

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION
TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION
THE RESERVE AT GOLD HILLS
S-17-04/PD-2-05/RZ-2-05**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-17-04, Rezoning Application RZ-2-05, and Planned Development Application PD-2-05, The Reserve at Gold Hills (a.k.a. Gold Hills Park)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Jim Wildauer, Associate Planner, (530) 225-4020
4. **Project Location:** The proposed project site is located in the northeast portion of the City of Redding, southeast of the Oasis Road and Gold Hills Drive intersection. The proposed project site is located on AP Nos. 074-220-009, 074-230-009, and 074-240-001 (see attached).
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Brian Burk, 2154 Harvard Way, Redding, CA 96003
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 2-3.5 units per acre"; "Residential, 6-10 units per acre"
7. **Zoning:** "RS-3" Residential Single Family District; "RM-6" and "RM-6-PD" Residential Multiple Family Districts
8. **Description of Project:** The project sponsor is requesting approval of a tentative subdivision map to subdivide three parcels totaling approximately 59.3 acres to create 219 lots for development of single-family residential homes, with lot sizes ranging from 3,260 square feet to 14,163 square feet in area. The proposed lot sizes are presented in Table 1. 13.4 acres are proposed as common open space. The project would include construction of on-site streets and utility and storm-drainage improvements and detention facilities necessary to serve the lots. Some culverts exist and additional arch culverts or equivalent crossings approved by the Department of Fish and Game and the City are proposed for installation at road locations crossing intermittent streams. The project would also include a sewer line corridor extending from the back lot of Gold Hills Golf Course to Oasis Road. The tentative map identifies three distinct neighborhoods (A-C). Neighborhoods A and B are proposed as planned single-family developments. Neighborhood C proposes a standard single-family subdivision project. A rezoning is proposed to implement the "PD" Overlay District for the planned development.

Table 1
Summary of Number of Proposed Lots and Sizes

Number of Lots	Square Footage
28	< 4,360
154	4,360-8,276
33	8,276-12,632
3	12,632 +

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The project site ranges from approximately 640 to 700 feet in elevation. The site and surrounding environs are undeveloped and contain an abundance of blue oak-grey pine woodlands, which consist of a mixture of hardwoods, conifers, and shrubs. Existing land uses near the site include rural residential, low-density residential, vacant land, and an 18-hole golf course. Oasis Road is located north and west of the project site. Gold Hills Drive is located directly west of the project site. The southeast portion of the project site is bisected by Dry Gulch Creek and reaches of the creek continue outside the project boundary to the northeast and south. Portions of the project site are located within the 100-year floodplain for Dry Gulch Creek. Surface waters on the site also include several small intermittent to ephemeral streams and one wetland area.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement):** The project applicants must obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement will also be required by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) for "streambed" crossings by interior streets and on-site and off-site utility lines. The project may be subject to Section 404 permit approvals from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) in the event that jurisdictional waters cannot be fully avoided. The most commonly used permits in this situation are Nationwide Permits 12, 14, and 39; an Individual Permit is unlikely to be required. In the case that the Army Corps of Engineers requires a Section 404 permit, a Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be necessary as well.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | |

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 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

Jim Wildauer
(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 | ■ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | ■ Agricultural Resources |
| ■ Population and Housing | ■ Geology and Soils | ■ Public Services |
| ■ Hydrology and Water Quality | ■ Utilities & Service Systems | |
| ■ Air Quality | ■ Aesthetics | |
| ■ Transportation/Circulation | ■ Cultural Resources | |
| ■ Biological Resources | ■ Recreation | |
| ■ Mineral Resources | ■ Noise | |

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. Vicinity map
- B. Site Location map
- C. Tentative 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 physical deterioration of the environment (economic blight)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- a.** The project site is designated in the City of Redding General Plan as suitable for single-family residential development. Land uses adjacent to the site include low-density residential, rural-residential development, vacant land, and an 18-hole golf course. The project does not have the potential to physically divide a community.
- b.** The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Redding classifies the project site as “RS-3,” “RM-6,” and “RM-6-PD.” The City of Redding General Plan classifies the project site as “Residential, 2 to 3.5 units per acre”; “Residential, 6 to 10 units per acre”; and “Residential Planned Development, 6-10 units per acre.” The overall project density is approximately 6.6 units per acre for the “Residential, 6- to 10-unit-per-acre” classification and 2.4 units per acre for the “Residential, 2- to 3.5-unit-per-acre” classification. Considering buildable area within the project site, the General Plan density ranges would allow between 203 and 343 residential units. The project represents 219 homes, which is consistent with the City of Redding General Plan and City of Redding Zoning Ordinance requirements.
- c.** There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the site. The project is consistent with the goals stated in the Natural Resources Element of the City of Redding General Plan.
- d.** The project would ultimately provide positive social and economic impacts by facilitating orderly residential development of natural lands within the urban core and extension of public roads and utilities as are fully supported by the General Plan. Market demands/opportunities/limitations will ultimately control project implementation and phasing.

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 the opportunity for construction of new single-family homes as planned and anticipated by the Redding General Plan. The project is similar in character to that of existing and planned subdivisions in the project vicinity. No existing homes or residents would be displaced.

Documentation

Housing, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

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:				
(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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The site is located in an area designated in the Health and Safety Element of the City of Redding General Plan as having a range of low to medium groundshaking potential, between 0.10 – 0.45 g. Liquefaction, landslides, and expansive soils are not considered to pose a significant hazard in the project area.

b. The project site contains a mix of soils, including Churn gravelly loam 0-3% slopes (CeA), Newtown gravelly loam 8-15% slopes (NeC), Newtown gravelly loam 15-30% slopes (NeD), Newtown gravelly loam 30-50% slopes (NeE2), Red Bluff gravelly loam 15-30% slopes (RdA), Red Bluff gravelly loam 3-8% slopes (RdB), and Red Bluff gravelly loam, moderately deep 3-8% slopes (RcB). Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of these soil types.

Table 2
Soil Types and Characteristics

Soil Name	Soil Type	Permeability	Slope (%)	Erosion Potential	Runoff Rate
Churn (CeA)	Gravelly loam	Moderately slow	0-3	None-slight	Slow
Newtown (NeC)	Gravelly loam	Slow	8-15	Moderate	Medium
Newtown (NeD)	Gravelly loam	Slow	15-30	Moderate-high	Medium-rapid
Newtown (NeE2)	Gravelly loam	Slow	30-50	High	Rapid
Red Bluff (RdA)	Gravelly loam	Slow	0-3	None-slight	Slow
Red Bluff (RdB)	Gravelly loam	Slow	3-8	Slight-moderate	Slow-medium
Red Bluff (RcB)	Gravelly loam, moderately deep	Slow	3-8	Slight-moderate	Slow-medium

Of the 59.3 acres included in the project area, ± 44.8 acres will be graded in order to facilitate street construction, provide utilities, and create building pads. Some minor grading encroachment may occur on slopes in excess of 20 percent to accommodate installation of streets and utility infrastructure, ensure adequate drainage, and provide continuity of lot design. Some grading will occur in the open-space areas to construct sewer and storm-water detention facilities and provide maintenance access. These construction activities will result in the displacement and overcovering of soil and a change in topographic features. The primary concerns raised by the extent of the proposed grading are the loss of trees and the potential for soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation of on-site drainages. Careful application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction in conjunction with the erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations will reduce the potential for soil erosion and related water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

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

- *City of Redding Grading Ordinance.* This ordinance requires the application of "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (Redding Municipal Code Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, and E). This ordinance also allows the City to require a monitor, an independent erosion-control specialist, or licensed civil engineer with demonstrated erosion-control expertise to conduct the following:
 - a. Prepare the required Interim and Final Erosion Control Plan.
 - b. Monitor the installation of all erosion-control improvements and measures.
 - c. Monitor the effectiveness of the erosion-control improvements and measures during project construction.

The recommendations of the monitor's reports shall be implemented in a manner and on a schedule as directed by the City Engineer.

In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final subdivision grading plan and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts.

- *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Construction Activity Storm Water Permit."* This permit overlaps the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion-control 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 Permit."* This permit is required for any work within a defined streambed and would be applicable to the proposed culvert installations and utility lines crossing through on- and off-site streambeds. In addition, the DFG permit may address any potential disturbance of riparian habitat.
- 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), 2003
City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
Background Report, City of Redding General Plan, 1998
Health and Safety Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
Soil Survey of Shasta County, August 1974

Mitigation

None necessary. Application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) required as a matter of course during construction in conjunction with the erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations will reduce the potential for soil erosion and related water-quality impacts to a less than significant level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 wastewater into ground or surface waters. Application of the regulations identified in Section III, particularly those of the State Water Quality Control Board, reduce the potential for water quality impacts to less than significant.

b. The project would utilize Bella Vista Water District water service for domestic uses and fire protection. There are no known wells on or near the project site that could be impacted by proposed construction. Compliance with the City of Redding General Plan policies will preserve and protect the quantity and quality of groundwater resources. These policies include NR3A, B, and E, which recommend: (1) maintaining the natural condition of waterways and floodplains to the extent feasible, (2) maintaining given flood-control requirements, (3) compliance with the State Regional Water Quality Control Board’s regulations and standards to maintain and improve groundwater quality, and (4) working with appropriate State, Federal, and local agencies to protect, improve, and enhance groundwater quality in the region.

d, e. The project will not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or area, nor will it alter the course of nearby streams or creeks. The project will not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in flooding on- or off-site. At present, site runoff enters Dry Gulch Creek, and a minor amount enters Salt Creek. 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. In this case, storm-water runoff from the project site will be directed to the proposed

storm-water detention basins. Detention for storm water going to Dry Gulch Creek is proposed to be held in a 6.4-acre detention pond created with the Road "F" crossing of Dry Gulch Creek. A small detention facility is proposed between lots at the inside corner of Roads "C" and "J" for detention of storm water going to Salt Creek. The project engineer has provided a preliminary hydrologic analysis indicating that the postdevelopment peak flows from the project would not be increased with use of the basins; therefore, no adverse impacts are anticipated to downstream properties or facilities. The final hydrologic analysis is subject to approval by the City's Development Services Department Engineering Division.

g, h. Small portions of the project site are located within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Gulch Creek. The project design has avoided placement of homes, structures, and support facilities within the 100-year floodplain. While culverts are proposed to cross over Dry Gulch Creek to avoid alteration of the existing waterway, they will be sized so that they do not significantly impede or redirect flood flows.

i. Two major dams are present in the general project vicinity, Shasta Dam and Whiskeytown Dam. The anticipated inundation resulting from the unlikely failure of these dams has been documented in the Redding General Plan. According to this documentation, the project site would not be affected by the unlikely failure of either of these dams. There are no levees near the 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 Lake or Whiskeytown Lake during an earthquake. However, neither lake has been identified in the Health and Safety Element of the General Plan as having any risk to the City under such circumstances. There is no documented threat of mudflows potentially affecting the project site.

Documentation

- Health and Safety, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Figure 8-3 (100-Year Floodplain), City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety, Final EIR, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Brian Burk Dry Gulch Project Hydrology Report dated April 14, 2005, by Hydmet, Inc.

Mitigation

None necessary. Those existing grading regulatory measures identified under Item 3, GEOLOGY AND SOILS, above, will also serve to maintain water quality impacts at a level of less than significant.

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 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 to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan acknowledged this; as a result, a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the City Council for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan, such as the proposed residential development. Nevertheless, the Air Quality Element of the General Plan incorporates strategies to reduce emissions associated with new and modified indirect sources of pollution in an effort to accurately determine and mitigate project-related impacts. Emission-reduction goals of 20 to 25 percent are established depending on the projected level of unmitigated emissions for a project. Mitigation thresholds are established for the important regional/local pollutants, including: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), which are ozone precursors, and Inhalable Particulate Matter, 10 Micron (PM₁₀). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

<p>Level "A"</p> <p>25 pounds per day of NOx</p> <p>25 pounds per day of ROG</p> <p>80 pounds per day of PM₁₀</p>	<p>Level "B"</p> <p>137 pounds per day of NOx</p> <p>137 pounds per day of ROG</p> <p>137 pounds per day of PM₁₀</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 (SMM) are 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 (BAMM), in addition to the SMM, in order to achieve a net emission reduction of 20 percent or more. If, after applying SMM and BAMM, 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.

The 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 only a medium-sized residential development, the project does not have the potential to generate significant emission concentrations of other pollutants subject to State and Federal ambient air quality standards, such as sulfur dioxide.

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

	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	29.6	33.6	32.93

The analysis indicates that the project would result in emissions of ROG and NOx that are above the Level "A" threshold, yet well below the Level "B" threshold. Hence, application of SMM and BMM are required in order to achieve a net emission reduction objective of 20 percent or more in accordance with General Plan policy. SMM applicable to the project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction and are noted below. Five BMM emission credit categories have been determined as feasible and applicable to the project as follows:

1. *Traffic Flow Improvements.* Payment of the Redding Citywide Traffic Impact Fee will be made as required by the Redding Municipal Code. Construction of left-turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and any necessary appurtenant improvements at the project entrances, as determined by the City Engineer, will improve traffic flow and safety conditions. The emission mitigation credit for these improvements is 6.5 percent.
2. *Pedestrian Access to Public Transit.* The project will provide for pedestrian access to major points within the development (e.g., clubhouse, private and public parks adjacent to subdivisions, and open-space areas). The emission mitigation credit for this item is 3.0 percent.
3. *Neighborhood Telecommunication.* The project will include a DSL neighborhood telecommunication network to facilitate residents working from home. The emission mitigation credit for this item is 4.0 percent.
4. *Complementary Use Mix.* The project site will be located within ¼ mile of the proposed Redding Oasis Center. The emission mitigation credit for this item is 6.0 percent.
5. *Park and Recreational Facilities.* A private park and clubhouse are proposed with the planned development. Additionally, a dedication of 4 usable acres of land is proposed at the southeast corner of the development for park purposes. This is expected to be a part of a 10-acre Neighborhood Park that will serve the area. Dedication of the steep-slope and floodplain areas for open-space purposes is also proposed. The need to travel a much greater distance to access such park and recreation facilities will be eliminated and impacts to air quality reduced. The emission mitigation credit for this item is 1.9–2.5 percent.

Based on these five BMM categories, the project can achieve net emission reduction credit of 20.4–21.0 percent, which is consistent with General Plan policy. The project's potential cumulative impact to air quality is therefore determined to be less than significant with these and incorporation of the BMM and the applicable SMM identified below.

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

The City of Redding development regulations require that the following measures, or equivalent measures, be implemented during construction of the proposed project:

1. Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
2. Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering before final occupancy.
3. Suspend all grading operations when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour as directed by the Shasta County AQMD.
4. Provide temporary traffic control (e.g., flag person) as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow.
5. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours.
6. Water active construction sites at least twice daily as directed by the Engineering Division.

7. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials or maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
 8. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads.
 9. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site on each trip.
- d. Potential impacts from fugitive dust caused during construction are mitigated by application of the SMM identified above.
- e. The project does not involve land use that could generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Documentation

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
Redding General Plan Natural Resources and Air Quality Elements, 2000
URBEMIS Report, dated 2-24-06.

Mitigation

1. The SMM and BMM listed under **a-c** above will reduce potential air quality impacts to a level less than significant and are standard City of Redding regulations applicable to all project and redevelopment plan approvals. The project will also incorporate Grading Ordinance measures for dust control during construction, including an erosion-control plan with the planting and seeding of bare ground, which will reduce dust. No additional measures are needed.

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

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, d. Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis for Gold Hills Park and Addendum to Traffic Impact Analysis for Gold Hills Park prepared by WBA Engineering (2005), access to the Reserve at Gold Hills subdivision would be via two new road connections. One access road would be from Oasis Road, approximately 1,700 feet east of Gold Hills Drive, and the other would be from Gold Hills Drive, approximately 1,550 feet south of Oasis Road. Oasis Road is identified in the Transportation Element of the City of Redding 2000–2020 General Plan as an arterial street; Gold Hills Drive is considered a local street. Various stub streets will be in place to provide sufficient interties with future subdivisions.

The City of Redding has established that weekday AM and PM peak-hour conditions are of primary concern along Oasis Road. The proposed Reserve at Gold Hills is expected to generate 144 weekday AM peak-hour trips and 192 weekday PM peak hour trips. Of the 144 projected weekday AM peak-hour trips, 86 are expected to utilize the Oasis Road access point and 58 are expected to utilize the Gold Hills Drive access point. Of the 192 projected weekday PM peak-hour trips, 114 are expected to utilize the Oasis Road access point and 78 are expected to utilize the Gold Hills Drive access point. From a traffic-engineering standpoint, a two-lane arterial street with restricted access can accommodate up to 10,000 to 12,000 vehicle trips per day. Existing traffic plus that associated with the project will not exceed the arterial street capacity. However, as is noted in the traffic report, there will be cumulative impacts to the Oasis Road/I-5 interchange and supporting road network by this and other projects in the area.

According to the traffic report, the Oasis Road/I-5 Northbound Ramp intersection currently meets signal warrants, but operates at a Level of Service (LOS) A. If the subdivision were to build out prior to development of the Redding Oasis Center (a foreseeable future retail project at the northeast quadrant of Oasis Road and I-5), the intersection LOS would degrade to LOS B. According to the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) for the Redding Oasis Center (EIR-2-02), this and other area intersections and the supporting State and local road network will need to be upgraded as development continues and cumulative impacts are realized. EIR-2-02 requires specific phased improvements to address these impacts. With the initial phase of development, the developer of the Oasis Center is required to construct certain circulation improvements. With the second phase of the Oasis Center the Oasis Road/Interstate 5 interchange will need to be replaced. This is triggered when vehicle trips generated from the Oasis Center and surrounding developments reach a certain threshold as identified in Mitigation Measure 5-5 of EIR-2-02. The traffic report for the Reserve at Gold Hills analyzed and found that full development of the Reserve at Gold Hills would not generate vehicle trips that would trigger the need for reconstruction of the interchange. The Addendum to Traffic Impact Analysis for Gold Hills Park (WBA

Engineering, 2005) recommends that based on its cumulative impacts, The Reserve at Gold Hills be a participant on a pro rata basis in implementing traffic mitigation measures recommended in the Redding Oasis Center MEIR.

The traffic report also indicated that the project be required to construct left-turn lanes and acceleration and deceleration lanes at the project's street intersections with Gold Hills Drive and Oasis Road to address traffic-safety impacts.

- 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. The Reserve at Gold Hills will have two public points of access—from Oasis Road, approximately 1,700 feet east of Gold Hills Drive, and from Gold Hills Drive, approximately 1,550 feet south of Oasis Road.
- 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 18.62).
- g. Project development does not conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. In 2004, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan. When the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan was prepared, Oasis Road was proposed as a bicycle route to potentially be used for transportation and recreational purposes by cyclists in the future. When funding becomes available for bikeway improvements, any improvements to Oasis Road will be in accordance with the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) provides public bus service in the Redding area. The nearest existing fixed route is on Twin View Boulevard. RABA does not currently operate a fixed route on this portion of Oasis Road, although one may be warranted in the future to accommodate anticipated growth.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
- Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan, City of Redding, 2004
- City of Redding Overflight Zones Map, 2000
- Traffic Impact Analysis for Gold Hills Park, WBA Engineering, 2005
- Addendum to Traffic Impact Analysis for Gold Hills Park, WBA Engineering, 2005

Mitigation

Mitigation measures include the following:

- 2. Construction of left-turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and any necessary appurtenant improvements as determined by the City Engineer at the project entrances is required to improve traffic flow and safety conditions.
- 3. Prior to recording a final map, the applicant, owner, or successor in interest shall agree to enter into an agreement with the City to participate in a funding mechanism that ensures the improvements to the Oasis Road/I-5 interchange, as well as the supporting State/local road network and their ancillary improvements. Improvements would include those recommended in EIR-2-02 for the Redding Oasis Center and any supplemental improvements which may be identified in the Oasis Road Specific Plan MEIR.
- 4. Notwithstanding #3 above, up to a maximum of 49 lots may be recorded prior to final establishment of a funding mechanism for the improvements referred to in #3 above. Payment of a project-specific facility fee, established by the City Council or its designee equal to the project's preliminary pro rata share of the circulation improvements, shall be paid at time of recording of the final map. In the alternative, a \$5,000-per-lot fee shall be deposited with the City prior to recording the final map.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b. Two reports, Gold Hills Park Biological Screening (ENPLAN 2004) and Wetland/Biological Evaluation for the Gold Hills Park Sewer Line Corridor and Shasta View Extension (ENPLAN 2005), were submitted in conjunction with the tentative map. The reports are incorporated herein by reference and are on file with the Development Services Department. The reports identified one unique plant association and five special-status species as potentially utilizing the project site. Special-status species potentially affected by site development include Henderson’s bentgrass, fall-run/late fall-run Chinook salmon, spring-run Chinook salmon, winter-run Chinook salmon, and Central Valley Steelhead. The following evaluations of potential impacts to special-status species and unique plant associations are drawn from the Gold Hills Park Biological Screening (ENPLAN 2004).

One unique plant association, buckwheat scrub, is present in limited amounts within the project site and in large quantities in the proposed development site directly west of the proposed Reserve at Gold Hills. Characteristic species are tripod buckwheat (*Eriogonum tripodum*) and Sanborn’s onion (*Allium sanbornii* var. *sanbornii*). Both of these plants and a third associate, depauperate milk-vetch (*Astragalus pauperculus*), which is less abundant in the area, are on List 4 of the California Native Plant Society (Plants of Limited Distribution), but are not State or Federally listed. These species by themselves would not likely warrant special protection. However, the Department of Fish and Game considers the assemblage of all three plants and the substrate upon which they occur as very unique, because nowhere else in California is this combination of plants and soil known to occur. For this reason, the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) would consider elimination of the plant community as a significant impact under Section 15065 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. To adequately protect the plant association, the DFG recommends establishing a preserve encompassing portions of the subject site and the parcel to the west. The preserve is proposed to be protected through establishment of a Conservation Easement and maintained by a Homeowners’ Association. On-site portions of the preserve would include two sites in APN 074-230-009 totaling ±1.06 acres: ±0.34 acre in the northwest and ±0.72 acre in the east area of the parcel.

Implementation of the following guidelines recommended by the DFG will decrease potential impacts to the buckwheat scrub plant

association to a less than significant level. These guidelines have been reviewed by the applicant and incorporated into the project proposal.

- a. Preserve areas will be established and protected from physical disturbance, both during and after construction. These areas shall be shown on all copies of the construction plans. Prior to initiating site clearing and grading operations, construction fencing shall be installed to clearly designate the preserve areas. Following construction, the preserves will be protected from unauthorized vehicle use with a post-and-cable system or other suitable barrier.
- b. Existing site hydrology must be maintained to the greatest extent possible. To avoid unseasonable runoff into the preserve, lots bordering the protected areas will be graded to drain toward the street. Where this is not feasible, a storm drain will be installed at the back of the lots to intercept and redirect all runoff from the lots away from the preserve areas.
- c. Erosion-control measures shall be implemented during construction to prevent sediment from being deposited within the preserve areas. Erosion-control measures shall include use of cellulose fiber, certified weed-free straw, or rice straw and shall avoid the use of invasive plant materials that may become established in the preserve.
- d. Walking trails within the preserve areas shall minimize removal of native vegetation and be sited to take advantage of existing disturbed areas to the greatest extent feasible.
- e. The preserve shall be protected in perpetuity through establishment of a conservation easement held by the DFG or an entity approved by the DFG. The conservation easement will include additional restrictions within the preserve area regarding soil and vegetation disturbance, allowable activities, and other protective measures.

Henderson's bentgrass is known to occur within two miles of the site, and it has a low potential to occur on the site. Henderson's bentgrass is on List 3 of the California Native Plant Society (Plants About Which We Need More Information), but is not State or Federally listed. Even if present, DFG is not currently requesting mitigation for the loss of this species.

Special-status anadromous fish species that may be potentially affected by site development include the fall-run/late fall-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), a Federal Candidate species and a State Species of Concern; winter-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), a federal and state Endangered species; spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), a Federal and State Threatened species; and Central Valley steelhead (*O. mykiss irideus*), a Federal Threatened species. Churn Creek is known to support these species on an occasional basis; Dry Gulch Creek is tributary to Churn Creek approximately one mile downstream of the site. Within the study area, Dry Gulch Creek has steep, eroded banks, approximately 3 to 15 feet in height and very little riparian vegetation. Between the study area and Churn Creek lies the Gold Hills Golf Course. Nearly the entire length of Dry Gulch Creek within the golf course (± 0.5 mile) has a densely vegetated streambed, exhibiting characteristics of an emergent wetland or riparian wet meadow. These conditions, combined with the intermittent nature of the stream, make it extremely unlikely to support anadromous fish. None of the other on-site stream channels are capable of supporting anadromous fish. As discussed with DFG staff, if a 50-foot buffer zone is maintained along Dry Gulch Creek and if adequate erosion controls are implemented, no adverse impacts on anadromous fish are expected.

c. The project site contains ± 0.471 acre of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "Waters of the United States." As proposed, the development will result in fill of ± 0.022 acre (960 feet) of ephemeral stream channel; all remaining jurisdictional waters will be fully avoided. Fill of the ephemeral stream will require that construction activities be undertaken in accordance with the terms and conditions of Nationwide Permit 39 (Residential, Commercial, and Institutional Developments). The applicant must also obtain Water Quality Certification and mitigate the proposed fill. Mitigation can be achieved by purchasing riparian forest mitigation credits from the Department of Fish and Game's Battle Creek Riparian Forest Mitigation Bank or by paying in-lieu mitigation fees to the ACOE or its designee.

d. As discussed above, Dry Gulch Creek is unlikely to support anadromous fish, although its riparian zone may provide for the movement of terrestrial species. The other small ephemeral and intermittent streams on the site have a negligible value as fish and wildlife movement corridors. Given the avoidance measures incorporated into the project proposal, no additional mitigation measures are necessary to provide for fish and wildlife movement.

The site has a high potential to support nesting migratory birds. In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, to avoid adverse impacts to nesting migratory birds, vegetation will be removed from the site before April 1 or after July 31. If this is not

possible, a nesting survey should be conducted prior to vegetation removal. If active nests are found, vegetation clearing is to be postponed until after the young birds have fledged.

e. The City of Redding has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development considerations. The subdivision site has an open to moderately dense canopy of blue oak, gray pine, and interior live oak. Of the existing trees, 38% will be retained. Of trees over 24-inch diameter at breast height, 38% will be retained. Tree-preservation areas of 12.03 acres are proposed. Given the effort to preserve existing trees and establishment of extensive open space, it is determined that the impact to on-site trees would be less than significant.

Documentation

City of Redding Tree Preservation Ordinance, Redding Municipal Code Title 18, Zoning, 2003
City of Redding General Plan EIR, 2000
Gold Hills Park Biological Screening, ENPLAN, 2004
Wetland/Biological Evaluation for the Gold Hills Park Sewer Line Corridor and Shasta View Extension, ENPLAN, 2005
Oasis Pointe Village, Shasta County, Letter to Don Burk from DFG, 2004

Mitigation

5. The developer shall secure a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) prior to issuance of a City grading permit that would result in the placement of fill or other loss of jurisdictional waters as identified by an ACOE-verified delineation. Mitigation for the loss of jurisdictional waters shall be satisfied in a manner and schedule established by the ACOE permit.
6. The developer shall secure any necessary "1600 permit" from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) prior to issuance of a City grading permit that would impact a stream channel under CDFG jurisdiction.
7. In compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, any vegetation removal from the site is to occur before April 1 or after July 31. If this is not possible, a nesting survey should be conducted prior to vegetation removal. If active nests are found, vegetation clearing is to be postponed until after the young birds have fledged.

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

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

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

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c, d. The nature of the project as a 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 over ten miles north of the Redding Municipal Airport, well outside the established approach/departure clear zones. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity.

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

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

1. A Vegetation Management/Fire Fuel Reduction Plan (VMFFRP) shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the City Fire Marshal and Development Services Director in conjunction with subdivision improvement plans. The VMFFRP shall address the entire subdivision site and, as necessary, adjacent public open-space areas and shall be prepared by a registered professional forester or other qualified professional. *Areas within 50 feet of the “unique plant community” discussed in 7(b) above are to be*

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

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

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

Documentation

- Underground Storage Tanks, Shasta County Department of Environmental Health, 2005
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2005
- Hazardous Materials Search, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, 2005
- CalSites, Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2005
- Health and Safety, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety, Final EIR, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety, General Plan Background Report, City of Redding 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, c. The Noise Element of the City of Redding General Plan establishes exterior and interior noise thresholds in residential areas of 60 and 45 Ldn/CNEL dB, respectively (Table 5-4). Based on the Environmental Noise Analysis prepared by J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc. (2005), exterior noise levels at the residential areas with property lines adjacent to Oasis Road and/or Gold Hills Drive may exceed acceptable levels unless the proposed 6-foot-tall solid masonry wall/noise barrier is constructed along the property line of single-family residences adjacent to Oasis Road and Gold Hills Drive. Interior noise-level thresholds will not be exceeded based on utilization of standard construction practices. The requirement for the exterior wall is a requirement of all developments adjacent to arterial streets in Redding, and the interior noise considerations are a requirement of Title 24 of State law. These measures are proposed by the applicant and are included by this reference into the project description.

b. There are no non-transportation-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. The project is not within an airport land use plan, nor is it within two miles of an existing public or public use airport. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Noise Element, 2000

Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12.120

City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000

Environmental Noise Analysis: Gold Hills-Emily Estates Subdivision, J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(5) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a (1) & a (2). The City would provide police and fire protection to the project from existing facilities and under existing service levels. The relatively small size of the project does not mandate the need for additional police or fire facilities. Cumulative growth in the Redding area may necessitate additional fire and police protection resources in the future. A per-square-foot fee is paid prior to issuance of building permits for a residential unit to offset impacts to these services.

a (3). The project is located in the Gateway Unified School District and would ultimately contribute to the total student enrollment in this District. However, a school facility impact (in-lieu) fee exists, as provided under State law, that is paid prior to the issuance of a building permit for each new single-family residence (and other types of development) to address school-facility funding necessitated by the effects of growth citywide.

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

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

Documentation

Public Facilities, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. Wastewater generated from the project would be that associated with domestic use (from single-family homes) and would be discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. This single-family residential land use activity would not typically generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the 219 single-family homes that would result from the project.
- c. Detention is proposed in the form of a 6.4-acre detention pond for runoff to Dry Gulch Creek and a small detention basin for runoff to Salt Creek. Storm-water runoff collected from the project's storm-drain system would be discharged from the storm-water detention basins into Dry Gulch Creek and Salt Creek. Potential impacts associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the storm drains are related to soil erosion and sedimentation. These impacts are discussed in Section III: Geology and Soils.
- d. The project site is located within the Bella Vista Water District (BVWD). Potable water is available from BVWD 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 District's existing water allotments.

e. The project will utilize the City's sanitary sewer system to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the 219 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

Housing, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Public Facilities, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Public Facilities and Services, Final EIR, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, c. The 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.

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, property, and streets.

Documentation

Community Development and Design, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Natural Resources, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

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

Discussion

a, b, d. Cultural resources inventories, including record searches and field surveys, were completed for the project (and surrounding lands) by Jensen & Associates (2003) and ENPLAN (2004). The record searches indicated that no significant historic resources have been recorded in the project area. No significant historic resources were found in the study area during the field survey. This site lacks evidence of association with historic-period mining, homesteading, or ranching activities.

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

Documentation

- Archaeological Survey, Oasis Pointe 32-acre Residential Development, Jensen & Associates, 2003
- Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, Gold Hills Residential Development Project, ENPLAN, 2004
- Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, Proposed Subdivision, ENPLAN, 2004
- Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, Proposed Sewer Line Easement South of Gold Hills Residential Subdivision, ENPLAN, 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b. Other than a small pocket park 1.5 miles away (North Ridge Gardens Park), the nearest developed City park to the proposed site is Caldwell Park (3.5 miles away). Caldwell Park is a 70-acre community park located along the Sacramento River, providing a wide range of active and passive recreational opportunities. This park is intended to serve residents of Redding and would not be overburdened by the future residents of the proposed subdivision. In addition, the proposed subdivision will include public and private community 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 final map or parcel map, the subdivider shall either dedicate land or pay a fee in lieu thereof for park or recreational purposes according to the standards contained in Chapter 17 in the City's Subdivision Ordinance. 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 tentative map for The Reserve at Gold Hills proposes 13.4 acres of open space, including a public park, tree preservation area, private park/recreation area, and Dry Gulch Creek corridor. The Community Services Department has recommended that land dedication be required and that four usable acres of land be dedicated at the southeast corner of the property. When adjacent lands are proposed for development, additional park dedication may occur to allow for a Neighborhood Park of approximately 10 acres in size.

Documentation

- Natural Resources, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Recreation, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Public Facilities, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan, City of Redding, 2004
- Chapter 17.42, City of Redding Subdivision Ordinance, 2003

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVI. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, c. The project site is not designated as prime farmland in the City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element. The site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes, is not governed by the Williamson Act, and does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

Natural Resources, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion

- a.** As documented in the Initial Study, project implementation could result in disturbance of nesting migratory birds and permanent disturbance of jurisdictional waters and streams; possible disturbance of a unique plant community; possible disturbance of subsurface cultural resources; increased soil erosion and water quality degradation; and increased noise levels and air emissions. Design features incorporated into the project would avoid or reduce to insignificant levels certain potential environmental impacts, as would compliance with required agency permits. The remaining impacts can be reduced to levels that are less than significant through implementation of the mitigation measures presented in this Initial Study.
- b.** As discussed in Section V: Air Quality, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMM) and Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMM) will reduce potential impacts from this project to less than significant. As discussed in Section VI: Transportation/Circulation, traffic from the project will contribute to a cumulative degradation of the levels of service to the Oasis Road/I-5 interchange as well as the supporting State/local road network. Mitigation measures will reduce the potential cumulative impacts from this project to less than significant.
- c.** As discussed herein, the project does not have characteristics which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.