

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION GPA-3-05
REZONING APPLICATION RZ-11-05
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN PD-12-05
REDDING RETIREMENT RESIDENCE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION**

Prepared by
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, California 96001

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Redding Retirement Residence Planned Development
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Lily Toy, Senior Planner, (530) 245-7231
4. **Project Location:** The proposed project site is located in the western portion of the City of Redding at the southwest corner of Eureka Way and Buenaventura Boulevard. The proposed project site is located on a ±7.64-acre parcel (AP No. 104-730-037). (See attached location map).
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Curry Brandaw Architects, 2601 25th Street SE, Suite 300, Salem, Oregon 97302
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 2 to 3.5 units per acre."
7. **Zoning:** "RS-2" Residential Single Family District
8. **Description of Project:** The project sponsor is requesting approval of a 118-suite facility on a ±7.64-acre parcel. The project applicant is requesting a rezone of the property to include the Planned Development Overlay District. The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Redding designates the project site as "RS-2" Residential Single Family District. The City of Redding General Plan designates the project site as "Residential, 2 - 3.5 units per acre." The proposed development would require a General Plan Amendment and rezoning to a General Plan designation of "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" and a zoning classification of "RM-18-PD" Residential Multiple Family District with Planned Development Overlay District. The project will include a 36,322-square-foot main building, ±1.0 acres of on-site driveways and parking, and ±4.0 acres of open space. The project would include construction of on-site utility and storm-drainage improvements necessary to serve the facility.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The study site ranges in elevation from approximately 670 to 730 feet above sea level and slopes gently to the north. An unnamed perennial stream is present on the study site. The perennial stream flows north into Jenny Creek, which is tributary to the Sacramento River, approximately one mile northeast of the study site. The project site supports a foothill woodland plant community. Eureka Way borders the project site to the north, Ridge Drive to the west, and Buenaventura Boulevard to the east. Pebble Drive, to the south, is not a through street. Existing land uses adjacent to the site include residential (3.5 units per acre) and vacant land. A shopping center, general offices, and open space are located to the east of Buenaventura Boulevard.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** The project applicants must obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement will also be required by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) for "streambed" crossings by street/driveway and utility line crossings. The project may be subject to Section 404 permit approvals from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) in the event that jurisdictional waters cannot be fully avoided. In the case that the Army Corps of Engineers requires a Section 404 permit, a Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be necessary as well. The most commonly used Section 404 permits in this situation are Nationwide Permits 12, 14, and 39; an Individual Permit is unlikely to be required.

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.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards (Fire) & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> None After Mitigation Measures Incorporated |

DETERMINATION. (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. 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 significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

June 28, 2006

Date

Lily Toy

Name

Senior Planner

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include:

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Circulation
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines and used by the City of Redding in its environmental review process. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the development's impacts and to identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The development will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The development will have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Where potential impacts are anticipated to be significant, mitigation measures will be required, so that impacts may be avoided or reduced to insignificant levels.

List of attachments:

- A. Location map
- B. Aerial photograph
- C. Site plan
- D. URBEMIS default parameter changes

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have social or economic impacts resulting in a physical deterioration of the environment (economic blight)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a. The project site is designated in the City of Redding General Plan for residential development (2-3.5 units per acre). Land uses adjacent to the site include existing roads, residential (3.5 units per acre), and vacant land. The project does not have the potential to physically divide a community.

b. The project applicant is requesting a rezone of the property to include the Planned Development Overlay District. The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Redding designates the project site as "RS-2" Residential Single Family. The City of Redding General Plan designates the project site as "Residential, 2 - 3.5 units per acre." The project proposal includes a General Plan amendment to "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" and a rezoning to "RM-18-PD" Residential Multiple Family District with Planned Development Overlay District. The proposal would change the land use from one that could accommodate single-family dwellings to one that would accommodate a higher residential-density potential. Under the existing base district, up to 16 housing units could be constructed, resulting in a potential population of 38 persons based on 2.36 persons per dwelling. Under the requested classification, between 77 and 153 housing units could be constructed on the project site. This results in a potential population between 190 and 378 persons based on 2.47 persons per unit. Under the requested zone, up to 138 housing units could be constructed. This results in a potential population of 341 persons based on 2.47 persons per unit. The requested project proposal of 118 units would result in a potential overall population of 291 persons based on 2.47 persons per unit, which is within the range of the potential population under the requested classification and consistent with the requested zone. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

c. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the site. The project is consistent with the goals stated in the Natural Resources Element of the City of Redding General Plan.

d. The project would ultimately provide positive social and economic impacts by facilitating orderly residential development of natural lands within the urban core as is fully supported by the General Plan. Market demands/opportunities/limitations will ultimately control project implementation and phasing.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Community Development and Design Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2002

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

A. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b, c. The project would create opportunity for the construction of new housing. No existing homes or residents would be displaced. As previously discussed under the Land Use and Planning section, the requested project proposal of 118 units would result in population and housing within the range of the potential population under the requested classification and consistent with the requested zone; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Housing Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Community Development & Design Element, 2000
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2002

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>(1) 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 Publication 42.</p> <p>(2) Strong seismic ground-shaking?</p> <p>(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>(4) Landslides?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>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?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>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?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>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 wastewater?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |

Discussion

a, c, d. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Faults designated in the Redding area of Shasta County. There are no other documented earthquake faults in the vicinity that pose a significant risk, and the site is located in an area designated in the Health and Safety Element of the City of Redding General Plan as having a range of low to medium ground-shaking potential, between 0.10–0.45 g. Landslides, expansive soils, and subsidence are not considered to pose a significant hazard in the project area. The type of soils and underlying geology is identified as having no potential for liquefaction. No portion of the site falls within the 100-year floodplain of the Sacramento River or any creek.

b. The project site contains two primary soil classifications, Auburn very stony loam (ArD) and Auburn loam (AnB).

**Table 1
Soil Types and Characteristics**

Soil Name	Soil Type	Permeability	Slope (%)	Erosion Potential	Run Off Rate
Auburn (ArD)	Very stony loam	Moderate	8-30	Moderate-high	Medium-rapid
Auburn (AnB)	Loam	Moderate	0-8	Slight-moderate	Slow-medium

Of the ±7.64 acres proposed for development, the project will result in the grading (cut area of 21,775 cubic yards, fill area of 20,094 cubic yards, export of 1,681 cubic yards) of ±4.2 acres in order to facilitate driveway construction, provide utilities, and create building pads. Some grading encroachment may occur on slopes in excess of 20 percent to accommodate installation of driveway and utility infrastructure and ensure adequate drainage. Some grading will occur in the open-space areas to construct utilities infrastructure and storm-water detention and provide maintenance access. These construction activities may result in the displacement and overcovering of soil and a change in topographic features. The greatest concern raised by the extent of the proposed grading is the potential for soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation of on-site drainages. Careful application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction will minimize soil erosion and related water quality impacts.

The project is subject to certain erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations. These requirements include:

- **City of Redding Grading Ordinance.** This ordinance requires the application of "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (Redding Municipal Code Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, and E). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final subdivision grading plan and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts.
- **California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Construction Activity Storm Water Permit."** This permit overlaps the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion control during construction of the project.
- **California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)."** This plan emphasizes storm-water best management practices and is required as part of the Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that affect the quality of storm-water discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in storm-water discharges.
- **California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) "1600 Permit."** This permit is required for any work within a defined streambed and may be applicable to the proposed culvert installations and driveway crossing through the perennial stream on the eastern portion of the project site. In addition, the DFG permit may address any potential disturbance of riparian habitat.

With incorporation of the following standard practices, potential impacts associated with grading and soil erosion will be reduced to a level that is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

1. All applicable provisions of the City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12) shall be met. This will require in part that a qualified erosion and sediment-control specialist be retained for preparation of a Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that establishes specific measures and Best Management Practices to minimize soil erosion during and after construction activities. Grading work shall be of a scale so that all grading can be completed in a single construction season.
2. The developer shall obtain a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit from the State Water Quality Control Board prior to commencement of construction of the subdivision in order to protect water quality from development activities. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared prior to construction activities in order to identify potential pollutants and to eliminate or minimize the potential for those pollutants to enter storm waters.
3. The developer shall acquire all necessary letters of approval and/or permits from regulatory agencies (e.g. Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board) for altering or working within the existing natural drainage courses prior to the issuance of a City grading permit, commencement of grading activities, and/or construction of utility and drainage infrastructure.
4. Clearing and grading activities shall be limited to the boundaries of the project site being developed and to construction of off-site improvements necessary to serve that site. Off-site material borrowing or stockpiling shall be allowed only where there is no feasible alternative and must be appropriately mitigated. Any necessary permits shall be obtained for off-site activity.

Application of Mitigation 8, as established under Item VII, Biological Resources, below, also helps reduce the potential for soil erosion to less than significant.

- e. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan, Health and Safety Element; Figures 4-1 (Ground-Shaking Potential) and 4.2 (Liquefaction Potential), 2000
City of Redding General Plan Final EIR, 2000
Redding Municipal Code, 2003

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
 City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
 City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
 Soils Survey of Shasta County Area, California, 1974
 Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, Woodward-Clyde, 1995

Mitigation

None required.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste-discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, c-f. Development of the site will not result in substantial water-related impacts, since the on-site storm water will be detained in accordance with the City of Redding Storm Water Management requirements. Construction of the proposed project and covering of the site with paving will have an effect on the absorption rate of water on-site; however, the project will include a drainage system designed in accordance with the City's improvement standards which will adequately handle on-site drainage associated with the development of the property. Storm-water detention will be designed to detain the increased storm drainage due to additional development of the property based on 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm frequencies at 6-hour durations. The detention will be designed by the applicant's engineer and approved by the City Engineering Division prior to issuance of a grading permit.

There may be minor amounts of wind and/or water erosion associated with construction of the facility. Standard erosion-control measures will be utilized during construction, as delineated in the measures under III.b. above. With implementation of these measures, potential impacts associated with drainage would be reduced to a level less than significant. In addition, application of Mitigation 4 under *Biological Resources* also reduces potential impacts to water quality from soil erosion and related site-drainage concerns to a level less than significant.

b. The project would utilize City water service for domestic uses and fire protection. There are no known wells on or near the project site that could be impacted by proposed construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies.

g, h, i. The project site is not located within any agency or otherwise-documented flood-hazard boundary.

j. The threat of a tsunami wave is not applicable to inland, Central Valley communities such as Redding. Seiches could potentially be generated in either Shasta Lake or Whiskeytown Lake during an earthquake. However, neither lake has been identified in the Health and Safety Element of the General Plan as having any risk to the City under such circumstances. There is no documented threat of mudflows potentially affecting the project site.

Documentation

- Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations, FIRM map 060360-0015, dated 9/29/89
- City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
- Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000

Mitigation

None required.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c. Shasta County, including the far northern Sacramento Valley, currently exceeds the State’s ambient standards for ozone (smog) and particulates (fine, airborne particles). Consequently, these pollutants are the focus of local air quality policy, especially when related to land use and transportation planning. Even with application of measures to reduce emissions for individual projects, cumulative impacts are unavoidable when ozone and/or particulate emissions are involved. For example, the primary source of emissions contributing to ozone is from vehicles. Any project that generates vehicle trips has the potential of contributing to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan acknowledged this; and as a result, a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the City Council for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan, such as the proposed residential development. Nevertheless, the Air Quality Element of the General Plan incorporates strategies to reduce emissions associated with new and modified indirect sources of pollution in an effort to accurately determine and mitigate project-related impacts. Emission-reduction goals of 20 to 25 percent are established depending on the projected level of unmitigated emissions for a project. Mitigation thresholds are established for the important regional/local pollutants, including: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), which are ozone precursors, and Inhalable Particulate Matter, 10 Micron (PM10). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

Level "A"	Level "B"
25 pounds per day of NOx	137 pounds per day of NOx
25 pounds per day of ROG	137 pounds per day of ROG
80 pounds per day of PM10	137 pounds per day of PM10

If a project has unmitigated emissions less than the Level "A" threshold, then it is viewed as a minor project (from an air quality perspective) and only application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) is required to try to achieve at least a 20 percent reduction in emissions, or the best reduction feasible otherwise. Land uses that generate unmitigated emissions above Level "A" require application of appropriate Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMMs), in addition to the SMMs, in order to achieve a net emission

reduction of 20 percent or more. If, after applying SMMs and BAMMs, a use still exceeds the Level "B" threshold, then a minimum of 25 percent of the unmitigated emissions exceeding 137 pounds per day must be offset by reducing emissions from existing sources of pollution; otherwise, an Environmental Impact Report is required.

Under policy of the Air Quality Element, the project has the potential to impact air quality primarily in two ways: (1) the project would generate vehicle emissions (with NOx, ROG, and PM10) that contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions and (2) fugitive dust (particulate/PM10) emissions are possible during construction activities. As only a medium-sized residential development, the project does not have the potential to generate significant emission concentrations of other pollutants subject to State and Federal ambient air quality standards such as sulfur dioxide.

In order to calculate the unmitigated emissions for the key pollutants noted above, the current URBEMIS air quality computer model (version 8.7) was used as prescribed in the Air Quality Element of the City of Redding General Plan. The results were as follows:

	ROG	NOx	PM10
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	4.75	3.70	3.87

The analysis indicates that the project would result in emissions of key pollutants that are well below the Level "A" threshold. Hence, application of SMMs is required in accordance with General Plan policy. SMMs applicable to the project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction.

During construction of the proposed project, emissions would be produced by a variety of sources. They would include criteria pollutant emissions produced by construction equipment and fugitive dust created by wind and the operation of construction equipment over exposed earth. The Air Quality Element of the City's General Plan does not require that emissions be estimated for construction activities. Instead, specific construction-related measures must be implemented. With the implementation of the following measures, impacts from construction equipment and fugitive dust would be reduced to a level less than significant.

The project applicant shall ensure that the following measures are implemented during construction of the proposed project:

1. Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
2. Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering before final occupancy.
3. Suspend all grading operations when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour as directed by the Shasta County AQMD.
4. Provide temporary traffic control (e.g., flag person) as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow.
5. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours.
6. Water active construction sites at least twice daily as directed by the Engineering Division.
7. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials or maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
8. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads.
9. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site on each trip.

d. Potential impacts from fugitive dust caused during construction are mitigated by application of the SMM identified above.

e. The project does not involve land use that could generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Documentation

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
Redding General Plan Natural Resources and Air Quality Elements, 2000

Mitigation

Mitigation 1. The SMMs listed under **a-c** above are mitigation measures incorporated into the project and into the conditions of approval which will reduce potential air quality impacts to a level less than significant. The project will also incorporate Grading Ordinance measures for dust control during construction, including an erosion-control plan with the planting and seeding of bare ground, which will reduce dust.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b, d. The Redding Retirement Residence will have two public points of access. Points of access will be from Buenaventura Boulevard, approximately 775 feet south of Eureka Way/State Route 299, and from Pebble Drive, approximately 65 feet east of Ridge Road. Buenaventura Boulevard is identified in the Transportation Element of the City of Redding 2000-2020 General Plan as an arterial street. Portions of Pebble Drive will need to be repaved in order to accommodate project traffic.

It is estimated that this project will generate 239 daily trips. The City of Redding has established that weekday AM and PM peak-hour conditions are of primary concern along the Eureka Way/Buenaventura Boulevard roadway. Of the 239 projected daily trips, 30 are expected to occur during the AM peak hour and 30 during the PM peak hour. From a traffic-engineering standpoint, a two-lane arterial street with restricted access can accommodate up to 10,000 to 12,000 vehicle trips per day. Traffic associated with the project, combined with existing traffic, will not exceed that capacity.

c. The project site is located outside the overflight zones for both the Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark and therefore has no potential to interfere with airport operations.

e. General Plan Health and Safety Policies HS4J and HS4I generally require that residential developments having 50 or more dwelling units have at least two points of public-street access and that cul-de-sac or dead-end street lengths provide sufficient turnaround areas for emergency vehicles. As previously stated, the Redding Retirement Residence will have two public points of access. Points of access will be from Buenaventura Boulevard, approximately 775 feet south of Eureka Way/State Route 299, and from Pebble Drive, approximately 65 feet east of Ridge Road. Turnaround areas will be constructed in accordance with General Plan Health and Safety Policies HS4J and HS4I.

f. In accordance with the Redding Municipal Code, the project will be required to provide 0.5 parking space for each one-bedroom dwelling unit and 0.66 parking space for each two-bedroom dwelling unit, or 62 parking spaces. The project includes 67 parking spaces; therefore, it is in conformance with the City’s Parking Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.41).

g. Project development does not conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. In 2004, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan. When the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan was prepared, Buenaventura Boulevard was proposed as a bicycle route to potentially be used for transportation and recreational purposes by cyclists in the future. When funding becomes available for bikeway improvements, any improvements to Buenaventura Boulevard will be in accordance with the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) provides public bus service in the Redding area. The project site is served by RABA Route 2. The project is expected to contribute to public transit travel. A bus turnout, stop, and shelter will be constructed as part of the project.

Documentation

- Transportation Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
- Redding Parks, Trails and Bikeways Map, 2004
- City of Redding Overflight Zones Map, 2000
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 18.41.040

Mitigation

Mitigation measures include the following:

Mitigation 2. Any and all improvements to Eureka Way/State Route 299, Buenaventura Boulevard, Ridge Road, and Pebble Drive shall satisfy the City's alignment, design, and construction standards for roadway improvements.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a. A Biological Screening Report prepared by ENPLAN (2006) identified four special-status species as potentially utilizing the project site: fox sedge, northwestern pond turtle, western red bat, valley elderberry longhorn beetle. In addition, special-status anadromous fish may be indirectly affected by project development. The following evaluations of potential impacts of special-status species are drawn from the Biological Screening Report.

The fox sedge is a small plant, typically found in moist, open areas. The fox sedge is not State or Federally listed, nor does the Department of Fish and Game currently require mitigation for projects affecting the plant. It was not observed during the botanical field evaluation. No additional plant surveys are necessary, and no mitigation is warranted with respect to special-status plant species.

The northwestern pond turtle is associated with permanent or near-permanent water; however, the stream on the study site lacks deep pools with basking sites, which are important components of the turtle's habitat. While the turtle was not observed during the site reconnaissance, a field survey extending 200 feet upstream and downstream of the road crossing site is recommended prior to any construction in the on-site stream bed, and all special-status turtles and egg masses shall be removed and relocated farther upstream or downstream.

The western red bat requires trees 2-40 feet above ground level for roosting, and such vegetation is present on the project site; therefore, the western red bat could potentially use the site for roosting and foraging. However, an abundance of suitable habitat is available in the surrounding area. Project implementation would not adversely affect populations of western red bats.

One elderberry shrub is present on the site and could potentially host the Federally listed valley elderberry longhorn beetle. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that the valley elderberry longhorn beetle could be affected if earth-disturbing work is proposed within 20 feet of elderberries. The on-site elderberries are included in an open-space parcel and are located over 20 feet from the nearest proposed construction activity. To further protect the valley elderberry longhorn beetle from any potentially significant impacts, protective fencing will be erected around the elderberry shrubs and maintained for the duration of the project. Therefore, the beetle, if present, would not be adversely affected by implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is warranted.

Special-status anadromous fish species may be indirectly affected by site development. The on-site stream is tributary to Jenny Creek, which confluences with the Sacramento River, a corridor for the movement of special-status anadromous fish, approximately one mile northeast of the project site. The shotgun culvert that exists at the confluence of Jenny Creek and the Sacramento River, as well as low water levels in the creek, most likely represent a barrier to fish passage. Indirect impacts to special-status anadromous fish will be avoided through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control and required storm-water pretreatment standards.

b. Two sensitive natural communities occur on the project site: Riparian wetlands and blue oak-foothill pine woodland. Potential effects of project implementation on riparian wetlands are addressed in Section VII: Biological Resources, Discussion, **c**.

The City of Redding has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development considerations. The subdivision site has an open to moderately dense canopy of blue oak and grey pine. ±4.0 acres are proposed as tree preservation/open space areas. Given the effort to preserve existing trees and establishment of extensive open space, it is determined that the impact to the blue oak-foothill pine woodland would be less than significant.

c. ENPLAN prepared a wetland delineation report in August 2005, addressing the project site. The delineation documented the existence of 0.347 acre of wetlands and other Waters of the United States (e.g. streams) within the study area, as summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2
Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States**

Jurisdictional Type	Size	
	Sq. Ft.	Acre
Seasonal Wetland	541	0.012
Riparian Scrub Wetland	10,760	0.247
Wet Swale	1,526	0.035
Perennial Stream	1,506	0.035
Ephemeral Stream	791	0.018
Total	15,124	0.347

Most riparian wetlands will be avoided under the proposed project design. Project site development will result in permanent impacts to ±0.113 acre of wetlands or other Waters of the United States. Prior to proceeding with construction, various permits from resource agencies will be needed depending on final site development plans. These would likely include a Nationwide Permit 14 or 39 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement would be required for the proposed stream crossing. Compliance with mitigation measures required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will adequately offset losses of streams and wetlands. Mitigation will consist of purchase of wetland and/or riparian forest mitigation credits, or payment of in-lieu fees to the Corps or its designee.

d. The project site may provide habitat for nesting migratory birds. Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act is recommended. To ensure that nesting migratory birds are not adversely affected, vegetation should be removed from the site before April 1 or after July 31. If this is not possible, a nesting survey should be conducted prior to vegetation removal. If active nests are found, vegetation clearing should be postponed until after the young birds have fledged.

As discussed above, Jenny Creek, which confluences with the Sacramento River approximately one mile northeast of the project site, most likely does not serve as a corridor for the movement of special-status anadromous fish. The shotgun culvert that exists at the confluence of Jenny Creek and the Sacramento River, as well as low water levels in the creek, most likely represent a barrier to fish passage.

The small ephemeral streams on the site have a negligible value as fish and wildlife movement corridors.

e. The City of Redding has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development considerations. The site has an open to moderately dense canopy of blue oak and gray pine. Given the effort to preserve existing trees and establishment of open space, it is determined that the impact to on-site trees would be less than significant.

Documentation

- City of Redding Tree Ordinance, Redding Municipal Code Title 18, Zoning, 2003
- Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Biological Screening Report, Redding Retirement Residence, CA, ENPLAN, 2006
- Wetland Delineation Report, Redding Retirement Residence, CA, ENPLAN, 2005

Mitigation

Mitigation measures shall include the following:

Mitigation 3. Mitigation for the permanent impacts of the on-site jurisdictional waters will be achieved through purchase of credits at a 2:1 ratio from a local mitigation bank acceptable to the Corps, or through payment of in-lieu mitigation fees to the Corps or its designee.

Mitigation 4. The developer shall acquire all necessary letters of approval and/or permits from the Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for altering or working within any of the ditches prior to the commencement of grading activities and/or construction of utility and storm-drainage infrastructure.

Mitigation 5. The final improvement plans shall be refined to maintain existing trees on the project site, wherever reasonably possible, subject to the standards of Sections 18.45.070.B and 18.45.090 (Tree Preservation) of the Redding Municipal Code. Trees to be retained or areas of trees to be retained shall be delineated with snow fencing prior to grading. Placement of the snow fencing shall be confirmed in the field at a preconstruction meeting with Development Services Department staff.

Application of standard measures as discussed under Item III, Geology and Soils, above, also helps reduce potential impacts to sensitive habitats and special status species to a level less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b. A mineral resource is land on which known deposits of commercially viable mineral or aggregate deposits exist. The designation is applied to sites determined by the State Division of Mines and Geology as being a resource of regional significance and is intended to help maintain any quarrying operations and protect them from encroachment of incompatible uses. The project site is not identified in the City of Redding General Plan or by the State Division of Mines and Geology as having any known mineral resource value.

Documentation

Natural Resources Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Critical Mineral Resources Overlay, Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 DMG Open File Report 97-03, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1997

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c, d. The nature of the project as a residential facility does not present a significant risk related to hazardous materials or emissions. There are no documented hazardous material sites located on or near the project.

e, f. The project is located outside of the established approach/departure clear zones of Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity.

g. The project does not involve a use or activity that could interfere with emergency-response or emergency-evacuation plans for the area.

h. Many locations within the City of Redding, including the project site, are identified as having a very high wildland-fire-hazard potential due to an intermixture of urban/rural uses and natural areas with high fuel loads and varied terrain. The presence of urban development adjacent/near to wildlands increases the likelihood of wildland fires, and the presence of wildlands adjacent to urban development allows fire to spread rapidly to and through developed areas. Possible measures to minimize fire risk in the wildland/urban interface are identified below. Specific measures to be required for the proposed project will be determined by the City Fire Marshal during final design review.

1. A Vegetation Management/Fire Fuel Reduction Plan (VMFFRP) shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the City Fire Marshal and Development Services Director, in conjunction with improvement plans. The VMFFRP shall address the entire site, and as necessary, adjacent public open space areas, and shall be prepared by a registered professional forester or other

qualified professional. The objectives of the VMFFRP shall be to reduce fire-fuel loads to establish an adequate fire-safety buffer between residential development and adjacent wildlands, subject to the following zoning criteria:

ZONE 1: This Zone shall include that part of the project approved for development with slopes of 20 percent or less. Within Zone 1, 90-100 percent of the existing brush shall be removed. Trees shall be saved except where approved project improvements will be located. At the time of construction, additional fuel-load reduction, consistent with Zone 1 standards, may be required based on the actual location of the structure. A 100-foot setback of the structure from the Zone 2 clearance area is necessary.

ZONE 2: This Zone shall include a 100-foot-wide band parallel and immediately adjacent to the Zone 1 clearance area. Within Zone 2, vegetation shall be reduced so that the combined crown closure of brush and trees is approximately 50 percent. Trees within Zone 2 shall not be removed where their removal would leave more than 10 feet between one tree canopy and another. Where crown closure of existing vegetation is already 50 percent or less, no reduction in fuel load is to occur.

2. Prior to the issuance of building permits, all required fuel-reduction work shall be completed as prescribed by the approved VMFFRP. Ongoing maintenance of the project site's fire-fuel management zones shall be the responsibility of future property owners.
3. The provision of two points of public access as approved by the City Fire Marshal.
4. Permanent, all-weather access points for fire-fighting equipment shall be provided to the open-space areas from a location within the project site, as reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal. The access shall have a minimum width of 15 feet and be surfaced with concrete, or another durable material. Provisions for the access path shall be included on the improvement plans. The path shall be constructed in accordance with approved plans prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
5. Wood fences, including posts, shall be prohibited adjacent to all open-space areas; fences adjacent to open space must be constructed of noncombustible material.
6. Any construction with a building envelope greater than 150 feet from the street shall have an on-site, emergency-vehicle turnaround approved by the Fire Marshal.
7. Construction adjacent to open space, including accessory buildings, shall comply with the following standards:
 - a. The roof coverings of all homes within the subdivision shall be of Class "A" fire-resistive materials.
 - b. Residential fire-sprinkler systems shall be installed in all habitable structures.
 - c. Any projections from the structure, including, but not limited to, eaves, decking, balconies, and patio covers shall be enclosed on the sides and/or underside with approved one-hour fire-resistant material on the exterior side, to prevent heat from exterior fires from being trapped underneath the projection.
 - d. Structures constructed in such a manner that they are suspended on piers or pilings over the hillside shall be of non-combustible material, fire retardant-treated wood, heavy timber, or enclosed on the sides by approved one-hour fire-resistant material on the exterior side in such a manner as to prevent the underside of the structure from being subject to heat or flame from the hillside below.
 - e. Venting shall not be located on the downhill side of structures when California Building Code venting regulations can be met without installation of downhill venting. When attic and underfloor vents are necessary on buildings, they shall be louvered and screened with ¼-inch metal mesh screen to prevent entry of sparks or burning embers. Turbine attic vents shall be equipped to allow one-way direction only; they shall not free spin in both directions.
 - f. Siding shall be noncombustible, and the eaves shall be protected with materials approved for one-hour fire-resistant construction on the exterior side.
 - g. Skylights shall be of tempered glass, or dual panel, except when the structure is protected with a fire sprinkler system.
 - h. Gutters shall be constructed of non-combustible material.

Documentation

Underground Storage Tanks, Shasta County Department of Environmental Health, 2005
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2005

Hazardous Materials Search, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, 2005
 CalSites, Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2005
 Health and Safety Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Health and Safety Element, Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Health and Safety Element, General Plan Background Report, City of Redding 1998

Mitigation

None required.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c. The Noise Element of Redding General Plan establishes exterior and interior noise thresholds in residential areas of 60 and 45 Ldn/CNEL, dB, respectively (Table 5-4). Table 5-2 of the Noise Element presents projected noise contours from the major road segments in the city. Although the property has frontage on Eureka Way/State Route 299 and Buenaventura Boulevard, the proposed living areas are separated from the street a minimum of 230 horizontal feet and 30 vertical feet by intervening remaining lands and open space. Based on FHWA modeling and Calveno Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels, traffic from Eureka Way/State Route 299 and Buenaventura Boulevard would cause exterior noise levels to exceed General Plan standards at the project site. Outdoor-activity areas would be located within the courtyard area of the development, thereby lessening potentially significant impacts resulting from exterior noise levels to a level that is less than significant. Since the Building Code requires construction techniques to achieve the interior noise level criterion of 45 dB L_{dn}, no additional mitigation is required.

There are no non-transportation-related noise or vibration-generating sources in the general vicinity of the project.

d. During project construction, there will be a temporary increase in noise in the project vicinity above existing ambient noise levels. The most noticeable construction noise would be related to grading, utility excavation, and land clearing activity. The City's Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12.120.H) limits grading-permit-authorized activities to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No operations are allowed on Sunday. Since the heavy construction work associated with the project is limited in scope and by existing regulation, the anticipated noise impact to neighboring residents is considered less than significant.

e, f. While the project is located within two miles of Benton Airpark, it is located outside of the established approach/departure clear zones. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Documentation

Noise Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Transportation Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12.120

Mitigation

None required.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.

a. 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:

(1) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(4) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(5) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a (1) & a (2). The City would provide police and fire protection to the project from existing facilities and under existing service levels. The relatively small size of the project does not mandate the need for additional police or fire facilities.

a (3). Based on the nature of the project as a retirement residence, no contribution would be made to student enrollment in local schools. However, a school facility impact (in-lieu) fee exists, as provided under State law, that is paid prior to the issuance of a building permit for each new residence (and other types of development) to address school-facility funding necessitated by the effects of growth citywide.

a (4). The project will not overburden existing community parks. See Discussion in Section XV: Recreation.

a (5). See Discussion in Section XII: Utilities and Service Systems.

Documentation

Public Facilities and Services Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. Wastewater generated from the project would be that associated with domestic use and will be discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. This residential land use activity would not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the proposed 118-unit residential complex.
- c. Detention is proposed to be in the form of oversized underground pipes. Storm-water runoff collected in the project's storm-drain system would be discharged from the underground pipes at the proposed culvert located at the Buenaventura Boulevard driveway entrance. Potential impacts associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the storm drains are related to soil erosion and sedimentation. These impacts are discussed and mitigation measures provided in Section III: Geology and Soils. No additional mitigation is needed for this aspect.
- d. The project site is located within the City of Redding water district. Potable water is available from the City of Redding to serve the project, with adequate pressure for domestic use and flows for fire suppression. The demands of the project can be accommodated within the City's existing water allotments.
- e. The project will utilize the City's sanitary sewer system to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the proposed 118-unit residential complex.
- f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up) service, which the project would utilize. Adequate capacity is available to serve the needs of the project without need of special accommodation. The City regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials from households, including those created by the project.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Housing and Public Facilities Elements, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, c. The buildings constructed as a result of development of the project would be consistent in height with buildings in adjacent neighborhoods and would not obstruct any documented scenic vistas. The project design is consistent with existing development in the area with intervening open spaces, so the project would not represent a significant change to the overall scenic quality of the area.
- b. The project site is not located adjacent to a State-designated scenic highway. There are no State-designated scenic highways within the City of Redding.
- d. Use of buildings constructed as part of the project would generate light that is customary for residential neighborhoods. The project alone would not generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from the lighting of a residential area.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Community Development and Design Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, Section 18.40.090

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, d. An archaeological survey, including a record search and pedestrian survey, was completed for the project (and surrounding lands) by ENPLAN (2006).

Records indicate that no cultural resources had been previously recorded and no pedestrian surveys had been previously conducted within the project area, although eight surveys had been conducted and two archaeological sites were recorded within 0.5 mile of the project area.

As a result of the pedestrian survey conducted by ENPLAN, prehistoric cultural resources (Brandaw Prehistoric Isolates) were recorded, and a possible historic cultural resource (a ditch segment) and contemporary materials were noted within the project area. In addition, prehistoric cultural resources were identified and noted outside the current project area on private property adjacent to the current project area.

As a result of the cultural resources inventory survey conducted by ENPLAN within the project area, no "historical resources" were identified within the project area and it does not appear that any "historic properties" are located within the study area; however, prehistoric cultural resources were recorded and noted within and adjacent to the project area. The small quantity of these common prehistoric artifact types does not hold the potential to be significant, especially considering that they are out of context as a result of disturbances in the area. However, these artifacts may be representative of a cultural deposit located somewhere within or adjacent to the project area.

Due to ground visibility constraints within the project area, the sensitivity of the general vicinity, the findings of neighbors adjacent to (and likely within) the project area, and the reported presence of Native American cultural resources in the vicinity, ENPLAN recommends that a qualified archaeologist be retained to visit the project area when it is grubbed, scraped, and trenched. This can be accomplished by having an archaeologist periodically visit the site during initial construction and groundbreaking activities.

This site lacks evidence of association with historic-period mining, homesteading, or ranching activities.

c. No unique geologic features, fossil-bearing strata, or paleontological sites are known to exist on the project site.

Documentation

Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Redding Retirement Residence Project, City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2006

Mitigation

Mitigation measures include the following:

Mitigation 6. Construction activities of all types shall be prohibited on land located outside the study area (Area of Potential Effects) outlined in the Cultural Resources Inventory Survey (ENPLAN 2006).

Mitigation 7. A qualified archaeologist will be retained to visit the project area when it is grubbed, scraped, and trenched.

Mitigation 8. If buried cultural resources are encountered during construction activities, all ground-disturbing activities shall be halted within a 100-foot radius of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist examines the resources, makes a determination as to their significance, and provides appropriate recommendations.

Mitigation 9. If, during construction activities, any human remains are uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, construction activities in the affected area shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted. Appropriate measures shall be required prior to any resumption of work on the project.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b. The nearest developed city park to the proposed site is Caldwell Park. Caldwell Park is a 70-acre community park located along the Sacramento River, providing a wide range of active and passive recreational opportunities. This park is intended to serve residents of Redding and would not be overburdened by the future residents of the proposed development. In addition, the proposed development will include ±4.0-acres of open space. Therefore no mitigation is required.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources, Recreation, and Public Facilities Elements, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b, c. The project site is not designated as prime farmland in the City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element. The site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes, is not governed by the Williamson Act, nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000
 USDA, SCS, and Forest Service Soil Survey of Shasta County, California, 1974

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a. As documented in the Initial Study, project implementation could result in disturbance of fish and other aquatic wildlife; disturbance of wetlands and streams; possible disturbance of subsurface cultural resources; increased soil erosion and water quality degradation; increased noise levels; and increased levels of air emissions during construction. Design features incorporated into the project would avoid or reduce to insignificant levels certain potential environmental impacts, as would compliance with required agency permits. The remaining impacts can be reduced to levels that are less than significant through implementation of the mitigation measures presented in this Initial Study.

b. As discussed in Section 5, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMM) will reduce potential impacts from this project to less than significant.

c. As discussed herein, the project does not have characteristics which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2002
 Redding Municipal Code, 2003
 City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
 City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
 City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
 Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations, FIRM map 060360-0015, dated 9/29/89
 City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
 Soils Survey of Shasta County Area, California, 1974
 Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, Woodward-Clyde, 1995
 Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
 Redding Parks, Trails and Bikeways Map, 2004
 City of Redding Overflight Zones Map, 2000
 DMG Open File Report 97-03, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1997

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
City of Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base Search, 2006
Noise Assessment by ENPLAN, May 2006
Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Redding Retirement Residence Project, City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2006
Biological Screening Report, Redding Retirement Residence, CA, ENPLAN, 2006
Wetland Delineation Report, Redding Retirement Residence, CA, ENPLAN, 2005
Underground Storage Tanks, Shasta County Department of Environmental Health, 2005
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2005
Hazardous Materials Search, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, 2005
CalSites, Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2005
USDA, SCS, and Forest Service Soil Survey of Shasta County, California, 1974

Mitigation

None necessary.