

# ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

---

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST  
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION  
PARCEL MAP APPLICATION PM-18-05**

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

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Parcel Map Application PM-18-05
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:** 12850 Akrich Street, Assessor's Parcel No. 075-240-001
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Rex and Lisa Emmett, 12750 Akrich Street, Redding, CA 96003
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre"
7. **Zoning:** "RE-2" Residential Estates District
8. **Description of Project:** The project proponent is requesting permission to divide an approximately 17-acre parcel into four single-family residential parcels. The property is currently vacant.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The property is gently sloping with approximately 35 feet of fall from the northwest to the southeast. Several intermittent and ephemeral drainages traverse the site, eventually tributary to Moody Creek, which lies off-site to the east. The property is uniformly covered with scattered medium-sized oak trees.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** The project may require permits from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for the filling and/or loss of wetlands or other waters of the U.S. on-site and a 1603 Streambed Alteration Permit from the California Department of Fish and Game.

### 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
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. Parcel map

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 and its location do not have the potential to physically divide an established community. The proposed parcels are consistent with the "RE-2" Residential Estates District and the current development in this area.
- b. Under the City's Zoning Ordinance, the project site is zoned "RE-2" Residential Estates District and is designated "Residential, 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre" on the Redding General Plan. The proposed lot sizes range from 1.5 acres to 4.2 acres and larger, which is consistent with zoning and the surrounding area.
- 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. As previously noted, the project's large lots are similar in character to those in the surrounding area. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, Newtown Gravelly Loam (NeD) and Perkins Gravelly Loam (PmB). Newtown Gravelly Loam is characterized by slopes of 15 to 30 percent with a slow permeability. Runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion potential is moderate to high. These soils are found in the northwest and southeast portions of the site where the topography is somewhat steeper. The Perkins Gravelly Loam, which is found on the flatter ground in the center of the site, is characterized by slopes of 3 to 8 percent. These soils are well drained with slow permeability. Runoff is slow to medium, and the hazard of erosion is slight to moderate. Division of the property will allow for construction of four single-family homes and related improvements, such as the driveways to access the home sites. Necessary grading and earthwork would be minimal; therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil that would pose a significant impact. The project is subject to certain erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City regulations—and State regulations, if they apply. 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.

- ▶ *California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) "1600 Agreement."* This notification is required for any work within a defined streambed and may be applicable to impacts associated with the crossing of the drainage channel for construction of the driveway providing access to the future homes on Parcels 3 and 4.

e. There is no sewer available to the project site; therefore, the use of septic tanks is proposed, and locations of appropriate sized disposal areas have been identified on the tentative map. The Shasta County Environmental Health Division, Department of Resource Management, has completed its reviewed the information supplied by the applicant.

**Documentation**

City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices  
 City of Redding General Plan Background Report 1998

Letter from Mark Cramer, Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division, dated December 14, 2005

**Mitigation**

None necessary.

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

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, d, e, f. The property drains in a southeasterly direction and contains several unnamed intermittent and ephemeral drainages that are tributary to Moody Creek, which lies off-site to the east of Akrich Street. Division of the property and construction of four single-

family homes would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor contribute runoff water which would be considered significant. With standard erosion-control measures applied for construction of the dwelling, there would not be substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. These future homes would be served by private septic systems; however, these would be permitted through the Shasta County Environmental Health Division and would not violate any water quality standards or waste-discharge requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated to be associated with hydrology or water quality.

**b.** The project would utilize the Bella Vista Water District water service for domestic uses and fire protection. The proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies.

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

**j.** The threat of a tsunami wave is not applicable to inland, central valley communities such as Redding. Seiches could potentially be generated in either Shasta 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 (PM<sub>10</sub>). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Level "A"</b><br/>                 25 pounds per day of NOx<br/>                 25 pounds per day of ROG<br/>                 80 pounds per day of PM<sub>10</sub></p> | <p><b>Level "B"</b><br/>                 137 pounds per day of NOx<br/>                 137 pounds per day of ROG<br/>                 137 pounds per day of PM<sub>10</sub></p> |
|---|--|

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 SMM, 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 PM<sub>10</sub>) that contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions; and (2) fugitive dust (particulate/PM<sub>10</sub>) 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.

The division of the property to allow development and construction of four single-family homes would not create a significant increase in pollutants or violate any air quality standards. The proposed project, with the potential for four single-family dwellings would fall well below Level "A" emissions thresholds established in the Air Quality Element of the Redding General Plan.

d. Potential impacts to neighboring homes (sensitive receptors) from fugitive dust caused during construction is mitigated by application of the SMMs discussed above and under *Mitigation* below.

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

**Documentation**

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

**Mitigation**

None necessary.

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

**VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Would the proposal:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, g. Division of the property with the potential for construction of four single-family homes would generate very minimal additional traffic. The additional trips would not be considered significant in relation to the capacity of the surrounding streets or the current traffic volumes in the area. The realignment of Akrich Street—or Pine Grove Avenue—from Oasis Road to Interstate 5 is identified through the southern half of this property on the City of Shasta Lake's General Plan diagram. The realignment is also identified on City's General Plan, but at a location south of this property. Staff met with the Development Services Director of the City

of Shasta Lake and the project traffic engineer and concluded that it is not necessary for Akrich Street to be realigned through this property. Development of property to the west and east would dictate if the realignment would occur farther to the south as shown on the City's diagram or if an additional connection to Akrich Street would be made at Reentry Lane (street located south of the parcel directly to the south of the subject parcel). As a condition of the parcel map, additional right-of-way will be dedicated to provide a proper radius curve along Akrich Street on the northern half of the frontage. It has therefore been determined that the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs. No adverse traffic-related impacts are anticipated with division or development of the property

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

e. Access to the site is provided by way of Akrich Street. All future homes must be within 250 feet of a fire hydrant or be equipped with a residential fire sprinkler system and be within 500 feet of a fire hydrant. Driveways accessing the future home must provide a turnaround area for emergency-response vehicles if they are greater than 150 feet in length. With these measures, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

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

**Documentation**

- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding Draft Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan 2002
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
- City of Redding Traffic Impact Fee Program Table 8.5
- City of Redding Bikeway Plan, December 1998

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

a, b, c, d. In conjunction with a proposed development on the property adjacent to the west, a *Delineation of Water of the United States* was prepared by Galloway Consulting, Inc., and included this project site. The project site contains several ephemeral and intermittent drainages that are tributary to Moody Creek. Since the site is large—17 acres—and development of only four single-family homes is proposed, for the most part, the drainages would not be disturbed and there would be no impact. There is also a fresh emergent wetland and a seasonal wetland feature identified on the tentative map on Parcel 3 and 4, respectively. Some minor loss may occur with construction of a driveway to access Parcel 3 and 4; however, it is anticipated that the amount of disturbance would be considered less than significant.

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. In this case, only trees in the identified building sites would be removed with construction. After recordation of the parcel map, individual single home sites are exempt from tree-removal permitting requirements under the ordinance.

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  
 Delineation of Waters of the United States, Gallo way Consulting, Inc., revised August 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?
- 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?

**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?
- 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?

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, which would allow construction of four single-family residential homes, does not present a significant risk related to hazardous materials or emissions. There are no documented hazardous material sites located on or near the project.

**e, f.** The project is located outside the established approach/departure clear zones for Redding Municipal Airport and the Benton Airpark. The project's land use of low-density residential would not conflict with operations of the Airport 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.** The project site is located in the Very High Fire Hazard Area of the City; however, it is not adjacent to any steep-slope or open-space areas, and the vegetation on-site consists of primarily trees and natural grasses as opposed to highly combustible brush such as manzanita. The Fire Marshal has indicated that all homes would be required to be within 250 feet of a fire hydrant, or be within 500 feet of a hydrant and have a residential fire sprinkler system installed within the home. Clearing of all highly combustible native vegetation would be required within 100 feet of the home site.

**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.

**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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> |

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. There are no nontransportation-related noise- or vibration-generating sources in the general vicinity of the project. Further, the project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

d. Since the construction work associated with a single-family home is limited in scope, the anticipated temporary noise impact to neighboring residents is considered less than significant.

e, f. The proposed subdivision site is not located within any of the noise contours of Redding Municipal Airport and is located approximately 10 miles from the property. 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
- Redding Municipal Airport Area Plan

**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"/>

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

(5) Other public facilities?

**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 size of the project would not mandate the need for additional police or fire facilities.

**a (3).** The project is located in the Gateway Unified Elementary and High School Districts 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 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?
- f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Discussion**

**a, e.** The parcel map proposes the use of private septic systems for each lot due to the fact that there is no sewer available to this area.

**b.** The proposed development does not generate the need for the construction of new water- or wastewater-treatment facilities.

**c.** Division of the property into four parcels for construction of single-family homes would not result in the construction of new storm-water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

d. Potable water is available from the Bella Vista Water District to serve the project, which would provide adequate pressure for domestic use and flows for fire suppression.

f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up) service, which homes in the area 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"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion**

- a. 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 construction of four homes 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.
- c. The project will be compatible with the existing residential visual character of the property and its surroundings.
- d. Homes constructed as a result of this parcel map would generate light that is customary for single-family residential homes. 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?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Discussion**

a, b, c, d. Due to the fact that there are known Native American grave sites in the general vicinity, the area is considered sensitive for the possible presence. Therefore, a *Cultural Resources Inventory Survey* was conducted on the 17-acre parcel by ENPLAN. The report indicates that Peak and Associates (1988) had previously conducted a small linear survey within the project area; however, no cultural resources were noted or recorded as a result of that survey. As a result of archival research and a pedestrian field survey conducted by ENPLAN, one historical structure (a portion of the Volta to Keswick Transmission Line and Corridor) was identified and recorded within and immediately adjacent to the project area. It was determined, however, that the particular portion of the historical transmission line and corridor located within the project area is not considered to have the potential for eligibility to the California Register. No other cultural resources were identified as a result of ENPLAN’s work.

The study determined that because of the known grave sites in the general vicinity, the project area was considered sensitive for the possible presence of Native American grave sites. That determination was also based upon verbal responses received from Native American correspondents; however, no indication was made that known grave sites exist within or immediately adjacent to the project area. In the event that human remains are encountered as a result of project development, the study recommends that the following stipulation be included in the project conditions:

1. If any human remains or cultural resources (i.e., burnt animal bone; midden soils; projectile points or other humanly-modified lithic, historic artifacts) are encountered during any phase of construction, all earth-disturbing work shall stop within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can make an assessment of the discovery and recommend/implement mitigation measures as necessary.

**Documentation**

Cultural Resources Inventory Survey on +17Acres for a Proposed Parcel Split and Residential Subdivision Project, City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, October 2005.

**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?
- 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?

**Discussion**

a, b. There are no neighborhood or regional parks in the vicinity of this project, nor does it include any recreational facilities. 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. Additional recreational development fees are collected by the City at the time of issuance of a building permit on an individual lot. The project contains 4 lots; therefore, land dedication may not be required; in-lieu fees will be required.

There would not be any potentially significant impacts to recreation associated with the project.

**Documentation**

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

**Mitigation**

None necessary.

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

**XVI. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion**

a, b, c. The project site 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
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.4: Agricultural Lands
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, August 1974, pp. 79

**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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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. The project has a very limited potential to degrade wildlife habitat in general due to erosion and sedimentation resulting from construction of the four homes and driveway access; 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. As discussed under Item VII. *Biological Resources*, the project has the potential to result in a minor loss of jurisdictional waters; however, impacts would be considered less than significant.

b. As discussed in Item 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.