

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: Use Permit 17-004 (Gill)

Lead Agency: Shasta County Department of Resource Management – Planning Division Contact Person: Lio Salazar, Senior Planner

Mailing Address: 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103

Phone: (530) 225-5532

City: Redding, CA

Zip: 96001

County: Shasta

Project Location: County: Shasta

City/Nearest Community: Palo Cedro

Cross Streets: Deschutes Road/Palo Way

Zip Code: 96073

Lat. / Long.: 40° 33' 14" N/ 122° 14' 56" W

Total Acres: 2.57

Assessor's Parcel No.: 059-110-080

Section: 31

Twp.: T. 31 N.

Range: R. 3 W.

Base: MDBM

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 44 East

Waterways: _____

Airports: n/a

Railways: n/a

Schools: Junction Elem, Foothill HS

Document Type:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|-------|------------------------------------|--------|---|
| CEQA: | <input type="checkbox"/> NOP | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR | NEPA: | <input type="checkbox"/> NOI | Other: | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR | | <input type="checkbox"/> EA | | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Document |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec | (Prior SCH No.) _____ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mit Neg Dec | Other _____ | | <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI | | |

Local Action Type:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Prezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element | <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Development Type:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining: Mineral _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Power: Type _____ MW _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste: Type _____ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Commercial/Light Industrial/2.57 Acres/6 Employees</u> |

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

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

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Vacant/Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (CM-DR)/Commercial (C)

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

The project site is a 2.57 acre parcel. The project is proposed contractor's equipment storage yard, including a 7,352-square-foot building containing 2,552-square-feet of office space, 3,600-square-feet of warehouse space, and a 1,200-square-foot of covered space; an 1,800-square-foot shed and volumetric concrete mixer for the production of concrete septic tanks and horse troughs; outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, or other materials commonly used in the contractor's type of business; outdoor storage of materials used for repair and maintenance of contractor's own equipment; and outdoor storage and sales of septic tanks and horse troughs, and a storm water detention basin.

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.

January 2008

Development of the site would include grading/paving an approximately 222-foot extension of Palo Way; grading/graveling an approximately 450-foot long emergency fire escape road that would extend from the end of the Palo Way extension to Logero Lane; grading/paving of an approximately 4,416-square-foot parking lot; grading and the application of asphalt grindings and aggregate base within the outdoor storage area and detention basin; construction of the proposed buildings; installation a screened fence around the outdoor storage area; construction of landscaped beds along the street frontage; planting of trees along the eastern and southern property lines; and trenching, construction, and backfilling utilities, including sewer, water and electricity all of which exist near the project site.

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".

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

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

Starting Date 12/01/2017 Ending Date 01/04/2018

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____	Applicant: <u>Tracy and Allen Gill</u>
Address: _____	Address: <u>P.O. Box 117</u>
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: <u>Millville, CA 96062</u>
Contact: _____	Phone: <u>(530) 547-1112</u>
Phone: _____	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative:  **Date:** 11/30/2017

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

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Use Permit 17-004
Gill

December 1, 2017

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:**
Use Permit 17-004 (Gill)
- 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:**
Lio Salazar, Senior Planner (530) 225-5532
- 4. Project Location:**
The project is located in Palo Cedro, CA, south of and adjacent to a 60-foot undeveloped road easement that extends beyond the current terminus of Palo Way. The project site is approximately 163 feet beyond the current terminus of Palo Way which is approximately 0.15 miles east of the intersection of Palo Way and Deschutes Road (Assessor Parcel Number 059-110-080).
- 5. Applicant Name and Address:**
Tracy and Allen Gill
P.O. Box 117
Millville, CA 96062
- 6. General Plan Designation:**
Commercial (C)
- 7. Zoning:**
Commercial-Light Industrial combined with Design Review (C-M-DR)
- 8. Description of Project:**
The project site is a 2.57 acre parcel. The project is proposed contractor's equipment storage yard, including a 7,352-square-foot building containing 2,552-square-feet of office space, 3,600-square-feet of warehouse space, and 1,200-square-foot covered space; an 1,800-square-foot shed and volumetric concrete mixer for the production of concrete septic tanks and horse troughs; outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, or other materials commonly used in the contractor's type of business; outdoor storage of materials used for repair and maintenance of contractor's own equipment; and outdoor storage and sales of septic tanks and horse troughs, and a storm water detention basin.

Development of the site would include grading/paving an approximately 222-foot extension of Palo Way; grading/graveling an approximately 450-foot long emergency fire escape road that would extend from the end of the Palo Way extension to Logero Lane; grading/paving of an approximately 4,416-square-foot parking lot; grading and the application of asphalt grindings and aggregate base within the outdoor storage area and detention basin; construction of the proposed buildings; installation a screened fence around the outdoor storage area; construction of landscaped beds along the street frontage; installation of trees along the eastern and southern property lines; and trenching, construction, and backfilling utilities, including sewer, water and electricity all of which exist near the project site.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The undeveloped project site is situated in the Palo Cedro Town Center and south of the State Highway 44 Deschutes Road interchange. Land uses in the vicinity are mix of commercial, urban residential, and public uses,

including Junction School which is located approximately 350-feet southwest of the project site. Adjacent land uses include undeveloped commercial/light industrial land to the north and east, a residence under construction to the south, and non-conforming single-family residence situated on a commercial/light industrial parcel to the west which is currently used for vehicle and equipment storage.

The topography of the site is predominantly flat to slightly sloping in a southeasterly direction. The low point of the property is near the southeast corner of the parcel which is approximately seven feet lower than the high point which is located near the middle of the parcel and along the west lot line. Vegetation within the project site is composed of one small pine tree and a mix of grasses.

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

State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board

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, has consultation begun?

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California & Toyon-Wintu Center (Tribe) filed and Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1 the Department of Resource Management on October 19, 2017 sent a certified letter to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request consultation on the project in writing.

The Tribe on October 24, 2019 responded by e-mail to indicate that it had limited concerns of destructive cultural impact in the proposed area. The tribe indicated that Tribal Member/Wintu Monitor, Vincent Cervantes was going to visit the site that same day to conduct a pedestrian survey to ensure the Tribe's limited concerns were warranted. The Tribe suggested that to expedite the notification/consultation process, the County allow 24 hours from the receipt of the Tribe's response before proceeding and that if the Tribe did not contact the County to further consult on the project within the requested 24 hours, the County should move forward with the permit process and proposed project.

The County did not receive any contact from the Tribe within the requested 24 hours and considers consultation with the Tribe to be concluded based on the e-mail communication.

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 section 21083.3.2.) 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		Geology / Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation / Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources		Utilities / Service Systems
	Mandatory Findings of Significance				

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Lio Salazar, Senior Planner at (530) 225-5532.



Lio Salazar, AICP
Senior Planner

11 / 30 / 2017
Date



Richard W. Simon, AICP
Director of Resource Management

11 / 30 / 2017
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if all the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more, "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are "Less-than-significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. General Plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify the following:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?		✓		
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		✓		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		✓		

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

- a) Views of project site include development and natural features that are common to the area. There is no view of the project site that includes or provides views of a highly valued or significant scenic vista for the benefit of the general public.
- b-c) The project is located in a Design Review (DR) zone district. The DR district adopted for the project site does not have any specific design standards, but was adopted for the area because of its visibility from State Highway 44 East. Projects in DR districts that do not have design standards must conform to the general DR district site development standards, including that 1) the design of the project take into account the surrounding area in terms of the project's visual appeal and character, scale of development and sense of proportionality, building size and dimension, mix and pattern of color and architectural variation, lighting, signing and other physical relationships affecting appearance between various architectural styles found in and around the development, and 2) that project landscaping provide shading over 50 percent of the parking and pedestrian areas within 10 years after project completion.

The project site is visible from State Highway 44 East which in this area is designated a highway corridor that is potentially eligible for designation as a State scenic highway where the natural and man-made environment contrast in the Shasta County General Plan. The architecture of existing commercial buildings in the vicinity are characterized by the materials, methods, and design style of the era in which they were constructed and most are single-story structures of typical height.

The north and east facing facades of the office/warehouse building visible would be from the eastbound and westbound lanes of the highway which are elevated above the project site. The project would be most visible from the westbound lanes as travelers approach from the east and from the eastbound on-ramp as travelers enter the highway. The north facing facade of the proposed office/warehouse building is proposed to include a covered entry and walkway and it incorporates three exterior siding finishes, including a river rock wainscot, hardi-lap siding, and ribbed metal siding. The hardi-lap siding would extend around the east and west sides of the office portion of the building. The warehouse portion of the building would be of significantly greater mass in relation to the office portion and most existing commercial buildings in the vicinity. It would incorporate a singular exterior metal ribbed siding finish and have roll-up doors visible from the eastbound lanes. The shed located within the outdoor storage area would be visible from the eastbound lane. It would incorporate a singular exterior siding material consisting of ribbed metal siding.

The Shasta County zoning code requires outdoor storage areas to be obscured from view by screened fencing. The applicant has proposed to plant trees along the east and south fence lines to provide additional screening of the roll-up doors, shed, and outdoor storage areas. The potential aesthetic impacts from the mass of the warehouse building, location of the roll-up doors, and outdoor storage area are proposed to be further mitigated by requiring the proposed trees to be evergreen or a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees that grow to a mature height at least as tall as the roll-up doors on the warehouse building; requiring siding and roofing materials to be different colors; and requiring the warehouse siding to be a darker shade than the office siding materials to alter the perception of the warehouse portion as being significantly greater in mass in relation to the office portion. With the incorporation of these recommended mitigation measures, the potential aesthetic impacts of the project on the highway corridor and visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would be less-than-significant.

- d) The project would create a new substantial source of light. Typical exterior lighting for contractor's yards include, parking area, walkway/doorway and task lighting either affixed to building and/or on poles within parking outdoor storage areas. Outdoor lighting can have negative impacts on both humans and wildlife that reside or occupy the vicinity of the project site. In the case of

impacts on humans, blue-white spectrum (color temperature of 4,600 Kelvin (K) above) would typically create the greatest impacts, including potential interruption of sleep. In addition, outdoor lighting can negatively impact views of the night sky and rural character of an area by potentially increasing sky glow. In general, glare from lighting is a function of the color spectrum and distribution of the light source.

The Shasta County Development Standards include general requirements for lighting, including it be designed to confine direct lighting to the premises and that the light source not shine upon any surface other than the area required to be lighted. In addition to these basic requirements, it is proposed that all exterior lighting be fully shielded (bulb not visible), fully cut-off (no light above horizontal), and in the yellow to orange color spectrum (color temperature below 4,600 K), except for security lighting which may exceed 4,600 K. The proposed lighting requirement would reduce the potential impacts of project lighting to a less-than-significant level.

Shasta County has required the use of neutral and earth tone building colors as a standard condition of approval for use permits. This requirement addresses the issue of glare from building colors and would apply to the proposed use permit.

Mitigation/Monitoring: The following mitigation measures will reduce the aesthetic impacts from the project to a less-than-significant level.

I.b.1) Prior to initiating use of the outdoor storage area, the applicant shall landscape the east and west property lines with evergreen or a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees. The trees to be planted shall be able to achieve a mature height at least as tall as the roll-up doors on the warehouse building; be a minimum 15-gallons in size; be placed outside the screened fence; and be spaced 20 feet on center or, based on their mature canopy spread, to maximize screening of the outdoor storage area. The landscape trees, with the exception of border materials, shall be subject to all applicable landscaping standards of the Shasta County zoning code effective at the time of the use permit approval. Plans for the landscape trees shall be provided with the building permit application(s) and approved by the Shasta County Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit(s).

I.c.1) Siding and roof materials shall not be the same color and the siding material of the warehouse portion of the warehouse/office building shall be of a darker shade than the siding materials used on the office portion of the building. The proposed siding and roofing material colors shall be provided with the building permit application(s) and approved by the Shasta County Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit(s).

I.d.1) All exterior lighting shall be fully shielded (bulb not visible), fully cut-off (no light above horizontal), and in the yellow to orange color spectrum (color temperature below 4,600 K), except for security lighting (i.e. lighting at entrances to buildings, and near vehicles, equipment, and materials commonly targeted for theft such as copper wire and other recyclable metals, equipment with gasoline, batteries, etc., passenger vehicles, hand tools, etc.) which may exceed 4,600 K. Cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixtures and bulbs shall be submitted with the building permit application(s) and approved the Shasta County Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit(s).

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?				✓

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
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 2014.
- b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) The project site is not forest land, timberland or zone Timberland Production.
- d) The project site is not forest land.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		✓		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

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

- a) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2006 Attainment Plan for Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan.
- b-e) Sensitive receptors nearest the project site include Junction School, which is approximately 350 feet southwest of the project site, and a few residences. The closest residence is a non-conforming residence approximately 150 feet from the project site on an adjoining commercial parcel to the west.

During construction activities at the site 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 would generate dust and exhaust from use of mobile equipment, such as a forklift, to move and load/unload septic tanks, horse troughs, and other finished and raw materials within the outdoor storage 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 at the facility would generate a conservative estimate of approximately 66 one-way vehicle trips per day, including 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. The proposed concrete volumetric mixer is 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 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: The following mitigation measures will reduce, the aesthetic impacts from the project to a less-than-significant level.

III.c.1) Water, non-toxic soil stabilizers, and/or other similar materials shall be applied as often as necessary to eliminate fugitive dust from driveways and other potential sources within the outdoor storage area that are likely to create dust while in use and/or, if dust is being transported off-site, during periods of high winds.

III.c.2) Sand and aggregate and other materials used in the cement mixing process that are stored within the proposed storage bins or otherwise stored within the outdoor storage shall be bagged, covered, and/or otherwise managed to eliminate fugitive dust.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat				

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> : Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				✓

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

a,b,c) No 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have been identified on the project site or in the project area. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community on the project site or in the project area. There are no vernal pools or wetlands identified on the subject property based on the Vernal Pools, Wetlands, and Waterways Map of Shasta County prepared by the Geographic Information Center, California State University, Chico, on August 24, 1996.

Lighting from the project could potentially impact wildlife in the vicinity as described in the Section I. Aesthetics. Lighting impacts on wildlife would be considered less-than-significant, if the mitigation measures described in Section I. Aesthetics are implemented.

Run-off from the project site has the potential to reach Cow Creek. Any pollution present in run-off from the site has the potential to negatively impact Cow Creek and downstream aquatic habitat. Potential water quality impacts are discussed below in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality.

- d) The project does not include any stream modification, tree removal, or other activated that would not interfere with any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e) The project would not conflict with any ordinances or policies which protect biological resources.
- f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: The proposed mitigation measures described in Sections I. Aesthetics and IX. Hydrology and Water Quality would reduce the biological resources impact from the project to a less-than-significant level.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?			✓	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			✓	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity and consultation with the Wintu Tribe of Northern California and Toyon-Wintu Center,, the following findings can be made:

a,b) There are no evident above surface historical or cultural resources present within the project site. No evidence of subsurface historical or cultural resources were discovered during construction review and construction of the residential subdivision to the south.

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1 the Department of Resource Management sent a certified letter to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request consultation on the project in writing.

The tribe responded to indicate that it had limited concerns of destructive cultural impact in the proposed area, but would conduct a pedestrian survey to ensure the Tribe’s limited concerns were warranted. The Tribe’s response also state that should they not contact the County within 24 hours of their response, the County should consider it a “go ahead” to move forward with the permit process and proposed project. The Tribe did not contact the County to express any further concern.

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, 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.

- c) Upon review of the Minerals Element of the General Plan, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- d) 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.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				✓

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake, fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publications 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				✓
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				✓
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				✓
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓

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

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault;

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;

According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The 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, Soil Conservation Service and