

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION
TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-21-04
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PD-6-04
THE COTTAGES AT BEL AIR**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Planned Development Application PD-6-04/Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-20-04, The Cottages at Bel Air.
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Linda Burke, Associate Planner, (530) 225-4020
4. **Project Location:** Portions of Assessor's Parcel No. 113-190-011; remainder parcel of Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Units 1 and 2.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Ochoa & Shehan, 3070 Crossroads Drive, Redding, CA 96001
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 6 to 10 units per acre" and "Greenway"
7. **Zoning:** "RM-9-PD" Residential Multiple Family District" with "Planned Development Overlay District"
8. **Description of Project:** The project applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development Plan and tentative map to subdivide 24.1 acres to create 55 single-family residential lots. The developed area of the subdivision consists of 9.1 acres, divided between three neighborhoods, the majority of which is proposed to be cleared and graded (cut and/or fill) to create the streets and lots. The remaining 15 acres is to be placed in open space. The typical lot size is 4,500 square feet, with a typical lot width of 50 feet and depth of 90 feet. The streets, central landscape islands, and open-space areas within the subdivision will be private and maintained by a homeowners' association. The project area is located adjacent to Quartz Hill Road and is the designated remainder parcel identified on the tentative map for Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Units 1 and 2, approved by the City in April 2003, of which Unit 1, Phase I, is currently under construction. Access to Neighborhood A will be provided from Bel Air Drive, which will be constructed with Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1, Phase II, while Neighborhoods B and C will take access directly from Quartz Hill Road. The applicants, Ochoa and Shehan, Inc., own both the Bel Air Estates Subdivision and The Cottages project sites; however, the subject application would be a distinct entitlement. Off-site improvements necessary to serve the subject project, such as improvements to Quartz Hill Road, extension of sanitary sewer service, and provision of storm-water detention, have previously been evaluated in the Negative Declaration approved for Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Units 1 and 2.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The property site is located on a series of ridges located adjacent to Quartz Hill Road and above the historical Sacramento River floodplain (i.e., pre-Shasta Dam). Single-family residential subdivisions—River Ridge Park Subdivision, River Park Highlands Subdivision, and Lake Redding Estates Subdivision—lie immediately to the west, east, and south, respectively. These subdivisions are built out with single-family homes on lot sizes similar to those proposed in Bel Air Estates. The Vistas Subdivision, under construction at this time, lies to the north across Quartz Hill Road. Open spaces associated with the subdivisions to the west, east, and north of the developed area of the proposed lots, consist of slopes in excess of 20 percent, with vegetation cover dominated by blue oak, grey pine, and manzanita.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** The project must obtain a General Construction Stormwater Permit and prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB). The project may also be subject to Section 404 permit approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE).

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 type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards (Fire) & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input 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 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

February 1, 2006

Date

Linda Burke

(Name)

Associate 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 Tentative map submittal pages 1 through 6

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 surrounded by existing residential subdivisions (River Ridge Park, River Park Highlands, Lake Redding Estates, and The Vistas) and vacant land (Bel Air Estates Subdivision) designated for similar residential development on the City’s General Plan. The project will be connected to Quartz Hill Road and the adjoining Bel Air Estates Subdivision and River Ridge Park Subdivisions through street extensions shown on the Bel Air Estates tentative map. Development is limited to ridge-top areas separated by open spaces dictated by steep slope. The project and its location do not have the potential to physically divide a community.

b. Under the City's Zoning Ordinance, the developable area of the project site is zoned "RM-9-PD" Multiple Family Residential District and is designated "Residential, 6 to 10 units per acre" on the Redding General Plan. Although the zoning would allow multiple-family development, the proposed project is for a small-lot single-family subdivision within the density allowed by the multiple-family zoning. The proposed average lot size of 4,500 square feet provides a net density of approximately 7.7 units per acre for the project. Section 17.33.040 of the City’s Subdivision Ordinance allows private residential streets and lot sizes that do not meet City size and street-frontage standards within a planned development project. The project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

c. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the site.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Community Development Element
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- City of Redding Natural Resources Element

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

II. 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 homes as planned and anticipated by the Redding General Plan. The project would be similar in character to those in the surrounding areas with construction of single-family homes, but would be at a higher density as allowed and anticipated by the multiple-family zoning and "PD" Planned Development Overlay District. The project would not induce unplanned population growth and does not propose the extension of any new roads or utilities not anticipated

by the General Plan. The project does not displace substantial numbers of people or substantial numbers of existing housing. The project will be providing housing.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Housing Element, 2000

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:

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

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 General Plan as having a low ground-shaking potential. The project is not located on or near any documented landslide hazard areas, and there is no evidence of ground slippage or subsidence occurring naturally on the site. 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, Red Bluff Loam (RdB) and Newtown Gravelly Loam (NeG). Red Bluff Loam is characterized by slopes of 3 to 8 percent with moderate to slow permeability, slow runoff, and minimal erosion potential. These soils are found in the 3 ridge-top areas adjacent to Quartz Hills Road to be developed with lots. Newtown Gravelly Loam is characterized by slopes of 15 to 30 percent with slow permeability, rapid runoff, and high erosion potential. These soils are those found in the large area surrounding the area proposed for development and characterized by slopes of 20 percent or greater and proposed to be placed in open space.

As shown on the preliminary grading plan, for the most part, grading would be limited to the 9-acre area of the 3 neighborhoods for street and lot development. Minor grading encroachment will occur on slopes in excess of 20 percent to accommodate installation of utility infrastructure and the trails linking Neighborhoods B and C to Bel Air Drive; but for the most part, the areas of steep slope and the drainages would be preserved as open space and left undeveloped. Therefore the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil that would pose a significant impact. The project would, however, be 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, 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 somewhat overlaps the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion-control measures 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. This Plan is especially pertinent to any potential erosion that could affect the drainages leading to the Sacramento River.
- ▶ *California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) "1600 Agreement."* This permit is required for any work within a defined streambed and may be applicable to the extension of the sewer and storm drain within and to serve the project. In addition, the DFG 1600 permit may address any potential disturbance of riparian habitat.

Conditions incorporated into the project will include the following:

1. All applicable provisions of the City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12) shall be met. Grading shall be of a scale that the work can be completed in a single construction season.
 2. The developer shall obtain a 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 reduce those pollutants from entering storm waters.
 3. Points of discharge from project drainage systems into any natural drainage course shall include water-velocity attenuation improvements or any other measures necessary per the requirements of the City Engineer to prevent earth scouring and erosion.
 4. The developer shall acquire all necessary letters of approval and/or permits from the Department of Fish and Game for altering or working within any natural drainage course prior to the commencement of grading activities and/or construction of utility and storm-drainage infrastructure.
- e. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal.

Documentation

City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
 City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
 City of Redding General Plan Background Report 1998
 Soil Survey of Shasta County, August 1974

Mitigation

None necessary.

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"/> |

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Since future homes in the subdivision would be served by City sanitary sewer service, the project would not involve any permitted discharges of waste material into ground or surface waters. However, with development of the project site, there is the risk that construction activities could contribute silt and sediment into the neighboring ephemeral drainages leading to the Sacramento River; however, with standard conditions incorporated into the project as identified under Item III above, potential water quality impacts would be less than significant.

b. The project would utilize City water service for domestic uses and fire protection. The proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies.

d, e. Storm-water runoff from the project site currently drains in a southeasterly direction to a series of on-site gullies and the ravine lying below Quartz Hill and within Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1. Although not commonly known, the seasonal creek in this ravine has at times been referred to as Dean's Creek. At the bottom of Quartz Hill, Dean's Creek crosses Quartz Hill Road and travels to Benton Drive in a 6-foot by 8-foot underground concrete-bottom/steel-arch structure. This structure also accepts flows from the River Park Highlands Subdivision. At times, this structure has been inadequate, causing uncontrolled overflow at the River Park Highlands inlet, affecting properties to the south.

City of Redding Policy 1806 requires that all subdivision development include storm-water detention facilities designed to maintain existing predevelopment rates of runoff during a 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm event with a 6-hour duration. The proposed project area was included in the hydrological calculation and detention basin design submitted for Bel Air Estates Subdivision and is currently under construction with Unit 1, Phase I. The detention basin was designed to limit postdevelopment runoff from the larger Bel Air Subdivision and the proposed project, as well as to provide additional detention value in order to reduce the current flows during a 100-year-storm event. This will alleviate the existing downstream flooding problem in the drainage structure between Quartz Hill Road and Benton Drive.

g, h, i. The project site does not contain any mapped special flood-hazard designation. The nearest such designation lies along the Sacramento River, more than a mile distant from the project site.

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 or Whiskeytown Lakes 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 affecting the project site.

Documentation

Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations, FIRM map 060360-0005, dated 9/29/89
 City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993

Mitigation

None necessary.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 incrementally to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan acknowledged this dilemma; and as a result, Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were adopted by the City Council for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan.

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 PM ₁₀	137 pounds per day of PM ₁₀

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, a project has the potential to impact air quality primarily in two ways: (1) the project would generate vehicle trip 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 a residential development, a project does not have the potential to generate significant emission concentrations of other pollutants subject to State and Federal ambient air quality standards.

In order to calculate the unmitigated emissions for the key pollutants noted above, the current URBEMIS air quality computer model was used as prescribed in the Air Quality Element. The results were as follows:

	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	7.94	15.52	5.5

These results indicate that the project would result in ROG, N_{ox}, and PM₁₀ emissions below the Level "A" threshold. Hence, application of SMMs is required in order to strive toward the General Plan policy of a net reduction objective of 20 percent to address small-scale cumulative effects. SMMs applicable to this project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction. For the most part, these requirements are standard development regulations in the City, promulgated in the City Grading Ordinance and Uniform Building Code. Application of special mitigation to achieve a level of less than significant is not necessary, since actions for compliance are already included in existing uniformly applied regulations and construction standards. The following City standard regulations, applied during grading and construction activities to control dust and PM₁₀ emissions, apply to the project.

1. Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
2. All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.
3. Temporary traffic control shall be provided as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
4. Construction activities that could affect traffic flow shall be scheduled in off-peak hours.
5. Active construction areas, haul roads, etc., shall be watered at least twice daily or more as needed to limit dust.
6. Exposed stockpiles of soil and other backfill material shall either be covered, watered, or have soil binders added to inhibit dust and wind erosion.
7. All trucks hauling soil and other loose material shall be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., 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. All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads. Wheel washers shall be used where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or trucks and any equipment shall be washed off leaving the site with each trip.
9. Alternatives to open burning of cleared vegetative material on the project site shall be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the City Planning Division. Suitable alternatives include, but are not limited to, on-site chipping and mulching and/or hauling to a biomass fuel site.

d. Potential impacts to neighboring homes (sensitive receptors) from fugitive dust caused during construction is mitigated by application of the SMMs discussed 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
- Project Calculations of Unmitigated Operational Emissions using URBEMIS 7G for Windows, V.5.1.0, report prepared December 22, 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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)?
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. Access to the subdivision would be derived from Quartz Hill Road, which is identified in the Transportation Element of the General Plan as an arterial street. Access from Quartz Hill Road to Neighborhood A will be provided from Bel Air Drive, which will be constructed with Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1, Phase II, while Neighborhood B and C will take access from Quartz Hill Road directly opposite Sensation Drive, to be constructed with The Vistas Subdivision, Unit 3, and an unnamed street, to be constructed with The Vistas Subdivision, Unit 4, respectively. The General Plan Background Report projects the section of Quartz Hill Road between Keswick Dam Road and Harlan Drive as being ultimately widened to four travel lanes, carrying approximately 19,400 vehicle trips per day (ADT). At the present time, this section of Quartz Hill Road is improved to two lanes and, in many places, does not meet the City's design criteria for an arterial street due to inadequate width, substandard horizontal and vertical curves, and lack of pedestrian sidewalks.

The most recent City traffic count on this section of Quartz Hill Road was taken on March 15, 2005, and recorded 3,322 vehicle trips. In July 1998, the General Plan Background Report indicated that the level of service for this section of roadway was acceptable (LOS "A"), but this was based on an ADT of 1,600. The development of 55 single-family homes has the potential to generate approximately 598 average daily trips. This subdivision would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the local street system; however, when Bel Air Estates Subdivision was processed in 2001, there was an estimate made of potential lots and vehicle trips. Including the 140 lots approved with the larger Bel Air Estates Subdivision, it was estimated that 769 potential lots were vacant and/or to be recorded. These previously approved subdivisions in the Quartz Hill Road area, along with the proposed 55 lots could significantly increase the traffic volume further.

Until recently, developments in the Quartz Hill Road area were required to pay a benefit fee for traffic improvements identified in the Environmental Impact Report EIR-2-82, completed for the Quartz Hill Area Plan. This fee was expected to pay for those necessary improvements to Quartz Hill Road and other circulation needs in the area that could not be expected to be built as a project frontage improvement, such as the hill section of the road above Snow Lane and the Buenaventura Bridge over the Sacramento River. In April 2001, the City Council updated and revised the entire Impact Fee Program for the city. Individual traffic-impact benefit zones were incorporated into the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) or dissolved. The Quartz Hill Road improvements were incorporated into the citywide TIF. The TIF includes a wide range of projects throughout the city that have been identified as necessary over the next 20 years. Because the TIF funds will become available incrementally as development occurs, not all the TIF projects can be built at once. Section 16.20.150 of the Redding Municipal Code ties the scheduling of TIF-funded projects to a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to be adopted by the City Council. The Draft CIP proposes construction of Quartz Hill Road in 2008 or later.

From strictly 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. The current project and the potential trips identified above from previously approved projects, in addition to existing trips, would not exceed that capacity. However, as noted, Quartz Hill Road does not meet arterial street design standards. The road does need to be improved as traffic volumes increase. The Comprehensive Impact Fee Study prepared by MuniFinancial, May 2000, in conjunction with the City's new Development Impact Fee Program, identified a threshold of 5,000 daily trips as the point at which the substandard conditions on Quartz Hill Road should be rectified. Generally, such road improvements are accomplished as abutting properties are subdivided and developed. In the case of the "hill" section, there is no potential for abutting development, so the Draft CIP proposes construction of this road segment with use of TIF funds in 2008 or later. This schedule is based upon the expected rate of development in the Quartz Hill Road area. If the anticipated rate of development and corresponding traffic volumes increase or decrease, the scheduling of these improvements may be modified accordingly by the City Council.

Although the Bel Air Estates Subdivision is currently under construction, a tentative map has not yet been recorded; therefore, the subject project site is still a part of the larger property. The property has approximately 3,200 lineal feet of frontage on Quartz Hill Road. Of this distance, 2,400 feet are adjacent to the current project. This 3,200 feet of Quartz Hill Road does not meet the City's arterial street-design standards in pavement width, curve radii, and pedestrian walks. Off-site between the subdivision and Snow Lane, Quartz Hill Road lies on a hill at an approximate grade of 6 to 8 percent and maintains the substandard 22-foot pavement width. One of the aforementioned substandard curves on the Bel Air Estates Subdivision frontage lies at the crest of the hill. Widening of this hill section of the road is extremely difficult due to severe topography on either side. The roadway is in a side-hill cut with steep banks (approximately 45 degrees) on either side.

With construction of the Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1, Phase II, Quartz Hill Road is required to be reconstructed across the entire parcel frontage, which may include all or a portion of the subject project frontage, to eliminate current substandard conditions and satisfy the City's construction standards for an arterial street. The improvements include a left-turn lane, acceleration/deceleration lanes, and adequate signal distance at the project entrance and to conform to an approved alignment of Quartz Hill Road, meeting current arterial street alignment and construction standards. The improvements across the subject project would consist of paved travel lanes, graveled shoulders, and minimum necessary drainage facilities, but do not include curb, gutter, and sidewalk. These improvements along the parcel frontage will be required as a condition of the subject project. Any and all improvements to Quartz Hill Road will satisfy the City's alignment, design, and construction standards for an arterial street.

Caltrans, District 2, has commented that development of this project, along with others in this area, will increase traffic in the area, including the intersections of Quartz Hill Road and Benton Drive with State Route 273. Caltrans is currently working on the North Market Street Rehabilitation project, which may necessitate an upgrade to an 8-phase signal. Caltrans indicates that traffic impact fees collected for the project would address cumulative traffic impacts to Quartz Hill Road.

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 neighborhoods 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 not exceed 600 feet. Although there are 55 lots in the proposed subdivision, the project is divided into 3 neighborhoods, each with a separate entrance and loop street meeting the intent of this policy. Neighborhoods B and C include 24 and 14 lots, respectively, with a single entrance from Quartz Hill Road each, while Neighborhood A includes 17 lots with access from Bel Air Drive. Bel Air Drive will provide for two points of public-street access—to Quartz Hill Road and to Stanford Drive to the south.

f. All homes within the subdivision will be required to provide a minimum of two on-site covered parking spaces in accordance with the City's Parking Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.41).

g. In 1998, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Bikeway Plan in compliance with the California Bicycle Transportation Act and in order to be eligible for funding for bikeway improvements. When the Bikeway Plan was prepared, Quartz Hill Road was recognized as a bicycle route currently being used for transportation and recreational purposes by cyclists. When funding became available recently for bikeway improvements, Quartz Hill Road, along with several other streets in the Redding area, was signed as a designated "Bike Route." The signing was done in order to alert motorists to the fact that the roadway was currently being used by bicyclists and to make it safer for that existing legal bicycle use. Any improvements to Quartz Hill Road will include striping and signage in accordance with the Bikeway Plan.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) does not currently operate, or anticipate in the future, a fixed route on Quartz Hill Road.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
City of Redding Draft Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan 2002
Caltrans, District 2, letter dated November 8, 2005
City of Redding Traffic Impact Fee Program Table 8.5
Comprehensive Impact Fee Study, MuniFinacial, May 2000
City of Redding Bikeway Plan, December 1998
Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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, b, c, d. The project site is situated on an upland oak woodland terrace north of the Sacramento River. There is an intermittent drainage, Dean’s Creek, that flows south to east lying just outside the boundary of the project. Several on-site ephemeral creeks drain to the larger creek from the open-space ravine areas located between the three neighborhoods. The project is characterized as hilly terrain. Blue Oak woodland is the dominant habitat type on the ridge tops within the project area, while blue oak/grey-pine habitat occurs commonly in the project site on the east- and west-facing slopes of the open-space areas.

The current subdivision project, as well as the previously approved larger subdivision of Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Units 1 and 2, calls for ridge-top development designed to minimally impact the natural on-site drainage courses and environmentally sensitive portions of the site. A single seasonal wetland feature occurring within the ridge top of Neighborhood B (.014 acre) has been identified and is proposed to be filled with construction of the project. This feature, along with the total estimated loss of seasonal wetland area that would occur with the larger Bel Air Estates Subdivision site, is identified in the *Biological Assessment for the Proposed Bel Air Estates Development, Redding, CA*, prepared by Galloway Consulting, Inc., in November 2004.

This study, as well as several other studies, was prepared for the larger project site, but also included the current project, identified as "Remaining Lands." A report titled, *Biological Characterization for the Proposed Bel Air Estates Residential Development Project*, September 2001, was prepared by the consulting firm of North State Resources, Inc., (NSR) and submitted in conjunction with the original tentative map. Subsequently, Galloway Consulting Inc., performed an ephemeral drainage evaluation for the project site in June 2004 in order to further clarify and refine jurisdictional acreage and classifications and is included in the November 2004 report. In addition, Galloway Consulting, Inc., also conducted a habitat suitability survey in June 2004, and several of the species that were considered by NSR in the original study to have the potential to occur on-site were found to have no suitable supporting habitat on-site. During the NSR survey performed in 2001, however, no special-status plant species were found within the project boundaries.

Three species of aquatic invertebrates: vernal pool fairy shrimp, California linderiella, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp have the potential to occur in the study area and, for the purpose of the Army Corps of Engineers permitting process, have been assumed to occur within the project area. Although the presence of special-status crustaceans is assumed, according to the Biological Assessment, the habitat on the project site is considered marginal for successful survival of the species. The study also indicates that filling of approximately .054 acre of seasonal wetlands, as identified for the larger site (includes the small feature within the current project site), has the potential of adversely affecting the Federally and State-listed threatened vernal pool fairy shrimp and Federally and State-listed endangered vernal pool tadpole shrimp, as well as affecting California linderiella, a Federally and State-listed species of concern;

however, the project has been designed to avoid the majority of intermittent and ephemeral streams found on-site, including Dean's Creek and its tributaries. The study indicates that overall, when specific mitigation measures are implemented through permitting by the Army Corps of Engineers, the proposed project is not likely to preclude the survival and recovery of these species. Additionally, the seasonal wetland areas to be filled have been created by the presence of off-highway vehicles on the ridge tops under unnatural conditions instead of draining naturally. While the presence of vernal pool species is assumed due to this condition, the environment for supporting vernal pool habitat in these depressions is not optimal.

The current project area and the loss of the .014 acre seasonal wetland located in Neighborhood B were identified in the *Bel Air Estates Subdivision Project Pre-Construction Notification*, prepared by Galloway Consulting, Inc., June 21, 2004, submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a Nationwide Permit 39 and considered in the consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in June 2005. The loss was also mitigated, along with the total impact of the larger subdivision project, by purchase of mitigation credits at the Stillwater Plains Mitigation Bank, Inc., in July 2005.

As noted above and under Section III, *Geology and Soils*, and Section IV, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project site contains several on-site ephemeral creeks draining to a larger intermittent creek, Dean's Creek, that is tributary to the Sacramento River, approximately one-half to three-quarters mile to the south. The Sacramento River hosts four special-status fish species: winter-run chinook salmon (Federal endangered), Central Valley steelhead (Federal threatened), Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon (Federal threatened and State endangered), and Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon (Federal candidate). As discussed previously under Sections III and IV, conditions are included in the project to minimize potential sediment and soil-erosion impacts resulting from construction that could emigrate to the Sacramento River and affect the fishery.

e. The City has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.65 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 consideration. The subdivision site has a fairly consistent and dense canopy of blue-oak, grey pine, and interior live oak trees. Of the 24.1 acres of the subdivision site, 9.1 acres will be cleared of all trees and vegetation. The remaining 15 acres, only 9.5 acres of which is contained in slopes of 20 percent or greater, is proposed to be placed in open space. The 8.3 acres of land less than 20 percent slope has been identified for tree-preservation purposes. The typical tree type and range of sizes between the acreage to be cleared and the acreage placed in open space is indistinguishable, although the denser tree coverages are found in the gullies placed in open space.

f. There are no habitat conservation plans adopted in this area.

Documentation

- California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base
- Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000
- City of Redding Municipal Code 18.45, Tree Preservation Ordinance
- City of Redding General Plan EIR, April 19, 2000, SCH #1998072103
- Biological Assessment for the Proposed Bel Air Estates Development, Redding CA, Galloway Consulting Inc., November 2004\
- Bel Air Estates Subdivision Project Pre-Construction Notification, Galloway Consulting, Inc. June 21, 2004
- Department of Fish and Game, Lake or Streambed Alteration Notification #04-0378, dated January 20, 2005
- Letter from United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, to Matthew P. Kelley, dated June 1, 2005
- State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality, Receipt of Your Notice of Intent. Dated July 12, 2005
- Letter from B. Demar Hooper to Matthew Kelley, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Redding Field Office, dated October 7, 2005
- Agreement for Sale of Mitigation Credits by Stillwater Plains Mitigation Bank, Inc., dated July 18, 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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. The project site is not identified in the General Plan as having any known mineral resource value or as being located within any "Critical Mineral Resource Overlay" area.

Documentation

City of Redding Natural Resources Element, 2000

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 single-family subdivision 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 slightly over 2 miles north of Benton Airpark, well outside the established approach/departure clear zones. The project's resulting land use of residential single-family would not conflict with operations of the airpark or present a safety hazard to people residing in the subdivision. 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. Much of the west side of Redding, including the project site, is 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 to wildlands increases the likelihood of wildland fires, and the presence of wildlands adjacent to the urban development allows fires to spread rapidly to and through developed areas. This is of particular concern for this project, since open space consisting of steep slopes and thick stands of vegetation is interspersed between the areas of homes. To minimize fire risk in the wildland/urban interface, the City has established policy requiring such things as a fire-safe buffer between developed and natural areas; minimum road design and access criteria; provisions for adequate fire-water flows; placement of hydrants; and in some cases, installation of residential sprinkler systems. The City Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposal and has identified project-specific conditions that, by application, would reduce the fire-hazard risk to less than significant. Conditions incorporated into the project will include the following:

1. A Vegetation Management/Fire Fuel Reduction Plan (VMFRP) shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the City Fire Marshal and Development Services Director in conjunction with subdivision improvement plans. The VMFRP shall address the portions of the subdivision site adjacent to high-fuel areas and shall be prepared by a registered professional forester or other qualified professional. As a part of the grading, all required fuel-reduction work shall be completed as prescribed by the approved VMFRP. Ongoing maintenance of the subdivision's fire-fuel management zones shall be the responsibility of future property owners through a maintenance association or Vegetation Management District. The objectives of the VMFRP shall be to reduce fire-fuel loads to establish an adequate fire-safety buffer between the residential development and adjacent wildlands subject to the following criteria:

- a. Two primary fuel-reduction areas shall be established as follows:

ZONE 1: This Zone shall include the area within 100 feet of the residential unit. Within Zone 1, 80 to 90 percent of the existing brush (manzanita, ceanothus, etc.) shall be removed. Trees shall be saved except where approved subdivision improvements will be located. Zone 1 clearing shall be provided on both sides of any road for a distance of 30 feet. Trees shall be limbed up to 8 feet.

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 50 percent of brush is cleared and trees are limbed up to 8 feet. Where crown closure of existing vegetation is already 50 percent or less, no reduction in fuel load is to occur.

2. Future residential construction in the subdivision, including accessory buildings, shall comply with the following standards:
 - a. Approved spark arresters shall be required on all chimneys, flues, and stove pipe, with a maximum ½-inch opening.
 - b. The roof coverings of all homes within the subdivision shall be of Class A fire-resistive materials. For roof coverings where the profile allows a space between roof covering and sheathing, the space at the eaves end must be fire-stopped to keep out flames or embers.
 - c. Residential fire-sprinkler systems shall be installed in all habitable structures abutting the open space.
 - d. Any projections from the structure, including, but not limited to, decking, balconies, and patio covers shall be enclosed on the sides and/or underside with approved one-hour fire-resistant material to prevent heat from exterior fires from being trapped underneath the projection.
 - e. Structures constructed in such a manner that they are suspended on piers or pilings over the hillside shall be of noncombustible construction, fire-retardant treated wood, heavy timber, or enclosed on the sides with materials approved for one-hour fire-resistant construction 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.
 - f. Venting shall not be located on the downhill side of the structure when the California Building Code venting regulations can be met without downhill venting. When attic and underfloor vents are necessary on buildings, they shall be screened with ¼-inch metal mesh screens to prevent entry or sparks or burning embers. Turbine attic vents shall be equipped to allow one-way direction only; they shall not free spin in both directions.
 - g. Siding shall be noncombustible, and the eaves shall be protected with materials approved for one-hour fire-resistant construction on the exterior side.
 - h. Skylights shall be of tempered glass or dual panel, except when the structure is protected with a fire sprinkler system.
 - i. Gutters shall be constructed of noncombustible material.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000

City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8 (Health and Safety)

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10, Health and Safety Element, 1998.

Memo from City of Redding Fire Marshal Bruce Becker dated October 20, 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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 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. Due to the project's location adjacent to Quartz Hill Road, identified as an arterial street by the City's General Plan, an *Environmental Noise Assessment Cottages at Bel Air Residential Development* was prepared by Bollard & Brennan, Inc. This document is incorporated herein by reference and is on file with the Development Services Department. The study concludes that lots along Quartz Hill Road will be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the applicable City of Redding exterior noise-level criteria of 60 dB Ldn. However, with installation of an appropriate noise barrier, a six-foot-high solid wall, which is a standard condition of developing lots along an arterial street, traffic noise would be attenuated to an acceptable level.

There are not any nontransportation-related noise- or vibration-generating sources in the general vicinity of the project.

d. During the construction of subdivision improvements, 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. Benton Airpark lies over 2 miles south of the project site. The Airpark's 60 CNEL noise contour extends approximately 0.5 mile north of the runway. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Noise Element, 2000
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12.120
- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance Section 18.40.100
- Environmental Noise Assessment Cottages at Be Air Residential Development, Bollard & Brennan, Inc., March 24, 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(5) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 would not mandate the need for additional police or fire facilities.

a (3). The project is located in the Redding Elementary School District and Shasta Union High School District and would ultimately contribute to the total student enrollment in these districts. 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 residential unit to address school-facility funding necessitated by the effects of growth citywide.

a (4). The project will not overburden existing community parks. See discussion under Item XV (Recreation) below.

a (5). See discussion under Item XII (Utilities and Service Systems) below.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 low-density domestic use (from single-family homes) discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. This type and intensity of land use activity does not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. The proposed development does not generate the need for the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Construction requirements for Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1, Phase I, included the off-site extension of the City's sewer system through adjoining parcels to the east and in Quartz Hill Road to reach that subdivision. These improvements were recently completed; therefore, sewer is available to the proposed project.
- c. As discussed under Section IV, Hydrology and Water Quality, this project site drains to Dean's Creek located just south of the subdivision boundary. Storm-water runoff collected from the project's storm-drain system would be discharged into the open-space areas and the storm-water detention basin currently under construction with Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 1. Hydrology calculations and design include this project in the larger subdivision basin. No additional requirements are needed under this section.
- d. Potable water is available from the City 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 resources.
- e. As noted, the project will utilize the City's sanitary sewer systems to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the 55 single-family homes that would result from the project.
- f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up) service, which homes in the subdivision 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
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
- City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
- Water and Sewer Atlas, City of Redding Engineering Division

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"/>

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

- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion

- a. The homes constructed as a result of development of the project must comply with the height standards of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, would be consistent in height with homes in adjacent neighborhoods, and would not obstruct any documented scenic vistas. The proposed subdivision 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.
- c. The project will be compatible with the existing residential visual character of the property and its surroundings.
- d. Use of homes constructed in the subdivision would generate light that is customary for single-family residential neighborhoods. The project alone would not generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from the lighting of homes and property for domestic activities and streetlighting. There would not be an adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000

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?
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Discussion

a, b, c, d. The project site has a potential for the presence of historic or prehistoric cultural resources due to its location on an upland above the historic seasonal floodplain of the Sacramento River. Consequently, an archaeological study was completed for the project by Peter M. Jensen and Associates. The Study, which included a record search and field survey, establishes the following findings:

1. A record search with the Northeast California Information Center at CSU Chico and other sources indicated that no historic or prehistoric sites are formally recorded within the project site, although other such sites have been identified within a quarter-mile of the project area. However, none of these previously documented sites will be affected by the project as proposed.
2. Evidence of prehistoric activity was observed in the form of several separate and isolated lithic artifacts found on the ground surface. A thorough inspection of the surrounding lands at these properties failed to identify additional cultural resources.
3. Historic findings were limited to trash scatters and isolated tailing piles. These sites lack evidence of association with historic-period mining, homesteading, or ranching activities.
4. The Study concluded that in view of the negative results of both the record search and field survey, it is reasonable to find that proposed development of the project site would not affect historic or archaeological sites deemed significant pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.

5. While no historic or archaeological features were discovered, the Study indicates that its findings are based on an inventory-level surface survey only, and there is always the possibility that significant, unidentified cultural materials could be unearthed during construction. This being the case, it is recommended that a standard mitigation measure be included that documents the potential presence of cultural materials on the site, and if discovered during construction, that work stop and archaeological consultation be obtained immediately to determine the significance of the find.

Documentation

Archaeological Inventory Survey, Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Jensen & Associates, March 30, 2001

Mitigation

None necessary.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 park to the proposed site is Caldwell Park, 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 area residents on the west side of Redding and would not be overburdened by the future residents of the subdivision. A 5.4-acre neighborhood park site will be dedicated and constructed with the larger Bel Air Estates Subdivision, Unit 2, and would serve these 55 residences as well.

Chapter 17.42 of the City's Subdivision Ordinance, Park and Recreational Land Dedications and In-Lieu Fees, requires that as a condition of approval of a tentative map, a subdivider shall either dedicate land or pay a fee in lieu thereof for park or recreational purposes. In accordance with State subdivision law, only projects containing 50 or more lots may be *required* to dedicate land for park development. Due to the fact that the large neighborhood park in Bel Air Estates Subdivision would serve this and the surrounding developments, only in-lieu fees would be collected. Additional recreational development fees are collected by the City at the time of issuance of a building permit on an individual lot.

As a planned development, this project includes both private and public open-space areas. Within each neighborhood pod, there is a small central landscape area that will include a walking trail connecting the three neighborhoods internally and making a connection through the open-space areas as well. The largest area—centrally located in Neighborhood B—is approximately .64 acre in size and will include a gathering area such as picnic tables, play equipment, or gazebo. A sitting area will also be provided along the trail in the open space to take advantage of the views. Undeveloped area within the subdivision that will be dedicated as open space includes 15 acres. The formal landscaped areas within the neighborhoods totals .8 acre.

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"/> |

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 has not been historically used for agricultural purposes nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources, 2000

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.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a. As discussed under Item VII. *Biological Resources*, the project has the potential to result in the loss of a single seasonal wetland feature occurring within the ridge top of Neighborhood B (.014 acre) and possibly associated fairy shrimp habitat; however, impacts were identified in the PCN prepared for the larger Bel Air Estates Subdivision and mitigated prior to construction of that project. The project also has the potential to degrade wildlife habitat in general due to erosion and sedimentation resulting from grading and construction of project infrastructure; however, with certain erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations as identified under Item IV. *Hydrology/Water Quality*, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

b. As discussed in Section V, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of existing grading and construction standards will reduce potential impacts from this project to a level 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.