.

| **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 zoned 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. No aspect of the project would conflict with the nearest agricultural activity which exists on the east side of Cow Creek.

**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-b) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area (NSVPA) 2018 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan for Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan. The project site is relatively flat land requires minimal grading activity for construction of parcel map improvements. No post-project development is proposed. However, the project could lead to commercial-light industrial development of the newly created parcels. The project is consistent with the air quality attainment plan.

The NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2018) designates Shasta County as an area of Nonattainment with respect to the ozone California ambient air quality standards. Nitrogen oxides (NOx) are a group of highly reactive gasses and are also known as "oxides of nitrogen." Because NOx is an ingredient in the formation of ozone, it is referred to as an ozone precursor. NOx is emitted from combustion sources such as cars, trucks and buses, power plants, and off-road equipment. Construction equipment and activities generate air contaminants, including oxides of nitrogen (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon dioxide (CO2) and particulate matter (PM10), in the form of engine exhaust and fugitive dust. Emissions emitted during construction are limited and temporary.

In addition, the Shasta County General Plan requires Standard Mitigation Measures and Best Available 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. Application of this requirement in combination with post-project development being uncertain and subject to Standard Mitigation Measures and Best Available Mitigation Measures will not 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 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.

c-d) The nearest sensitive noise receptors are Junction School located roughly 450 feet southwest of the project site and the residential subdivision adjacent to the south. Exposure of sensitive receptors to pollution concentrations as a result of the proposed zone amendment and parcel map is considered to be less than significant.

Construction activities would produce dust, engine exhaust, fumes from adhesives and/or solvents, and other common air contaminants typically associated with development projects. Day to day operations resulting from development of the lots could generate exhaust from use of mobile equipment, such as a forklift or loading and unloading of delivery trucks within any outdoor storage or loading area.

The number of equipment hours needed to prepare the site and construct the project will be relatively low because the project site is flat and the scope and scale of the proposed improvements is limited. Operation of mobile equipment is not expected to generate significant emissions and the equipment itself would be subject to all applicable emissions requirements for off-road mobile sources of emissions.

Day to day operations would not occur until the created lots have been developed with commercial-light industrial uses and would not generate a greater capacity of vehicle trips than would otherwise be expected without the project. The current community-commercial zone district allows for similar uses that may be expected to generate more traffic than commercial-light industrial

type uses. The zone amendment does not significantly change estimates for vehicle trips which include trips generated by employees arriving and departing for work, work vehicles departing and arriving to/from job sites, and miscellaneous incidental vehicle trips such as deliveries and customer visits. Any potential land uses would be powered by electricity. No stationary proposed emission sources, such as a generator are proposed. Substantial pollutant concentrations and significantly objectionable odors are not anticipated from future development of the project.

The Shasta County General Plan requires that standard air quality mitigation measures be applied to all projects. To minimize potential impacts from dust it is recommended that water, non-toxic soil stabilizers, and/or other similar materials be periodically applied to driveways and other potential areas within the outdoor storage area that are likely to create dust. It is also recommended that materials used in the concrete mixing process be bagged, covered and/or otherwise managed to eliminate fugitive dust.

Based on the discussion in this Section and the application of standard mitigation measures as required by the General Plan, and the recommended dust mitigation measures, air quality impacts from the project would be less-than-significant.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None proposed.

| **IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u>:** Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | ✓ | | |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local 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, project-specific studies listed on page 27, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) Wildland Resource Managers completed a biological review for the project site which identified several candidate, sensitive or special-status species referenced by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as present or potentially present on the project site. The biological review noted unspecified bat species foraging on the site and, while none were observed utilizing the woodland stand structures for roosting or maternal denning, six qualifying nesting sites were noted on site. Loss of these nesting sites would have likely significant impact on roosting habitat for the Pallid Bat. To reduce this to a level that is less-than-significant, mitigation measure IV.a.1 requires incorporation of at least two bat roosting structures on the eastern sides of the buildings that are developed on lots 7 and 8 and at least one bat roosting structure on the eastern sides of the buildings that are developed on lots 6

and 9.

The biological report also cites the potential for the following endangered botanical species: Baker's Navarretia, Boggs Lake Hedge-Hyssop, Henderson's Bent Grass, Legenere, Red Bluff Dwarf Rush, Redding Checkerbloom, Shield-Bracted Monkeyflower, Slender Orcutt Grass, and the Woolly Meadowfoam. None of these species were found during the surveys. However, the Redding Checkerbloom and Slender Orcutt Grass were not in bloom season at the time of the surveys. Impacts to these sensitive or special status species would be considered to be significant if they are present on-site and removed for the development. Mitigation measure IV.a.2 ensures that impacts to both of these species would be reduced to a degree that is less-than-significant by ensuring that surveys be done for the Redding Checkerbloom prior to recordation of the parcel map and ensuring that development does not impact wetland areas or the ephemeral wet swale on lot 10 which is the where the Slender Orcutt Grass is found. If the sensitive species are discovered and impacts cannot be avoided to a degree that is less-than-significant by either avoidance or a redesign of the subdivision, then mitigation measure IV.a.2 prescribes options for mitigation upon determining the level of significance of the impact. These options include a conservation easement on another site in the vicinity, seed harvesting for a seed bank or top soil removal and stockpiling for future transplant.

b) The biological review and comments from the CDFW identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities on the project site. At the far eastern edge of the project area adjacent to the west and east sides of Cow Creek, a 1.15-acre narrow belt of willow species, alder, Oregon ash, California grape, Himalayan blackberry and rush species. In addition, an association of 50 black cottonwoods ranging in size from 7" to 53" diameter at breast height (DBH) in the east-central portion of the project. South-westerly of that, primarily, and spread elsewhere on the site, there is an association of as many as 120 live oaks trees which ranging in size from 1" to 5" and 399 valley oak trees ranging in size from 1" to 71" DBH. This totals 519 oaks within the 0.442-acres of oak woodland. There are 2 live oaks and 32 valley oaks in this woodland that are over 5" DBH. Most of the oak woodland area falls within the floodway is therefore identified as non-building/non-disturbance area. However, several oaks over 5" DBH are also located outside of this non-building/non-disturbance area and may require removal for the development of the subsequent lots. The applicant has identified trees of significance that are not to be removed so that adverse impacts to the oak woodland habitat are not substantial. Mitigation measure X.b.1 requires the identification of these trees on the final map and further seeks to retain existing oak trees greater than 5" where feasible. If oaks of significance are proposed to be removed, mitigation measure X.b.1. offers a prescriptive replacement ratio of 2:1.

Adverse effects to birds, and other nocturnal species, including aquatic species due to artificial lighting could be significant as a result of by-right development on the lots. With several wetland features throughout the project site, this poses a circumstance that should be addressed to minimize impacts from artificial lighting to such species. Shasta County Development Standards (SCC 17.84.050) ensures that light pollution does not affect neighboring properties by requiring exterior lighting to be shielded and not shine directly upon neighboring properties. Mitigation measure would extend those lighting standards to adjacent wetland or oak woodland habitat. By shielding and directing exterior lighting downward and away from adjacent sensitive habitat, the impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant.

c) Wildland Resource Managers completed a wetland report, which identified six wetland features associated with the project site. Cow Creek which is a perennial stream that borders the eastern part of the property. A variety of fish live in Cow Creek including fall-run Chinook Salmon, Winter-Run Steelhead, Rainbow Trout (generally at higher elevations), Hardhead, Pikeminnow, Sculpin, Smallmouth Bass, Carp, Bluegill, Brown Trout and Brook Trout. The second wetland feature is an emergent wetland found in the east-central portion of the project area in association with the Cottonwood grove. This 0.772-acre area is located within the proposed non-building/non-disturbance area and as a result, substantial adverse impacts to the wetland will be avoided. The third wetland feature is a small wetland area to the north of the identified 0.772 wetland, which is also located within the non-building/non-disturbance area. The fourth wetland feature is a small pond on the southern property line where drainage from the site pools as a result of construction of a block wall which doesn't allow water to naturally drain southward until it can seep through or under the wall. This pond is associated with a fifth wetland feature. An ephemeral wet swale drains the center of the project area southward to the pond during a storm event. The sixth wetland feature are two small wetland areas adjacent to, and associated with the ephemeral wet swale and pond. All wetland features will be identified on the final map and construction will avoid the wetland areas. As a result, the proposed project would not disturb any wetlands area on the project site or in the project area. Mitigation Measure IV.c.1 further ensures that adverse impacts to federally protected wetlands and sensitive species and habitat associated with the wetlands would not be substantial. This mitigation measure calls for a demarcation on the final map which shows the limits of non-building/non-disturbance surrounding the wetlands and further requires low-impact development best management practices (LID-BMPs) to be utilized when on-site drainage will flow to the wetlands after the lot is developed.

d) The project is likely to cause the removal of oak woodland habitat and trees which could otherwise be suitable for nesting birds. The biological review and surveys conducted on site identified that the site is used by nesting birds. Several nests, both vacant and active were observed on site. As a result, it was recommended that construction take place outside of the nesting season to avoid substantial adverse effects of nesting birds. In the event that tree removal for site development might take place during the nesting season, mitigation measure IV.d.1 has been included to ensure that adequate surveys are conducted for nesting birds prior to habitat and that adverse impacts to nesting birds is avoided with the proper measures. No other alteration is proposed to the site that would

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) 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. Furthermore, all grading activity and any development within the F-2 zone district would be reviewed for consistency with County ordinances as part of the permit application process and inspections.

f) Several agencies and groups have striven to protect, conserve and manage the Cow Creek watershed in recent years. The Western Shasta Resource Conservation District (WSRCD) and Cow Creek Watershed Management Group (CCWMG) formed a partnership in 2000 and an assessment of the entire watershed and management plan was adopted. Development of the subdivision was sensitive to potential watershed impacts as a significant non-building/non-disturbance area is identified adjacent to Cow Creek and subsequent development of the subdivision and individual lots will include low-impact development and convey drainage in such a way that pollutants are sequestered and naturally filtered in wetlands or managed on-site to a degree that is less-than-significant as part of mitigation measure IV.c.1.

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

IV.a.1. To ensure that the loss of bat habitat due to tree removal where suitable roosting sites may be lost, the project shall feature man-made bat roosting features in the following manner:
Prior to issuance of a building permit for any buildings on lots 6 – 9, it must be demonstrated on the plans that bat roosting structure requirements are met. The plans must incorporate at least two bat roosting structures on the buildings that are developed or on alternative roosting structures on lots 7 and 8; and at least one bat roosting structure on the buildings that are developed or on an alternative roosting structure on lots 6 and 9. Such roosting structures shall follow the guidelines for Pallid Bat or Wester Red Bat artificial roosting and shall be located on the lot in such a way that disturbance from human activity is least likely. The location and design of such roosting structures shall be reviewed by the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit and must be installed prior to a final inspection for the permit.

IV.a.2. To account for potential substantially adverse impacts to the Redding Checkerbloom, an imperiled and vulnerable listed species in the State of California, a botanical survey shall be conducted to verify its presence prior to recordation of the map. If Redding Checkerbloom is found on site, it must be avoided with a non-building/non-disturbance area noted on the final map or by redesigning of the parcels. Otherwise, a qualified botanist shall work with the Planning Division, who may seek guidance from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and to ensure impacts to the sensitive species are less than significant by analyzing the degree of potential impacts, and utilizing tools such as a conservation easement, seed harvesting for a seed bank, or top soil excavation and stockpiling. These measures would only be necessary if Redding Checkerbloom is discovered and significant impacts from development would occur.

IV.b.1. To reduce the adverse impacts to oak woodland habitat present on the project site, the following measures shall be taken:

Oak trees over 5" in diameter shall be maintained on the property where feasible. Oak trees within the non-building/non-disturbance areas shall be maintained on the property. The oak trees to be retained, as identified on the tentative map, shall be maintained on the property and protected from impacts to development, including ground disturbance within the dripline.

If oaks greater than five inches in diameter are proposed to be removed, the oak trees shall be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 in a suitable location elsewhere on site with monitoring of the survival of the plantings for a period of three years. In the event of mortality, the monitoring period shall be extended for additional periods of three years as needed to demonstrate survival of the number of plantings required to ensure replacement. A completed contract for planting and monitoring shall be presented prior to issuance of the building permit. A contract for planting and monitoring shall be executed by a qualified individual or company including a Registered Professional Forester, a landscaping contractor, certified horticulturalist, and/or certified arborist.

This requirement shall not prohibit the removal of oak trees as necessary to comply with defensible space requirements of the State Fire Code, after the improvements are completed.

IV.b.2. To mitigate adverse effects on birds and other nocturnal species, including aquatic species from artificial lighting the project shall incorporate limitations to outdoor lighting in the following manner:
Lighting fixtures shall be shielded downward and installed in a manner that limits photo-pollution and light spillover onto adjacent wildlife habitat. This requirement is in addition to Shasta County Development Standards (SCC17.84.050) which require such measures be taken in regards to neighboring property boundaries. The applicant shall demonstrate that these requirements will be met as part of the application for building permits or electrical permits for exterior lighting.

IV.c.1. To mitigate adverse impacts to federally protected wetlands and sensitive species and habitat associated with the wetlands to a degree that would not be substantial. The following measures shall be taken:
A) Prior to recordation, the final map shall show the location of the wetland features identified on site and demarcate a non-building/non-disturbance area so that direct impacts are avoided. B) As part of further mitigation to indirect impacts, prior to recordation, it shall be noted on the final parcel map that Low-Impact Development Best Management Practices (LID-BMPs) will be required on lots which contain wetland features or for lots where drainage conveyance would lead to an identified wetland. As part of the review for development permits and prior to issuance of grading or building permits on these lots, the applicant shall demonstrate how drainage on site will be using LID-BMPs. The LID portion of site development should include native species in the plan.

IV.d.1. To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and 3503.3, the applicant shall ensure that either:
A) Tree removal associated with improvements for the map or construction on the subsequent lots shall be conducted from September 1 through January 31, when birds are not nesting; or
B) Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds if tree removal is to take place during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31). These surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than one week prior to tree removal during the nesting season. If an active nest more than half completed is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest by a qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No tree removal shall occur within this non-disturbance buffer until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by the qualified biologist. The results of pre-construction surveys shall be sent 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, project-specific studies listed on page 27, 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 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 a prehistoric site was identified previously to exist on the project site and that the project area is considered to be extremely sensitive for cultural resources. Consulting Archaeologist, Trudy Vaughn, who conducted a previous archaeological survey on the project site in 1990 reviewed the project proposal, visited the project site, and reviewed previous survey reports and confirmed in a letter dated March 28, 2019 that, in fact, no prehistoric site exists within the project boundaries and that there is no evidence that historical or cultural resource exists in the project area either. As a result, Mrs. Vaughn recommended an archaeological clearance.

The archaeologist recommends that a condition be added to the final map stating that if any archaeological discoveries (human skeletal remains, culturally modified lithic materials, structural features, or historic artifacts) are encountered during ground disturbing activities, all such activities should halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery, and a qualified archaeologist should be contacted to determine the nature of the find, evaluate its significance, and, if necessary, suggest preservation or mitigation measures. 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, 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.

| **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 potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. No post-project development is proposed. However, the project is expected to lead to commercial-light industrial development of the newly created lots. During construction, 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 2016 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:<br><br>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.<br><br>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?<br><br>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | ✓ |

| **VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault;

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;

According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The 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 project site is located in an area determined to have moderate liquefaction potential as shown on the South Central Region Planning Area Potential Areas Liquefaction map. 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 project site is flat and is not located at top or toe of any significant slope.

b) The Soil Survey of Shasta County, completed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service in November of 2018, identifies the soils type at the project site as Hillgate Loam (Hb) and Churn Gravelly Loam (CeA). These soil types have an erosion hazard ranging from none to slight. 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 topography of the site is flat. Based on a review of the Soil Survey of Shasta County and discussion in Sections VI.a and VI.b above, the threat of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse is less-than-significant.

d) The site soils are described as moderately expansive soils in the Soil Survey of Shasta County. 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.

e) The project would utilize a municipal sewer system for disposal of wastewater.

f) The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. There has not been any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature identified on the site.

**Mitigation/Monitoring**: None proposed.

| **VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | | ✓ |
| 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 AS 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 5697 established that an individual project's effect on GHG emission levels and global warming must be assessed under CEQA. SB97 further directed that the State Office of Planning and Research (QPR) 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.

With regard to the project, the amount of potential commercial-light industrial space resulting from development of the lots is unknown but is expected to be less than the non-zero project-specific threshold described above. The scope of the required project improvements

is limited to infrastructure and road improvements for a 690-foot extension of Palo Way and will not involve extensive ground disturbance, require a significant number of equipment hours to complete, or generate significant traffic volumes during construction. Post construction operations emissions are unknown at this time. However, the proposed zone amendment and map does not change the development capacity that is currently allowed by-right to any degree of significance. Currently the property could be developed with commercial retail and commercial-light industrial uses at the same intensity as is being proposed. This does not change the outcome of future GHG emissions for the project site. Therefore, GHG emissions due to construction of the subdivision and subsequent by-right development is expected to be less-than-significant.

**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 zone amendment would allow for land uses that could include storage or wholesale of hazardous materials or could allow light manufacturing type uses that would utilize hazardous materials. However, these types of uses, that are permitted by-right, are not expected to use large amounts of hazardous materials that would be considered a significant hazard. Any hazardous materials used would be done so in accordance with a hazardous materials business plan. Those uses which could potentially be considered to routinely transport, use or dispose of hazardous materials to a degree that could pose a significant hazard, would be required to first obtain a use permit and be subject to a separate environmental review process.

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. Similarly, to the discussion in section a) above, the amount of hazardous materials being routinely transported to and from the proposed subdivision is limited in scale and type of businesses that are allowed, by-right, in the C-M zone district. There are no reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions expected as a result of this project that would be considered significant. Any storage, use or routine transportation of larger amounts of hazardous material would be subject to separate environmental review as part of a use permit in the C-M zone district.

c) The project site is within a quarter-mile of an existing school and could potentially have land uses established where small amounts of pre-packaged hazardous materials are handled. These, by-right, land use types in the C-M zone district are limited to ones which aren't expected to emit hazardous emissions or waste. For this reason, impacts from hazardous materials emissions, or waste as a result of the zone amendment and subdivision are considered to be less-than-significant.

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 property has not been developed and there is no historical evidence of any commercial activity on the site that would have used hazardous materials.

e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

f) The project 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.

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 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.

**Mitigation/Monitoring**: None proposed.

| **X. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u>:** 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:<br>(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site:<br>(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;<br>(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<br>(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, as well as utilizing low-impact development for on-site drainage as part of mitigation measure IV.c.1. 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 decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The project will connect to Bella Vista Water District lines and does not propose to include any private on-site wells. There is no expected significant impact to ground water

from potential site development. The existing wetlands are to remain and be protected from pollutants using low-impact development features as part of mitigation measure IV.c.1.

Water service for the project is to be provided by the Bella Vista Water District. The District is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the project.

c) The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or add 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; and or (iv) impede or redirect flows. A soils and preliminary drainage report was prepared by DKM Engineering for the project which ensures that runoff after development of the project site would be adequately addressed through the project's storm water system. The primary drainage areas identified in the preliminary drainage report proposes that drainage from these areas be conveyed to an improved storm water system which includes a private detention basin on the southeastern portion of the property. The private detention basin would ensure that outflows are not increased as a result of site development under 100-year peak flows to Cow Creek. The County Department of Public Works will review parcel map improvement plans for meeting these requirements prior to recordation of the final map.

d) Risk of release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones due to project inundation is not significant. A majority of the project site which lies within flood hazard area will not be developed. The small portion that is within the flood hazard may include storage of hazardous materials which could be inundated in a worst-case scenario. This area amounts to 0.56 acres on lot 10. Within this area is an ephemeral wet swale and a 0.02-acre wetland. Development of and storage of hazardous materials within the F-2 boundaries would be severely limited due to the existing protected sensitive habitats. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None. The above referenced mitigation measure IV.c.1 is for reference purposes only.

| **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. California State Highway 44 currently acts as an existing barrier to the north of the project site, Cow Creek is a barrier to the east of the project site and a block wall was constructed as part of the residential subdivision to the south. These conditions already serve as physical divides to any areas that would be considered to be an established community and no new road, ditch, wall, or other feature which might be constructed in the future would have an effect on those conditions.

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 Commercial (C) General Plan land use designation and meets other county development standards and those found within the proposed C-M zone district.

**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. No locally-important mineral resources appear to exist on the project site and the project area was excluded from the Mineral Land Classification Study. 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 would result in a temporary increase in noise levels in the project vicinity due to operation of equipment during the construction of the project improvements. Shasta County does not have a noise ordinance and the Shasta County General Plan noise thresholds do not specifically address noise from construction activities. A general rule of noise attenuation is that noise is reduced six decibels for every doubling of distance. For example, if a piece of equipment produces 100 decibels at 25 feet away from the equipment, the noise level will be 94 decibels at 50 feet from the equipment. The area where construction of required improvements will take place is approximately 650 feet from the nearest residence. A typical grader/scraper operates at approximately 85 decibels at 50 feet. Sound from the grader scraper would attenuate to approximately 59 decibels within fifty feet of the nearest residence and 57 decibels at the residence. Noise levels in excess of 70 decibels are generally considered to be potentially irritating. On this basis and due to the fact that the increase in noise levels will be temporary, noise impacts from the project would be less-than-significant. In addition, when a project involves construction activities near noise sensitive uses the Department as a matter of practice recommends a condition of approval that limits construction to daytime hours and prohibits construction on weekends and National holidays.

It is likely that there will be an increase noise levels for permanent uses as a result of the development of the parcels for uses permitted by-right in the zone district. Permanent noise sources from future development of the proposed lots would include vehicular traffic, commercial and light-industrial activities that take place indoors and human activity in appurtenant outdoor

storage areas during normal business hours. However, much of the area adjacent to the sensitive noise receptors to the south (the residential subdivision) is already within the Commercial-Light Industrial zone district and could be developed with such uses by-right. The seven-acre area proposed to be made consistent with the existing C-M boundaries is either restricted from development (near Cow Creek non-disturbance buffer) or on the opposite side (north) of the existing C-M zone district from where the residential subdivision is. Additionally, any uses that could potentially lead to noise or vibrations that exceed thresholds in the General Plan would require the approval of a use permit. Future projects within the proposed zone district could not be established without having to either meet the Shasta County General Plan noise thresholds or being approved as a separate project subject to CEQA. For these reasons, the increase in noise levels from the proposed zone amendment and parcel map is less-than-significant.

b) The project will not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. During construction of the road, sidewalks, storm drains, utility installations and associated grading activities, there may be some groundborne vibration due to the potential use of heavy equipment. However, due to the distance from adjacent property and structures from the proposed work, these construction-related activities are not expected to be significant.

c) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None proposed.

| **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. Potential impacts to infrastructure (including roads and traffic) will be mitigated by those developing the lots paying impact fees for future road improvements. Furthermore, the proposal is consistent with the Commercial General Plan land use designation which allows for the existing land to be developed with businesses. The project does not propose any specific business and is not converting additional land to a use that would induce population growth in the area. Therefore, it is not expected to induce substantial growth in the area.

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? | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | |

| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 HIGH fire hazard severity zone. However, the Shasta County Fire Department have not indicated that any additional level of fire protection is necessary. Additional fire hydrants will be installed according to the County Fire Safety Standards.

Police Protection:

The County has a total of 147 sworn and 119 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff's deputies) for the County population of 67,274 (California. Department of Finance 2015) persons in the unincorporated area of the County. That is a ratio of one officer per 267 persons. The project will configure the land with 8 additional lots but will not convert land from a non-commercial use. This is not considered a significant change 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. The project would not result in any impacts related to parks or the demand for additional land for public parks.

Other public facilities: N/A

**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, project-specific studies listed on page 27, 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 a program, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The road is not a through road and would not be considered a viable route for a bikeway or transit. Sidewalks are included as a development standard to account for pedestrians and accessible pathways for employees and customers patronizing the businesses. The Traffic Impact Analysis Technical Memorandum prepared by GHD concluded that, without mitigation, the project would contribute to unacceptable traffic conditions at the Deschutes Road and State Highway 44 interchange. Comments were received from Caltrans confirming this as a potentially significant impact as well. Mitigation Measures XVII.a.1. and VVII.a.2 were included to require the project to contribute traffic impact proportionate share mitigation funds so that improvements can be made to the interchange. Those improvements would include signalization of the intersection to ensure the level-of-service does not drop to F.

b) The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highway. There is no County congestion management agency, and no level-of-service established by such an agency. However, as noted in section a above, impacts to level-of-service is expected to occur as a result of the project. Objectives in the Shasta County General Plan including Policy C6-L seeks to ensure traffic levels remain acceptable and projects do not drop the level-of-service to level F throughout the County and therefore, the mitigation measures listed in section a are included to reduce traffic impacts to levels that are less than significant.

c) The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The project proposes no such features and is subject to the fire safety and road improvement standards found within the Shasta County Development Standards Manual.

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 adequate emergency access will be provided with a connection and additional improvements to the Emergency Fire Escape Road at the north end of Grand Estates Drive.

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

XVII.a.1) Prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, pay pro-rata share (based on traffic generated) of the cost of a traffic signal system and other required improvements to the intersection of State Highway 44 Northbound ramps and Deschutes Road, which are necessary due to increased vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Pro-rata share and traffic generation report shall be provided by applicant, and approved by the Director of Public Works.

XVII.a.2) Prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, pay pro-rata share (based on traffic generated) of the cost of a traffic signal system and other required improvements to the intersection of State Highway 44 Southbound ramps and Deschutes Road, which are necessary due to increased vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Pro-rata share and traffic generation report shall be provided by applicant, and approved by the Director of Public Works.

| **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:<br><br>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<br><br>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, 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.

In addition to the previous archaeological survey conducted on the project site and the updated determination by archaeologist Trudy Vaugh, the County sent the Wintu Tribe of Northern California & Toyon-Wintu Center formal notification of a determination that a project application is complete pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21080.3.1 and AB 52. The County did not receive a request for consultation within 30 days nor has any response been provided to date. In the event that tribal resources are discovered during construction of the project, Section V of this initial study outlines the proper steps to mitigate any impacts.

**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 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? | | ✓ | | |

| **XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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) The project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or, wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocations of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The project will be served by the Bella Vista Water District. The Bella Vista Water District has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project in non-drought years without the need for construction of new water treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities.

The project will be served by the Palo Cedro wastewater treatment system. The Palo Cedro Community Service Area (CSA No. 8) has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities. The CSA No. 8 wastewater treatment system is in compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to water quality.

b) The Bella Vista Water District has indicated that service to the project would need to be ensured for dry or multiple dry years through an agreement to augment water supply during water shortage years that's suitable to the District's Board. This plan will be in place as a mitigation measure XIX.b.1 to be addressed prior to recordation of the final map.

c) The project would 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. The project will be served by the CSA No.8 wastewater treatment system. The CSA has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

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 businesses 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 proposes no abnormal aspects that might be out of compliance with Federal, State and local management and solid waste reduction. Waste Management offers a variety of solid waste disposal programs that the project would utilize.

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

XIX.b.1 Prior to recordation of the map the applicant shall demonstrate that the condition of the Bella Vista Water District will serve letter has been met. The condition states that water service to the project is contingent upon a water supply agreement be provided that is acceptable to the District Board in order to address water supply in shortage years. Proof shall be provided to the Planning Division that this condition has been satisfied.

| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

| **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? | | | | ✓ |
| 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:**

a) The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project would conform to Shasta County Fire Safety Standards and ensure that adequate emergency ingress, egress and fire suppression water would be provided for the site. It would not conflict with any other aspect of the County's adopted Hazard Mitigation Plan.

b) The project would not 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. The project is not located near slopes nor other factors that exacerbate wildfire risks.

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. The road proposed for the project would be built to meet fire safety standards and the project offers alternative ingress/egress via an emergency fire escape road.

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. The project is required to ensure runoff does not increase as a result of development of the project. Slopes on the area to be developed on the project site would not pose a risk, due to their slope that would cause downslope or downstream flooding or landslides.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** None proposed.

| **XIX. 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 with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | ✓ | | |

| XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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, findings and mitigation measures 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. Avoidance of sensitive habitats and additional mitigation measures (IV.a.1, IV.a.2, IV.b.1, and IV.b.2) ensure that any potential impacts to sensitive species is less than significant.

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 as well as mitigation measures incorporated into the project, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would have impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Vehicular circulation to and from the project site as a result of development would add cumulative traffic impacts to the Deschutes Road/State Highway 44 interchange. However, mitigation measures XVII.a.1 and XVII.a.2 would ensure that traffic circulation impacts to the interchange, and its necessary signalization would receive proportionate share mitigation funds toward those future improvements. There are no other past projects, current projects or probable future projects which could be 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. Any exposure to hazardous materials or other impacts to humans are considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation/Monitoring:** With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant. See Mitigation Measures IV.a.1, IV.a.2, IV.b.1, IV.b.2, XVII.a.1 and XVII.a.2.

**INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS**

**PROJECT NUMBER Project ZA19-0003 & PM18-0003 - Foster**

**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 Mitigated Negative Declaration. These studies are available for review through the Shasta County Planning Division.

1. Shasta County Preliminary Drainage Report-Palo Way Industrial Park, DKM Engineering, July 15, 2019
2. Archeological Survey Memorandum, Trudy Vaughn, Consulting Archaeologist, March 28, 2019
3. Preliminary Soils Report, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, November 30, 2018
4. Palo Way Biological Review, Wildland Resource Managers, April, 2019
5. Palo Way Industrial Park Traffic Impact Analysis Memorandum, GHD, July 11, 2019
6. Palo Way Wetland Report, Wildland Resource Managers, April, 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. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
3. California Regional Water Quality Control Board

**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 Act 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.
1. 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**

1. 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 Measure/Condition | Timing/Implementation | Enforcement/Monitoring | Verification (Date & Initials) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** | | | |
| IV.a.1. To ensure that the loss of bat habitat due to tree removal where suitable roosting sites may be lost, the project shall feature man-made bat roosting features in the following manner:<br>Prior to issuance of a building permit for any buildings on lots 6 – 9, it must be demonstrated on the plans that bat roosting structure requirements are met. The plans must incorporate at least two bat roosting structures on the buildings that are developed or on alternative roosting structures on lots 7 and 8; and at least one bat roosting structure on the buildings that are developed or on an alternative roosting structure on lots 6 and 9. Such roosting structures shall follow the guidelines for Pallid Bat and Western Red Bat artificial roosting and shall be located on the lot in such a way that disturbance from human activity is least likely. The location and design of such roosting structures shall be reviewed by the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit and must be installed prior to a final inspection for the permit. | Prior to Issuance of Building Permit and Inspection Prior to Final Permit Approval | Planning Division/Building Division | |
| IV.a.2. To account for potential substantially adverse impacts to the Redding Checkerbloom, an imperiled and vulnerable listed species in the State of California, a botanical survey shall be conducted to verify its presence prior to recordation of the map. If Redding Checkerbloom is found on site, it must be avoided with a non-building/non-disturbance area noted on the final map or by redesigning of the parcels. Otherwise, a qualified botanist shall work with the Planning Division, who may seek guidance from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and to ensure impacts to the sensitive species are less than significant by analyzing the degree of potential impacts, and utilizing tools such as a conservation easement, seed harvesting for a seed bank, or top soil excavation and stockpiling. These measures would | Prior to Recordation of the Parcel Map / Prior to Ground Disturbance. | Planning Division | |

| Mitigation Measure/Condition | Timing/Implementation | Enforcement/Monitoring | Verification (Date & Initials) |
|---|---|---|---|
| only be necessary if Redding Checkerbloom is discovered and significant impacts from development would occur. | | | |
| IV.b.1. To reduce the adverse impacts to oak woodland habitat present on the project site, the following measures shall be taken:<br><br>Oak trees over 5" in diameter shall be maintained on the property where feasible. Oak trees within the non-building/non-disturbance areas shall be maintained on the property. The oak trees to be retained, as identified on the tentative map, shall be maintained on the property and protected from impacts to development, including ground disturbance within the dripline.<br>If oaks greater than five inches in diameter are proposed to be removed, the oak trees shall be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 in a suitable location elsewhere on site with monitoring of the survival of the plantings for a period of three years. In the event of mortality, the monitoring period shall be extended for additional periods of three years as needed to demonstrate survival of the number of plantings required to ensure replacement. A completed contract for planting and monitoring shall be presented prior to issuance of the building permit. A contract for planting and monitoring shall be executed by a qualified individual or company including a Registered Professional Forester, a landscaping contractor, certified horticulturalist, and/or certified arborist.<br><br>This requirement shall not prohibit the removal of oak trees as necessary to comply with defensible space requirements of the State Fire Code, after the improvements are completed. | Prior to Issuance of Building Permits/Ongoing | Planning Division/Building Division | |
| IV.b.2. To mitigate adverse effects on birds and other nocturnal species, including aquatic species from artificial lighting the project shall incorporate limitations to outdoor lighting in the following manner:<br>Lighting fixtures shall be shielded downward and installed in a manner that limits photo-pollution and light spillover onto | Prior to Issuance of Building Permits and Electrical Permits. | Planning Division/Building Division | |

| Mitigation Measure/Condition | Timing/Implementation | Enforcement/Monitoring | Verification (Date & Initials) |
|---|---|---|---|
| adjacent wildlife habitat. This requirement is in addition to Shasta County Development Standards (SCC17.84.050) which require such measures be taken in regards to neighboring property boundaries. The applicant shall demonstrate that these requirements will be met as part of the application for building permits or electrical permits for exterior lighting. | | | |
| IV.c.1. To mitigate adverse impacts to federally protected wetlands and sensitive species and habitat associated with the wetlands to a degree that would not be substantial. The following measures shall be taken:<br>A) Prior to recordation, the final map shall show the location of the wetland features identified on site and demarcate a non-building/non-disturbance area so that direct impacts are avoided.<br>B) As part of further mitigation to indirect impacts, prior to recordation, it shall be noted on the final parcel map that Low-Impact Development Best Management Practices (LID-BMPs) will be required on lots which contain wetland features or for lots where drainage conveyance would lead to an identified wetland. As part of the review for development permits and prior to issuance of grading or building permits on these lots, the applicant shall demonstrate how drainage on site will be using LID-BMPs. The LID portion of site development should include native species in the plan. | Prior to Recordation of the Parcel Map and Prior to Issuance of Building Permits | Planning Division | |
| IV.d.1. To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and 3503.3, the applicant shall ensure that either:<br>A) Tree removal associated with improvements for the map or construction on the subsequent lots shall be conducted from September 1 through January 31, when birds are not nesting; or<br>B) Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds if tree removal is to take place during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31). These surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than one week prior to tree removal during the nesting season. If an active nest more than half completed is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest by a | Prior to Tree Removal for Subdivision Improvements and Construction on the Parcels | Planning Division/Building Division | |

| Mitigation Measure/Condition | Timing/Implementation | Enforcement/Monitoring | Verification (Date & Initials) |
|---|---|---|---|
| qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No tree removal shall occur within this non-disturbance buffer until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by the qualified biologist. The results of pre-construction surveys shall be sent to CDFW. | | | |
| **XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** | | | |
| XVII.a.1. To account for impacts to traffic contributed by the project to the Deschutes Road/State Highway 44 interchange, the following measures shall be taken:<br>Prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, pay pro-rata share (based on traffic generated) of the cost of a traffic signal system and other required improvements to the intersection of State Highway 44 Northbound ramps and Deschutes Road, which are necessary due to increased vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Pro-rata share and traffic generation report shall be provided by applicant, and approved by the Director of Public Works.<br>XVII.a.2) To account for impacts to traffic contributed by the project to the Deschutes Road/State Highway 44 interchange, the following measures shall be taken:<br>Prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, pay pro-rata share (based on traffic generated) of the cost of a traffic signal system and other required improvements to the intersection of State Highway 44 Southbound ramps and Deschutes Road, which are necessary due to increased vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Pro-rata share and traffic generation report shall be provided by applicant, and approved by the Director of Public Works. | Prior to Recordation of the Parcel Map | Department of Public Works | |
| **XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** | | | |
| XIX.b.1) Prior to recordation of the map the applicant shall demonstrate that the condition of the Bella Vista Water District will serve letter has been met. The condition states that water service to the project is contingent upon a water supply agreement being provided that is acceptable to the District Board in order to address water supply in shortage years. Proof shall be provided to the Planning Division that this condition has been satisfied. | Prior to Recordation of the Parcel Map | Planning Division | |