

## 10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In accordance with the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* §15128, this section briefly describes the potential impacts found to be *less than significant*. In February 2016, Shasta County conducted an Initial Study to determine significant effects of the proposed project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the proposed project were found to be *less than significant* because of the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). However, many of the impacts found to be *less than significant* are also evaluated in greater detail in this Draft EIR. A copy of the Initial Study is in Appendix 15.1, NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) INITIAL STUDY, AND NOP COMMENT LETTERS, of this EIR. The resources listed below have been numbered the same as they appear in the Initial Study.

### II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

**b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**

**No Impact.** None of the parcels within the project site are under a Williamson Act contract. While agricultural uses occur on some adjacent properties, these properties are not zoned for agricultural uses, and are not under Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, project implementation would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning.

### III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

**d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**No Impact.** Due to the characteristics of the proposed development, it is unlikely that the project would cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No impact has been identified.

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

**e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?**

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

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The wastewater treatment facility will be centrally located. It will be approximately 0.25 acre in size and will be fenced for security. The facility will include a controls/storage building approximately 12' by 15' in size. This building will have a restroom and will house the treatment system controls, the disinfection system, records keeping work station, safety equipment, maintenance equipment and miscellaneous storage.

The treatment system will be designed to meet the reuse requirements for discharge of Title 22 Disinfected Secondary effluent. Title 22 reuse requires daily testing for coliform. The system controls will have remote monitoring capability with automatic alarms if the effluent discharge does not meet minimum requirements. Effluent constituents that will be monitored will include turbidity, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP), and Chlorine Residual. The treatment system will include flow equalization and emergency storage tankage. Secondary treatment will occur through Orenco AXMAX units installed in phases as the wastewater flow increases. Chlorine disinfection will follow, including capacity for contact time and de-chlorination prior to dispersal. Further evaluation in the EIR is required.

## **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:**

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

**No Impact.** Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site and transported to and from the site during construction. In addition, some potentially hazardous construction waste may be generated during the construction phase. Construction wastes from the site would be disposed of in accordance with the Standard Specifications in the California Code of Regulations. Compliance with federal and state laws would reduce the potential for hazards related to construction waste to a less-than-significant level.

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

- b) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous materials through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site. Accidental releases of these substances could potentially contaminate soils and degrade the quality of surface water and groundwater, resulting in a public safety hazard. Compliance with standard safety procedures and hazardous materials handling regulations will reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

**No Impact.** The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no indications at this time that the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

## **IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:**

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a new deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** Water service for the project is to be provided by the Bella Vista Water District. The District has provided a Will Serve Letter and is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the proposed project.

- g) *Place housing within 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

**No Impact.** The project would not place housing within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

***h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

**No Impact.** The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. No structures are proposed in the 100-year flood hazard area.

***j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project is not located near a large lake or the ocean so would not be subject to seiche or tsunami. It is not located on or near a mountainside or hillside which is subject to mudflows.

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:**

***a) Physically divide an established community?***

**No Impact.** The 715.4-acre site is not located in any established community. The project does not include the creation of any road, ditch, wall, or other feature which would physically divide an established community.

***c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

**No Impact.** The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area.

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:**

***a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site.

***b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. The project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource. There is no other land use plan which addresses minerals.

## **XII. NOISE: Would the project:**

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There is no identified source of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project area.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

**No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

## **XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:**

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** The project site is primarily undeveloped, and is being used for agricultural purposes. The project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to the displacement of housing and people.

- c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** The project site is primarily undeveloped, and is being used for agricultural purposes. The project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to the displacement of housing and people.

## **XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:**

***Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services including: parks and other public facilities?***

### ***Parks:***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility

would occur or be accelerated. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.

The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding also has a number of recreational facilities. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public land available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by Bureau of Land Management.

***Other Public Facilities:***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project could potentially affect other public or government facilities, such as libraries. Because the project involves a substantial change in the character of land uses and would generate new residents within the County, the project could result in an increased demand on public facilities. Potential impacts to public facilities and the potential to build new offices and buildings to serve the public will be evaluated in the EIR.

**XV. RECREATION: Would the project:**

***a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.

***b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding also has a number of recreational facilities. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public land available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by Bureau of Land Management.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC: Would the project:**

***c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. The project would result in the construction of single-family residences which would not affect air traffic patter

**f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

**No Impact.** The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. The project design incorporates adequate area for off-street parking in accordance with County standards.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:**

**d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project which serves or may serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Bella Vista Water District. Development of the proposed planned development will require extension of the District's water lines to serve the proposed residential parcels for domestic water use and fire protection purposes and will be addressed in the EIR

**g) *Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.