

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**SUBDIVISION APPLICATION S-25-05
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN PD-13-05
REZONING APPLICATION RZ-12-05
LA QUERCIAS SUBDIVISION AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** La Quercias Planned Development and 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:** Lily Toy, Senior Planner, (530) 225-4020
4. **Project Location:** 1630, 1642 and 1644 Dana Drive, 1279 Old Alturas Road
5. **Project Sponsor's Name:** Corpac Development, Inc.
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre"
7. **Zoning:** "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District
8. **Description of Project:** The project applicant is requesting a subdivision of three parcels totaling 2.2 acres into 28 parcels and a Planned Development Application for 28 townhouses with related parking, common areas, and facilities. All units are three-bedroom and two stories with two-car garages. The project includes a common area. The site is zoned "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District, 12 units per acre, with a General Plan designation of "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre." The project applicant is requesting a rezone of the property to include a "Planned Development" overlay. The project will involve approximately 7,900 cubic yards of cut and fill. The project will involve removal of three existing residences and traffic improvements along the frontage of Dana Drive. Utility improvements within an off-site easement extending to Victor Avenue are also anticipated.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The 2.2-acre site fronts the north side of Dana Drive east of the Dana Drive commercial district. The site is surrounded by residential properties. The parcels to the north are developed with single-family residences. Along the west property boundary are existing multiple-family units. A duplex development is also currently under construction (Old Alturas Park). Property to the east is vacant except for one residence fronting Dana Drive. All parcels adjacent to the project site and north of Dana Drive are zoned "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District. Parcels south of the project site and on the opposite side of Dana Drive are zoned "RM-15" Residential Multiple Family District and are developed with multiple-family residences. The project site currently has three single-family residences. The elevation of the site ranges from 569 feet above mean sea level to 590 feet above mean sea level, sloping downward west to east. The site is primarily vegetated with nonnative grasses and weedy species, with approximately 21 blue and live oak trees. There are no wetlands, significant wildlife habitats, or slopes exceeding 20 percent.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

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

Lily Toy
(Name)

Senior Planner
(Title)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 surrounded by existing residential development and vacant residentially designated property. The project does not have the potential to physically divide the community.
- b. The project as proposed with a Planned Development District is compatible with the applicable polices and regulations of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
- 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 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 provide 28 single-family residential homes consistent with the Redding General Plan. The proposed density of 12.72 units per acre is consistent with the General Plan designation of "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" and the present zoning of "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District (a maximum of 31 units could be developed under this zoning—28 are proposed). The project would not induce unplanned population growth, and the proposed minor access road and utilities are consistent with the General Plan. Although the project entails removing 3 existing residences, construction of the proposed 28 new residences will result in a net increase of 25 housing units.

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposal:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure, or landslides.

(1)—(3) The project site is located in Redding, which is in Shasta County. The project site lies within Seismic Zone 3, which represents an area of moderate seismic risk. No active faults transverse the site. The project site is considered to have low seismic activity relative to other areas in California with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure, and liquefaction. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated in association with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic-related ground failure.

(4) The project site has mild to moderate slopes (less than 20 percent) and is not located on or near any documented landslide hazard areas. There is no evidence of ground slippage or subsidence occurring naturally on the site. Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. Since there are no slopes on or adjacent to the site steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project, impacts associated with landslides are considered less than significant.

b, c, d. Site grading and utility excavation work will be necessary to support the project. Preliminary grading information supplied by the project engineer indicates 4,500 cubic yards of material to be cut and 3,400 cubic yards of material to be used for fill. Areas of undisturbed soils correspond to the location of preserved trees. The project site contains two primary soil classifications: Red Bluff loam (RbA) over the western half of the property; and Newtown Gravelly loam (NeD) over the eastern half of the property. The Red Bluff loam classification indicates moderately slow permeability and well-drained soils with very slow runoff and none-to-slight erosion hazard. The Newtown Gravelly loam classification represents soils of slow permeability and rapid runoff with high erosion hazards. The project site is proposed to be leveled with grading, thus reducing the potential for severe erosion. Development of the site is not anticipated to result in significant erosion potential. Prior to commencement of grading or construction on the site, a grading permit is required. Standard erosion-control measures from existing City and State regulations will be applied during development to reduce any potential impacts. These standard requirements include:

- ▶ *City of Redding Grading Ordinance.* This ordinance requires the application of "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (Redding Municipal Code Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, E). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the improvement plans/grading plan and are tailored to project-specific soils and grading impacts.

- ▶ *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Construction Activity Storm Water Permit."* This permit somewhat overlaps the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion-control measures during construction of the project.
- ▶ *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)."* This plan emphasizes stormwater 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 stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.

Given the site's characteristics, application of standard requirements and best management practices mandated by these grading-related processes would be adequate to ensure that construction activities would not result in substantial soil erosion and associated impacts off-site. Therefore, application of special project mitigation related to grading is not necessary.

e. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal; therefore, no impact to soils relative to supporting use of septic tanks would occur.

Documentation

- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12)
- City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element; Figures 4-1 (Ground Shaking Potential) and 4-2 Liquefaction Potential, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, issued August 1974, by U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., February 2006

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 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 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"/>

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

- 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?
- j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

a, f. Since the residential units 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.

b. The project would utilize City water service (a surface-water source) for domestic uses and fire protection. The proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies.

d, e. City of Redding Policy 1806 requires that the project 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. Storm-water-detention is proposed for this project via an on-site storm-water-detention pipe which is subject to City approval.

g, h, i. There is no identified 100-year floodplain associated with the project site; therefore, there are no risks associated with potential flooding.

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, FIS and FIRM map 060360 0025D, dated March 2, 1998
- City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance
- City of Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element; Figures 4-3 (100-Year Floodplain) and 4-5 Inundation Area for Shasta Dam Failure
- Preliminary grading map, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., February 2006

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?
- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- 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)?
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

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, a Statement of Overriding Considerations 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.

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 NOx, ROG, and PM₁₀) that contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions; and (2) fugitive dust (particulate/PM₁₀) emissions are possible during construction activities. As a residential development, a project does not have the potential to generate significant emission concentrations of other pollutants subject to State and Federal ambient air quality standards.

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

	ROG	NOx	PM₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	3.07	3.36	3.39

These results indicate that the project would result in ROG, NOx, and PM₁₀ emissions below the Level "A" threshold. Hence, application of SMMs are required in order to strive toward the General Plan policy of a 20 percent reduction in emissions to address small-scale cumulative effects. SMMs applicable to this project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction and are identified below. These measures, as listed below, are incorporated into the project as standard conditions and would thus not result in significant impacts to air quality.

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 the 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 be prohibited. Cleared vegetation shall be treated by legal means other than open burning, such as chipping, shredding, or grinding. Such methods shall be noted on improvement plans. At no time shall open burning of materials generated by this project occur at another site.

d. Through application of the SMM discussed above, potential impacts to neighboring homes (sensitive receptors) from fugitive dust caused during construction will be less than significant.

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 2002 for Windows, report prepared March 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, d. Access to the project would be from Dana Drive, which is a four-lane urban collector that currently operates at an adequate level of service. There are signals at the intersections of Dana Drive and Victor Avenue to the east and Dana Drive and Bradford Way to the west. The traffic counts taken in 1999 showed an average daily traffic of 7,102 trips on this portion of Dana Drive. The General Plan Background Report identified a carrying capacity of 15,800 ADT on this portion of Dana Drive located east of Bradford Way and west of Victor Avenue in 1998. Additional traffic (203 average daily trips based on 7.25 trips per unit at 28 units) would be generated with construction of the proposed 28 residential units. The additional trips would not be considered significant in relation to the capacity of the surrounding streets or the current traffic volumes for this portion of Dana Drive. The project is also consistent with the General Plan designation of "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" as assumed for the Transportation Element of the General Plan. It is not expected that the project would adversely affect roadways under State jurisdiction. Although traffic impacts are individually limited, they are cumulatively significant when considered with all future growth. Traffic impact fees are collected by the City at the time of development to offset any cumulative impacts to regional roadways. Road improvements are accomplished as abutting properties are developed.

The project conditions will include provisions for frontage improvements to Dana Drive, including any necessary pavement widening, curb, gutter, sidewalk, striping, and widening for a turn lane. With these improvements, any potential impacts to circulation or street safety risks would be reduced to a level less than significant.

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

e. Access to the site is provided by way of a private entrance road from Dana Drive. Adequate access for fire protection and fire hydrants will be provided on-site in accordance with the requirements of the Fire Marshal.

f. The project has been designed to provide vehicle parking in compliance with the City’s parking standards; therefore, there are no impacts with respect to parking.

g. In 2003, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Bikeway Plan in compliance with the California Bicycle Transportation Act in order to be eligible for funding for bikeway improvements. When the Bikeway Plan was prepared, this portion of Dana Drive was not designated as a bicycle route; however, Victor Avenue, which is approximately 400 feet from the project site, was identified as a planned Class II bicycle route. Class II bicycle routes include striped and signed lanes within the road right-of-way, designated specifically for one-way bicycle use. The project is consistent with the Bikeway Plan.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) currently operates one fixed route on Dana Drive along the property frontage, connecting Victor Avenue to the Mt. Shasta Mall, downtown, and Enterprise Park (Route 6). On this route, there is currently a bus stop on Victor Avenue at Dana Drive, approximately 425 feet to the west. An additional bus turnout or bus stop is not required as a part of this project proposal.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding Bikeway Plan, December 2003
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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, c, d. A wetland biologist has evaluated the site, and through the on-site investigation, it was determined that no wetlands or sensitive species exist on the subject property. Therefore, there will be no impact of wetlands or sensitive species. The site is not a part of any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

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 project site has 21 oaks (blue and live oaks), ranging in size from 6 to 26 inches in diameter. The applicant is proposing to retain 9 of the 21 existing trees. The City’s ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development considerations. Residential projects at the densities proposed for this project require significant grading for buildings and related facilities. Tree preservation in this case is occurring in two clusters, as well as several single trees located at the rear of proposed lots. Preserved trees range in size from 10 to 24 inches in diameter. Section 18.65.160 of the Tree Preservation Ordinance requires tree planting upon construction of residential development at a ratio of one 15-gallon tree for every 500 square feet of enclosed gross living area. The project is compatible with the applicable polices and regulations of the City of Redding Tree Preservation Ordinance; therefore, there is no significant impact.

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

Documentation

- Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code)
- Biological survey notes by North State Resources, dated December 21, 2005
- Tentative Tree Preservation Plan prepared by McEntire Landscaping, Inc., dated February 16, 2006

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"/> |

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

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

e, f. The project is located outside the established approach/departure clear zones for Redding Municipal Airport. The project's land use would not conflict with operations of the Airport or present a safety hazard to people residing in the residential units. 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 does not have a wildland fire-hazard potential. The site has been disturbed in the past and is surrounded primarily by developed residential and commercial property.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10, Health and Safety, 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b, c. The establishment of single-family residential units at this site is not anticipated to cause noise levels to exceed General Plan standards.

The Noise Element of the Redding General Plan establishes exterior and interior noise thresholds in residential areas of 60dB and 45 dB Ldn/CNEL, respectively (Table 5-4). The predominant noise source in the vicinity is Dana Drive, an existing four-lane arterial located along the frontage of the project site. Table 5-2 of the Noise Element presents projected noise contours from the major road segments in the City. This table indicates that the projected 60 dB noise contour will extend approximately 98 feet from the centerline of Dana Drive, which will impact the most southerly portion of the project site. Since the Building Code requires construction techniques to achieve the interior noise level criterion of 45 dB L_{dn}, no additional mitigation is required.

d. During the construction of the project, 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 site is not located within any of the noise contours of Redding Municipal Airport or Benton Airpark. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site.

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"/> |

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

(5) Other public facilities?

Discussion

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

a (3). The project is located in the Enterprise Elementary School District and Shasta Union High School District and may 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 residential unit to address school-facility funding necessitated by the effects of growth citywide.

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

a (5). See discussion under Item 12 (Utilities and Service Systems) below.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a. Wastewater generated from the project would be that associated with medium-density domestic use discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. This type and intensity of land use activity does not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed land use was also anticipated under the City's General Plan.

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, storm-water detention must be designed to maintain existing predevelopment rates of runoff during a 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm event with a 6-hour duration. Storm-water runoff collected from the project would be detained on-site in an underground system and then discharged into existing storm-drain improvements in Victor Avenue via a public-utilities easement on the eastern boundary of the project site. No additional storm-drainage facilities are anticipated.

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. The project includes construction of a sewer line through a public facilities easement running from the eastern property boundary to existing services at Victor Avenue.

f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal (on-site trash enclosures) service, which the residents 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
 Grading and Drainage Plan, prepared by Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., February 2006

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

Discussion

a, c. There are no documented scenic vistas in this area. The proposed residential buildings 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. Also, see Section VII (e) regarding tree preservation.

d. Use of the residential units to be constructed would generate light that is customary for residential neighborhoods. The project alone would not generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from the lighting of homes and property for domestic activities and streetlighting. There would not be an adverse effect on daytime 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"/> |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a, b, c, d. There is no evidence of, or no known, historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources on the property, nor is the property in an area of potential resource sensitivity. The majority of the 2.2 acre site has been previously disturbed. No impacts in this area are anticipated.

Documentation

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

Discussion

The proposed residential project allows for common usable open space and a public walkway for the use by residents. The closest neighborhood park in the vicinity of this project is Bobwhite Park in the Quail Ridge neighborhood, approximately ¼ mile to the northwest. Residents do have the potential to utilize other parks within the City outside the vicinity of the project. Recreational development fees are collected by the City at the time of issuance of a building permit to offset any impacts to regional park facilities and to raise funds to provide for new recreational facilities.

Project impacts associated with recreation would be less than significant.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources, Recreation, and Public Facilities Elements, 2000
 City of Redding Parks Trails and Open Space Master Plan, 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 has not been historically used for agricultural purposes nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.4: Agricultural Lands
 Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, and Forest Service, August 1974.

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion

a. The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce or degrade wildlife habitat, or eliminate examples of history or prehistory.

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

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