

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-20-05

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-20-05, Oak Mesa Heights Subdivision
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Andre' H. Benoist, Assistant Planner, (530) 225-4020
4. **Project Location:** 1870 Oak Mesa Lane, AP No. 077-290-005 (see attached location map)
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** CRB Properties, LLC, 6806 Fallsbrook Court, Suite 2, Granite Bay, CA 95746
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 2 to 3.5 units per acre"
7. **Zoning:** "RS-3" Residential Single Family, 3 units per acre
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is requesting approval of a tentative subdivision map to divide 5.3 acres into 14 lots for the development of single-family homes. The site is currently occupied by a single-family residence with a detached accessory building and livestock. The site is well covered with a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and native and nonnative grasses. The proposed subdivision will create lots that range in size from 9,100 to 28,500 square feet. The project includes the southern extension of Oak Mesa Lane and a new cul-de-sac street, as well as water, sewer, utility, and storm-drain improvements necessary to serve the lots.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The subject property is located on the east side of the city. The surrounding area to the north and south has been developed with medium-density single-family residential subdivisions. Property to the east is proposed to be subdivided into 14 lots for the construction of single-family homes by tentative map application S-11-05 (Gregory Subdivision). The west side of the parcel is adjacent to Churn Creek and one large nine-acre parcel that contains a single-family home. The west side of Churn Creek has commercial lots zoned "HC" Heavy Commercial that are developed with a mix of commercial and light industrial uses.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** The project must obtain a Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

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

January 17, 2006

Date

Andre' H. Benoist

(Name)

Assistant Planner

(Title)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

List of attachments:

- A. Location map
- B. Tentative Map

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"/> |

Discussion

- a.** The project site is in an area predominantly developed with single-family homes on lots ranging in size from one-quarter acre to nine acres in size. The proposed subdivision will be in character with existing adjacent parcels designated for similar residential development on the City's General Plan. The project does not have the potential to physically divide the community.
- b.** The proposed subdivision does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning applicable to the property.
- c.** There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the site.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Community Development and Design Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
 City of Redding Zoning Ordinance

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, c. The project would create opportunity for the construction of 14 new homes as planned and anticipated by the Redding General Plan. The project is similar in character to development in the surrounding area. The project would not induce unplanned population growth and does not propose the extension of any new roads or utilities not anticipated by the General Plan. The project does not displace substantial numbers of people or substantial numbers of existing housing.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Housing Element, 2000
 City of Redding Transportation Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, c, f. Since future homes in the subdivision would be served by City sanitary sewer service, the project would not involve any permitted discharges of waste material into ground or surface waters. Application of the regulations identified in Section III reduce the potential for water quality impacts to less than significant. There are no watercourses affected by this project.

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

d, e. 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. This project proposes an underground detention system, where storm water will be collected and stored in two large underground pipes before it is released into Churn Creek. All storm water will be directed to the underground detention system which is designed to meet City standards for storm-water detention/retention. This proposal is under consideration by the City Engineer; the ultimate detention facility design will conform to Policy 1806.

g, h, i. The floodplain of Churn Creek crosses the southwest tip of the subject property. The area determined to be affected by the 100-year floodplain is approximately 528 square feet. From the edge of the floodplain at the 530-foot elevation, the property is steeply sloped uphill for about 75 feet. The floodplain and steep-slope area will be set aside as an open space, nondisturbance easement. The

area proposed for development is at the 570- to 582-foot elevation, which is approximately 40 to 50 feet above the elevation of the 100-year floodplain and set back approximately 130 feet or more from the edge of the floodplain. The remaining 5.29 acres of the property are located in "Zone X," described as areas located outside the 500-year floodplain, as identified on FEMA panel number 060360 0020 D, dated March 2, 1998.

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

Documentation

Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain Regulations, FIRM map 060360 0020 D dated March 2, 1998.
 City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c. Shasta County, including the far northern Sacramento Valley, currently exceeds the State's ambient standards for ozone (smog) and particulates (fine, airborne particles). Consequently, these pollutants are the focus of local air quality policy, especially when related to land use and transportation planning. Even with application of measures to reduce emissions for individual projects, cumulative impacts are unavoidable when ozone and/or particulate emissions are involved. For example, the primary source of emissions contributing to ozone is from vehicles. Any project that generates vehicle trips has the potential of contributing incrementally to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan acknowledged this dilemma; and as a result, Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were adopted by the City Council for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan.

Emission-reduction goals of 20 to 25 percent are established depending on the projected level of unmitigated emissions for a project. Mitigation thresholds are established for the important regional/local pollutants, including: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), which are ozone precursors, and Inhalable Particulate Matter, 10 Micron (PM₁₀). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

Level "A"	Level "B"
25 pounds per day of NOx	137 pounds per day of NOx
25 pounds per day of ROG	137 pounds per day of ROG
80 pounds per day of PM ₁₀	137 pounds per day of PM ₁₀

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

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

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

	ROG	NO_x	PM₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	1.60	1.78	1.82

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

1. Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
2. All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.
3. Temporary traffic control shall be provided as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
4. Construction activities that could affect traffic flow shall be scheduled in off-peak hours.
5. Active construction areas, haul roads, etc., shall be watered at least twice daily or more as needed to limit dust.
6. Exposed stockpiles of soil and other backfill material shall either be covered, watered, or have soil binders added to inhibit dust and wind erosion.
7. All trucks hauling soil and other loose material shall be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
8. All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads. Wheel washers shall be used where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or trucks and any equipment shall be washed off leaving the site with each trip.
9. Open burning of cleared vegetation shall only occur during designated "burn periods" and with a burn permit from the Redding Fire Department.

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

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

Documentation

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures

City of Redding, General Plan, Air Quality Element, 2000

City of Redding, General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8.6, Air Quality, 2000

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the City of Redding, General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, as adopted by the Redding City Council on October 3, 2000 by Resolution 2000-166

City of Redding, General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.7, Natural Resources and Air Quality, 1998

Project Calculations of Unmitigated Operational Emissions using URBEMIS 7G for Windows, V.5.1.0, report prepared January 10, 2006

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> |
| h. Other transportation or circulation issues? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b. The proposed subdivision will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Oak Mesa Lane is a local street which serves several subdivisions consisting of approximately 172 homes. An increase of 14 new homes will not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips on Oak Mesa Lane. Furthermore, the tentative map will not exceed a level-of-service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Oak Mesa Lane is planned to eventually extend to Tarmac Road, creating a link between Old Alturas Road and Shasta View Drive. Traffic calming is being consistent on Oak Mesa Lane in anticipation of this work.

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

d. The subdivision does not include any unsafe design features. There are no sharp curves proposed for the extension of Oak Mesa Lane. Vehicle speed on the proposed streets is limited to 25 miles per hour (mph). The proposed streets (Bayberry Lane and Scarlet Court) and street extensions (Oak Mesa Lane) will meet or exceed City standards for safety and design. None of the streets share their use with agricultural, industrial, or other incompatible uses.

e. The proposed tentative map will not result in a situation that poses inadequate emergency access. All streets meet or exceed the Fire Department standards for emergency access and turnaround.

f. The proposed development is for single-family residential construction and will not exceed the available parking capacity. The City requires each house to provide two covered parking spaces on-site.

g. In 1998, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Bikeway Plan in compliance with the California Bicycle Transportation Act and in order to be eligible for funding for bikeway improvements. The project does not conflict with this plan.

h. There are no other transportation or circulation issues associated with this project.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Transportation and Circulation, 1998
- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding Bikeway Plan, December 1998
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b. The project area is adjacent to Churn Creek, but does not contain water or riparian vegetation associated with the creek. The site is currently occupied by a single-family residence and an approximate 700-square-foot detached shed. The entire site is enclosed with wire fence and is grazed by livestock (horses). A field review by City staff concluded that the project area does not contain significant riparian or other sensitive habitat that could support special status species. The application for the tentative map included a biological survey prepared by Gallaway Consulting Inc., in August 2005. The conclusions of the survey confirm the finding that the site does not contain Federal- or State-endangered, threatened, or sensitive species.

c. The biological assessment prepared for this subdivision states that the project site does not contain any wetlands or other "Waters of the United States" that would require additional permitting from the Army Corps of Engineers.

d. The biological assessment prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc., recognizes suitable nesting habitat for several raptor species. As a standard condition of the tentative map, the City will require a raptor survey prior to commencement of subdivision improvements. The survey must be conducted during the months that raptors are found to nest in this area, which is during the months of March and July. If nesting raptors are observed, the California Department of Fish and Game will be notified and will then be responsible for overseeing the appropriate buffers required for the nesting birds.

e. The City has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.65 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development consideration. Section 18.65.160 of the Tree Preservation Ordinance requires tree planting upon construction of homes on the lots within the subdivision at a ratio of one tree per 500 square feet of enclosed living area.

The site contains approximately 154 trees with a diameter of 6 inches or larger at breast height (dbh). All but 12 of the trees are either oak or grey pine. The remaining trees are a mix of mimosa, fir, and juniper trees. The tree plan identifies approximately 21 trees that will be removed as a result of right-of-way improvements (8 oak trees, 13 pine trees) and 19 trees that will be removed for the placement of fill on 4 contiguous lots (11 oak and 8 pine). Approximately 27 grey pines in the central areas of many of the proposed

lots will be selectively removed due to their propensity to damage property with falling pine cones or the entire tree falling over during storm activity. The remaining trees (approximately 88 trees, or 57 percent of the original amount of trees) will be left until the lots are developed with residences, at which time the home builder will remove the trees necessary to construct the residence.

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

Documentation

- Redding Municipal Code, Tree Preservation Ordinance
- Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000
- Biological Assessment prepared by Gallaway Consulting, Inc August 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

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

Documentation

- City of Redding Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c, d. The nature of the project as a low-density, 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 outside the influence area of Benton Airpark and the Redding Municipal Airport. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity.

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

h. The project site has a relatively low potential as a wildland-fire-hazard due to the level terrain and surrounding residential development to the north. The project site is situated between Churn Creek on the west side and Oak Mesa Lane on the east side. Land to the south is sparsely developed, with 3 homes on 15 acres, and then transitions into a subdivision with standard lot sizes.

The City Fire Marshal has reviewed the tentative map and recommended specific fire-safety requirements to be incorporated into the tentative map approval. These requirements are typical development standards and practices in the City of Redding and are delineated in the Fire Marshal's January 5, 2006, memo to the tentative map application file. The fire-safety improvements incorporated into the project development include residential sprinkler systems, fire hydrants within 250 feet of proposed homes, and a Fire Department-approved turnaround (cul-de-sac) at the end of Scarlet Court.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10, Health and Safety, 1998
- Memo dated January 5, 2006, from Bruce Becker, Redding Deputy Chief/Fire Marshal

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- 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?

Discussion

a. The project will not subject people to noise exceeding the thresholds in the General Plan and Zoning Code. State Route 44 is visible from the southwest portions of the property and can be heard as part of the ambient background noise from that portion of the parcel, even though the highway is nearly 1,000 feet away. The City's extension noise level standard for residential property is 55 dB CNEL. The Noise Element of the City's General Plan identifies this section of SR 44 as producing traffic noise at the 65 dB level out to 134 feet from the centerline of the highway and at 60 dB out to 289 feet from the centerline. Based upon these figures, the property is well within the City's residential noise standards.

b. The subdivision will not subject people to groundborne vibration or noise sources.

c. This project will not permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The new homes will contribute to the ambient noise levels from the sounds generated from additional vehicles and residential activities that may take place in outdoor spaces within the subdivision. However, these noises are compatible with the surrounding area in terms of frequency, volume, noise type, and duration.

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 located outside the influence area of the Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Noise Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.

a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

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

Discussion

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

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

a (4). The project will not overburden existing community parks. See discussion under Item 15 (Recreation) below.

a (5). The project will not affect other public facilities.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element, 2000

City of Redding Subdivision Ordinance

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a. Wastewater generated from the project would be that associated with low-density domestic use (from single-family homes) discharged into the City's sanitary sewer system. This type and intensity of land use activity does not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

c. As discussed under Section IV, Hydrology and Water Quality, this project would not result in the construction of off-site storm-water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The subdivision design includes a detention basin to help mitigate storm-water runoff in the event of flooding. Standard subdivision improvements, such as curbs and gutters, will direct surface-water runoff into the detention area.

d. Potable water is available from the City to serve the project, with adequate pressure for domestic use and flows for fire suppression. The demands of the project can be accommodated within the City's existing water 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.

f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up) service, which homes in the subdivision would utilize. Adequate capacity is available to serve the needs of the project without need of special accommodation. The City regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials from households, including those created by the project.

Documentation

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

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.

d. Use of homes constructed in the subdivision would generate light that is customary for single-family residential neighborhoods. The project alone would not generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from the lighting of homes and property for domestic activities and street lighting. There would not be an adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

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

Discussion

a, b, c, d. An archaeological survey was conducted by Peter M. Jensen on May 9, 2005. A complete records survey and a field survey of the site were performed. The results of the survey concluded that there are no historic, prehistoric, or culturally sensitive resources occurring in or potentially affected by the proposed project. No impacts in this area are anticipated.

Documentation

Archaeological Survey, Peter M. Jensen, May 9, 2005.

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Discussion

a, b. Chapter 17.42 of the City's Subdivision Ordinance, *Park and Recreational Land Dedications and In-Lieu Fees*, requires that as a condition of approval of a tentative map, a subdivider shall either dedicate land or pay a fee in lieu thereof for park or recreational purposes. In accordance with State subdivision law, only projects containing 50 or more lots may be *required* to dedicate land for park development. Additional recreational development fees are collected by the City at the time of issuance of a building permit on an individual lot. Based upon the 50-lot threshold, it is anticipated that this project will contribute in-lieu park fees. In accordance with General Plan policy, public access from the public street to the Churn Creek open space is being considered as part of the project.

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

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVI. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?
- 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?

Discussion

a, b, c. The project site has not been used for agricultural production purposes in recent times nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.4: Agricultural Lands

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish, wildlife, or plant species. There are no aspects of the project which could reduce or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. This project will not pose any threat to important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. As discussed in Section V, the project will contribute to region wide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMM) will reduce potential impacts from this project to a level less than significant. There are no other aspects of this project that would contribute incrementally to an effect that would be considered "cumulatively considerable."

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

1-17-06
RFPEIR\S2005-OakMesaEst-AB-IS.wpd