

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Shasta County Department of Resource Management (County) is a Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and is responsible for preparing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Tierra Robles Planned Development Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2012102051). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.), California CEQA Statutes and Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, §15000 et seq.), and the rules, regulations, and procedures for implementation of CEQA, as adopted by the County. The principle State *CEQA Guidelines* sections governing content of this document are §15120 through §15132 (Content of an EIR), and §15161 (Project EIR).

CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a *significant* effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (State *CEQA Guidelines* §15378[a]). Pursuant to CEQA's definition, the County has determined that the proposed Tierra Robles Planned Development (Zone Amendment Z10-002, Tract Map 1996) is a *project*, which has the potential for resulting in significant environmental effects. The purpose of this EIR is to review the existing conditions, analyze potential environmental impacts, and identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects related to the Tierra Robles Planned Development Project herein referenced as the "proposed project."

### 1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The EIR is an informational document that appraises decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental effects of a proposed project. An EIR must describe a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project and identify possible means to minimize the significant effects. The Shasta County Planning Commission and Shasta County Board of Supervisors (BOS) will consider the information in the EIR, including the public comments and staff response to those comments, during the public hearing process. As a legislative action, the final decision is made by the Board of Supervisors, who may approve, conditionally approve, or deny the project. As provided in State *CEQA Guidelines* §15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues. The purpose of an EIR is to identify:

- *The significant potential impacts of the project on the environment and indicate the manner in which those significant impacts can be avoided or mitigated;*
- *Any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated; and*
- *Reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental impacts or reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.*

An EIR also discloses growth-inducing impacts; impacts found not to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of the project when taken into consideration with past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects.

The County, which has the principle responsibility of processing and approving a proposed project, and other public agencies (e.g., responsible and trustee agencies; refer to Section 1.5 of this EIR) that may use this EIR in the decision making or permit process, will consider the information in this EIR, along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process. CEQA requires an EIR that reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency regarding the impacts, the level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation implementation, and mitigation measures proposed to reduce the impacts. Environmental impacts are not always mitigated to a level considered *less than significant*; in those cases, impacts are considered *significant and unavoidable* impacts. In accordance with §15093(b) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, if a public agency approves a project that has significant impacts that are not substantially mitigated (i.e., significant unavoidable impacts), the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project, based on the Final EIR and any other information in the public record for the project. This is termed, per §15093 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, a “statement of overriding considerations.”

This document analyzes the environmental effects of the proposed project to the degree of specificity appropriate to the current proposed actions, as required by §15146 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*. The analysis considers the actions associated with the proposed project to determine the short-term and long-term effects associated with their implementation.

Reviewers of a Draft EIR are requested to focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects.

## **TYPE OF DOCUMENT**

This EIR has been prepared as a Project EIR, addressing the environmental effects of the proposed project. In accordance with §15121 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, a primary purpose of this EIR is to provide decision makers and the public with specific information regarding the environmental effects associated with development of the site. This EIR also identifies ways to minimize the significant effects and describes reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. Mitigation measures are provided which may be adopted as Conditions of Approval in order to reduce the significance of impacts resulting from the proposed project. In addition, this EIR is the primary reference document in the formulation and implementation of a mitigation monitoring program for the proposed project.

## **SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT**

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

A detailed project development breakdown summary is provided in Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION. The following provides a brief summary of the principle project components:

### **Zone Amendment**

A Zone Amendment (Z10-002) is requested to change the current zoning from Rural Residential 5-acre minimum (RR-BA-5), Rural Residential 3-acre minimum (RR-BA-3), and Unclassified (U), to a Planned Development (PD) zone district establishing a conceptual development plan covering the entire site.

### **Tract Map**

A Tract Map (TR 1996) is requested to divide the approximate 715.4-acre property into 166 single-family residential parcels ranging from 1.38 acres to 6.81 acres in size on approximately 471.92 acres, and six open space parcels totaling 192.7 acres.

### **Community Services District (CSD)**

The project proposes the formation of the Tierra Robles Community Services District (TRCSD) as a means to provide operation and maintenance of the wastewater treatment system, maintenance of improved streets within the subdivision, management of open spaces, including preservation and fire management operations, and maintenance of drainage improvements. The ultimate approval of the TRCSD would be subject to separate application and approval from the Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

### **Design Guidelines**

The proposed project includes a set of *Design Guidelines* to direct future architecture and site layout of individual lots. The *Design Guidelines* are intended to provide property owners, architects, homebuilders and contractors with a set of parameters for the preparation of construction drawings and specifications. The *Design Guidelines* oversight and enforcement would be the responsibility of the TRCSD in coordination with Shasta County.

### **Wildland Fuel/Vegetation Management Plan**

The Tierra Robles Wildland Fuel/Vegetation Management Plan (TRWF/VMP) provides for the management direction for the reduction of flammable vegetation from around buildings, roadways and driveways in accordance with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/Shasta County Fire Department (CAL FIRE/SCFD) requirements.

### **Project Design Features**

The project applicant proposes the following design features/amenities into the subdivision design: (1) Grey water diverter system; (2) Inclusion of solar design in new homes which reduces annual energy usage by 15 percent or more; (3) Variation of housing design and setbacks with not more than 5 percent of the same building footprint or building design; and (4) Class 1 public bikeways and pedestrian trails within the project site.

### 1.3 TERMINOLOGY

To assist reviewers in understanding this EIR, the following terms are defined:

- *Project*. The whole of an action that has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.
- *Environment*. The physical conditions that exist in the area and which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. The area involved is where significant direct or indirect impacts would occur as a result of the project. The environment includes both natural and man-made (artificial) conditions.
- *Impacts*. Impacts analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change. Impacts are:
  - *Direct or primary* impacts that would be caused by a proposed project and would occur at the same time and place; or
  - *Indirect or secondary* impacts that would be caused by a proposed project and would be later in time or farther removed in distance but would still be reasonably foreseeable. Indirect or secondary impacts may include growth-inducing impacts and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use; population density or growth rate; and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.
- *Significant Impact on the Environment*. A substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions in the area affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, tribal resources, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself is not considered a significant impact on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.
- *Mitigation*. Mitigation consists of measures that avoid or substantially reduce a proposed project's significant environmental impacts by:
  - Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
  - Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;
  - Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
  - Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or
  - Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.
- *Cumulative Impacts*. Two or more individual impacts that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The following statements also apply when considering cumulative impacts:

- The individual impacts may be changes resulting from a single project or separate projects.
- The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over time.

This EIR uses a variety of terms to describe the level of significance of adverse impacts. These terms are defined as follows:

- *Less Than Significant.* An impact that is adverse but that does not exceed the defined thresholds of significance. *Less than significant* impacts do not require mitigation.
- *Significant.* An impact that exceeds the defined thresholds of significance and would or could cause a substantial adverse change in the environment. Mitigation measures are recommended to eliminate the impact or reduce it to a *less than significant* level.
- *Significant and Unavoidable.* An impact that exceeds the defined thresholds of significance and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a *less than significant* level through the implementation of mitigation measures.

#### 1.4 COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA

A Draft EIR is subject to a 45-day review period by responsible and trustee agencies and interested parties. Section 15087 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* lists optional procedures for noticing, including publication in a newspaper, posting onsite, or mailing to owners of a property or properties contiguous to the site. In accordance with the provision of §15085(a) and §15087(a)(1) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, Shasta County, serving as the Lead Agency, will: 1) publish a notice of availability of a Draft EIR in the Record Searchlight, a newspaper of general circulation, and 2) will prepare and transmit a Notice of Completion (NOC) to the State Clearinghouse (proof of publication is available at the office of the Lead Agency).

Any public agency or members of the public desiring to comment on the Draft EIR must submit their comments in writing to the individual identified on the document's NOC prior to the end of the public review period. Upon the close of the public review period, the County will then proceed to evaluate and prepare responses to all relevant oral and written comments received from both citizens and public agencies during the public review period. After the close of the public review period, the County will hold a regularly-scheduled public hearing regarding the EIR.

The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR, revisions to the Draft EIR, and responses to comments addressing concerns raised by responsible agencies and reviewing parties. After the Final EIR is completed, and at least 10 days prior to its certification, a copy of the Responses to Comments will be transmitted to agencies providing written or oral comments on the Draft EIR.

## 1.5 EIR SCOPING PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the Lead Agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project.

The process of determining the focus and content of the EIR is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. The scoping process is not intended to resolve differences of opinion regarding the proposed project or evaluate its merits. Instead, the process allows all interested parties to express their concerns regarding the proposed project and thereby ensures that all opinions and comments applicable to the environmental analysis are addressed in the EIR. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interest groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR.

In compliance with the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the County has taken steps to maximize opportunities for interested individuals, parties, and agencies to participate in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, an effort was made to contact various federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and other interested parties to solicit comments and inform the public of the proposed project. Accordingly, an Initial Study and NOP were distributed in October 2012 and re-distributed in February 2016 (refer to *Notice of Preparation*, below).

### INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with §15063(a) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, the County undertook the preparation of an Initial Study. The Initial Study determined that a number of environmental issue areas may be impacted by the construction and buildout of the proposed project. As a result, the Initial Study determined that the Draft EIR should address the project's significant impacts on a variety of environmental issue areas that are addressed in Section 5.0, DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES of this Draft EIR.

Based on the Initial Study, no impacts on mineral resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, these issues are addressed in Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, in this EIR. Although recreation facilities were identified as having *less than significant* impacts in the Initial Study, further analysis regarding these environmental issue areas is provided in Section 5.0 of this EIR.

## NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Pursuant to the provision of State *CEQA Guidelines* §15082, as amended, the County circulated an Initial Study and NOP to public agencies, special districts, and members of the public who had requested such notice for a 30-day period commencing October 26, 2012, and ending on November 26, 2012. The purpose of the NOP was to formally announce that the County is preparing a Draft EIR for the proposed project, and that, as Lead Agency, was soliciting input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. A revised Initial Study and NOP was circulated for an additional 30-day comment period between February 19, 2016 and March 25, 2016.

Applicable agencies and interested members of the public have 30 days to respond to the NOP, indicating, at a minimum, reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR, and whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project. The NOP, Initial Study, and comment letters received during the NOP circulation period are provided in Appendix 15.1, NOTICE OF PREPARATION, INITIAL STUDY, AND NOP COMMENT LETTERS, of this EIR.

## SCOPING MEETING

Pursuant to §15206 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the lead agency is required to conduct at least one scoping meeting for all projects of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance. The scoping meeting is for jurisdictional agencies and interested persons or groups to provide comments regarding, but not limited to, the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and environmental effects to be analyzed. Shasta County hosted a scoping meeting at 7:00 p.m. on November 8, 2012 at the North Cow Creek Elementary School, and was intended to facilitate public input. The meeting was held with the specific intent of affording interested individuals, groups, and public agencies a forum in which to orally present input directly to the Lead Agency, to assist in further refining the intended scope and focus of the EIR as described in the NOP and Initial Study.

## DRAFT EIR

The EIR focuses primarily on changes in the environment that would result from the proposed project. The EIR identifies potential impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed project and provides measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Those impacts that cannot be mitigated to *less than significant* levels are also identified. This EIR addresses impacts in the following areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Soils and Geologic Hazards
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Fiscal Impacts
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy

As soon as the Draft EIR is completed, a NOC is filed with the SCH, and a public notice is published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and/or public review. In addition, the NOC provides information regarding the location of drafts and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR is circulated for a minimum 45-day period, during which time reviewers may make comments. The lead agency must evaluate and respond to comments in writing, describing the disposition of any significant environmental issues raised and explaining in detail the reasons for not accepting any specific comments concerning major environmental issues. If comments received after public notice is given result in the addition of significant new information to an EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

## 1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

The Draft EIR is organized into fifteen (15) sections, as follows:

- Section 1.0, INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE, provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the Draft EIR and the review and certification process. It also provides summaries of the chapters included in the Draft EIR, and summaries of the issues and concerns received from the public and public agencies during the NOP review period.
- Section 2.0, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, summarizes the elements of the proposed project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Acknowledges alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts.
- Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including the project's location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.
- Section 4.0, BASIS FOR THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, describes the approach and methodology for the cumulative impacts analysis.
- Section 5.0, DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING (Impacts and Mitigation Measures), contains a detailed environmental analysis of the existing conditions, project impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and unavoidable adverse impacts (if applicable). The analysis of each environmental category in Section 5.0 is organized as follows:
  - "Existing Conditions" describes the physical conditions that exist at this time and that may influence or affect the issue under investigation.
  - "Significance Criteria" provides the thresholds that are the basis of conclusions of significance, for which the primary source for the criteria is Appendix G of the State *CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations [CCR], §15000 through §15387).
  - "Project Impacts" describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur if the proposed project is implemented.

- A designation of “no impact” is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
  - A “less than significant impact” would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
  - A “less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated” avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
  - A “significant and unavoidable impact” would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less than significant impact.
- “Cumulative Impacts” describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur with the proposed project, together with all other reasonably foreseeable, planned, and approved future projects.
  - “Mitigation Measures” are those specific measures that may be required of the proposed Project to avoid a significant adverse impact; minimize a significant adverse impact; rectify a significant adverse impact by restoration; reduce or eliminate a significant adverse impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; or compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment.
  - “Level of Significance After Mitigation” discusses whether the proposed project and the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts can be reduced to levels that are considered less than significant.
- Section 6.0, GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS, discusses significant environmental changes that would result from the proposed action, should it be implemented, and discusses growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project.
  - Section 7.0, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or to the location of the project that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives, and provides and a determination of the environmentally superior alternative.
  - Section 8.0, OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS, lists mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant impacts of the proposed project.
  - Section 9.0, INVENTORY OF MITIGATION MEASURES, describes those proposed project impacts that remain significant following mitigation.
  - Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, explains potential proposed project impacts that have been determined not to be significant.
  - Section 11.0, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED, identifies all Federal, State, or local agencies, other organizations, and individuals consulted in the preparation of the EIR.

- Section 12.0, BIBLIOGRAPHY, provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.
- Section 13.0, MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, identifies responsibilities for monitoring mitigation.
- Section 14.0, COMMENTS AND RESPONSES, will be provided as part of the Final EIR for the proposed project.
- Section 15.0, APPENDICES, contains comments received during the NOP comment period, and the technical documentation prepared for the proposed project.

## 1.7 RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Certain projects or actions undertaken by a Lead Agency require subsequent oversight, approvals, or permits from other public agencies to be implemented. Such other agencies are referred to as “Responsible Agencies” and “Trustee Agencies.” Pursuant to State *CEQA Guidelines* §15381 and §15386, as amended, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies are respectively defined as follows:

- *“Responsible Agency” means a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency that have discretionary approval power over the project (State CEQA Guidelines §15381).*
- *“Trustee Agency” means a State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California. Trustee Agencies include . . . (State CEQA Guidelines §15386).*

Responsible and Trustee Agencies and other entities that may use this EIR in their decision-making process or for informational purposes include, but may not be limited to, the following:

### LOCAL AGENCIES

Shasta County Air Quality Management District  
Shasta County Board of Supervisors  
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Air Quality Management  
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division  
Shasta County Department of Public Health  
Shasta County Department of Public Works  
Shasta County Fire Department  
Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission  
Shasta County Sheriff’s Department

## STATE AGENCIES

California Air Resources Board  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
California Historical Resources Information Systems, Northeast Information Center  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board  
California Department of Water Resources  
California Water Resources Control Board

## FEDERAL AGENCIES

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

## 1.8 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Pertinent documents relating to this EIR have been cited in accordance with State *CEQA Guidelines* §15148, which encourages incorporation by reference to reduce redundancy in and the length of environmental reports. The following documents, which are available for public review at the County, are hereby incorporated by reference into this EIR. Information contained within these documents has been utilized for this EIR. A synopsis of the scope and content of each of these documents is provided below.

## SHASTA COUNTY

### Shasta County General Plan

The Shasta County *General Plan* is a statement of public policy reflecting the aspirations and values of Shasta County residents which is adopted by their elected representatives. The Shasta County *General Plan*, amended 2004, identifies strategies, policies, and implementation recommendations for land use within its planning area. The Shasta County *General Plan* is a long-range comprehensive plan that governs growth and development in the unincorporated areas of Shasta County. The function of the *General Plan* is to provide a policy framework that must be reflected in the zoning ordinance, specific plans, and other development guidelines.

### Shasta County Zoning Plan

The Shasta County *Zoning Plan*, amended 2003, is a tool to assist the County in attaining goals identified in the Shasta County *General Plan*. The Shasta County *Zoning Plan* consists of the establishment of various zoning districts to be used within the unincorporated territory of the County. As a legal instrument, the zoning map has immediate force and effect and is one of the key tools in implementing the *General Plan's* policies. The purpose of the Shasta County *Zoning Plan* provisions are:

- To promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare;

- To implement the Shasta County *General Plan*, and to facilitate and guide growth in accordance with the Shasta County *General Plan*; and
- To protect the social and economic stability of residential, commercial, industrial, resource production, and recreational.

### **Shasta County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan**

The purpose of Shasta County's *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan* is to implement and sustain actions that reduce vulnerability and risk from hazards, or reduce the severity of the effects of hazards on people and property. Mitigation actions are both short-term and long-term activities, which reduce the cause or occurrence of hazards; reduce exposure to hazards, or reduce effects of hazards through various means to include preparedness, response and recovery measures.

### **Shasta County Code, Title 15, Subdivision Regulations**

The Subdivision Regulations outline the requirements and standards necessary for preparing and submitting tentative subdivision maps for review and approval. The Subdivision Regulations are intended to encourage orderly community development by providing for the regulation and control of the design and improvement of the subdivision, with proper consideration of its relation to adjoining areas; to ensure that the areas within the subdivision that are dedicated for public purposes will be properly improved by the subdivider so that they will not become an undue burden on the community; to implement the objectives established for development of the county in conformance with the goals and policies of the general plan and adopted development policies; to limit undue fiscal impacts to the County; and to protect the public and transferee of parcels created through the subdivision process.

### **Shasta County Grading Ordinance, Section 12.12**

The Shasta County Grading Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) sets forth regulations concerning grading, excavating, and filling. The Grading Ordinance prohibits any grading of more than 250 cubic yards or 10,000 square feet of disturbance area without a grading permit from the County. The grading permit must include an approved grading plan provided by the project applicant, and it must set forth terms and conditions of grading operations that conform to the County's grading standards. The permit also requires the project applicant to provide a permanent erosion control plan that must be implemented upon completion of the project. In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final subdivision grading plan and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts.

### **Shasta County Parks, Trails and Open Space Plan**

The intent of the *Shasta County Parks, Trails and Open Space Plan* is to identify the issues and opportunities for improving the provision of parks, trails, and open space in Shasta County. The plan outlines a set of strategies and recommendations for meeting current and future community needs based on changing trends in recreation, new patterns for recreation participation, and new areas of growth and development in the County.

## Tierra Robles Public Scoping Report

The release of the NOP to prepare an EIR initiated the County's 30-day public scoping period under CEQA. The *Tierra Robles Public Scoping Report*, dated April 2016, documents the issues and concerns expressed by members of the public, government agencies, and organizations during the October 2012 – November 2012 EIR public scoping period and the most recent 30-day NOP comment period that circulated from February 19, 2016 through March 25, 2016. Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in the *Tierra Robles Public Scoping Report*. Comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by the County in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the EIR.

## PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

As part of the preparation of this EIR, the following studies, which are included in the Technical Appendices (Section 15.0, APPENDICES), were prepared or utilized to develop baseline information and project-related impact discussions. With the exception of online references noted in Section 12.0, BIBLIOGRAPHY, other reference documents utilized in preparation of the Draft EIR are available at the County of Shasta Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, Monday through Friday during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.).

- *Additional Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch Development*. Coyote and Fox Enterprises. April 3, 2006. Document on file at the County.
- *Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch (820 Acres North of Boyle Road) between Deschutes Road and Old Alturas Road), Palo Cedro, Shasta County, California*. Coyote and Fox Enterprises. July 28, 2004. Document on file at the County.
- *Biological Review for Geringer's Capitol "Tierra Robles Ranch" Shasta County, California*. Wildland Resource Managers. August 2016.
- *Chatham Ranch Wetlands Delineation Addendum*. Wildland Resource Managers. May 2011.
- *Cultural Resource Investigations for Tierra Robles Development*. Coyote and Fox Enterprises. January 2013. Document on file at the County.
- *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Limited Geologic Hazards Evaluation of Proposed Residential Subdivision, Chatham Ranch, Shasta County, California*. Brown & Mills, Inc. December 18, 2006.
- *Preliminary Hydrology Analysis*. S<sub>2</sub>-J<sub>2</sub> Engineering, Inc. February 15, 2016.
- *The Oaks Resource of Tierra Robles*. Wildland Resource Managers. 2015.
- *Tierra Robles Design Guidelines*. Shasta Red, LLC. December 2016.
- *Tierra Robles Oak Management Plan*. Wildland Resource Managers. 2016
- *Tierra Robles Oak Tree Assessment Study*. Wildland Resource Managers. September 2012.
- *Tierra Robles Traffic Impact Study*. Omni-Means Engineering Solutions. May 2015.
- *Tierra Robles Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis Technical Memorandum*. Omni-Means Engineering Solutions. August 2017.
- *Tierra Robles Waste Water Management Plan*. S<sub>2</sub>-J<sub>2</sub> Engineering, Inc. July 2015.
- *Tierra Robles Wildland Fuel/Vegetation Management Plan*. Wildland Resource Managers. July 2015.
- *Wetlands Delineation for Chatham Ranch*. Wildland Resource Managers. December 2008.

## 1.9 PREPARERS OF THE DRAFT EIR

The County of Shasta is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this EIR. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Kimley-Horn) is the environmental consultant retained by the County to prepare the EIR for the proposed project. The names and contact information of the consultants who prepared the technical studies that are a part of this EIR are provided in Section 11.0, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED.

<i>Lead Agency</i>	<b>Shasta County Department of Resource Management</b> <i>Planning Division</i> 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103 Redding, California 96001
<i>Project Applicant</i>	<b>Shasta Red, LLC</b> <i>a Delaware Limited Liability Company</i> 9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000 Beverly Hills, California 90212
<i>Applicant Representative</i>	<b>S<sub>2</sub>-J<sub>2</sub> Engineering, Inc.</b> 19032 Lahalah Way Cottonwood, California 96022
<i>Environmental Consultant</i>	<b>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.</b> 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300 Sacramento, California 95814

## 1.10 REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR will be distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with PRC §21092 (b)(3). The NOC of the Draft EIR will also be distributed as required by CEQA. During the 45-day public review period, the Draft EIR, including technical appendices, is available for review at the County of Shasta Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, California 96001. Written comments on the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Mr. Kent Hector, AICP, Senior Planner  
**Shasta County Department of Resource Management**  
*Planning Division*  
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103  
Redding, California 96001

Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to all substantive environmental issues raised will be prepared and available for review prior to the public hearing before the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. These environmental comments and their responses, as well as any proposed changes in the Draft EIR based on the comments, will be included as part of the environmental record for consideration by decision-makers for the proposed project.

## 1.11 GUIDELINES FOR COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT EIR

The purpose of the public review of the Draft EIR is to evaluate the adequacy of the environmental analysis in terms of compliance with CEQA. Section 15151 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* states the following regarding standards from which adequacy is judged:

*An EIR should be prepared with sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonable feasible.*

Section 15204(a) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* provides guidance to assist members of the public and public agencies in preparing comments on a Draft EIR. Section 15204.5(a) states:

*In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.*

*Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviews should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts. And the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a Lead Agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.*

Pursuant to the State *CEQA Guidelines*, an effect is not considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence; therefore, comments should be accompanied by factual support. Section 15204(c) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* states:

*Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and, should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts. Or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to §15064 an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.*