ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION S-6-06
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN PD-4-06
REZONING APPLICATION RZ-5-06
TRAVIATA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AND SUBDIVISION
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Traviata 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:** Linda Burke, (530) 225-4020

4. **Project Location:** 1375 Browning Street, Redding, Northeast corner of Browning Street and Old Alturas Road, Assessors Parcel Number 071-270-026

5. **Project Sponsor's Name:** Traviata Development, LLC

6. **General Plan Designation:** "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre"

7. **Zoning:** "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District, 12 units per acre

8. **Description of Project:** Subdivision of one 3.9-acre parcel into 34 parcels, rezoning to "PD" Planned Development Zone, and a Planned Development Application for 34 single-family homes with related parking, common areas, and facilities. All units are two-story detached single-family homes with two-car garages. The project includes private and common open spaces and walking trails. 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 will involve approximately 8,250 cubic yards of cut and fill, traffic improvements along the frontages of Browning Street and Old Alturas Road, and on-site stormwater detention.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The 3.9-acre site is located in Redding at the northeast corner of Browning Street and Old Alturas Road. The project site is currently vacant. The site is bordered by residential properties to the north, east, and south. Across Browning Street to the west is a major grocery store and a movie theater. The parcels to the north and northeast are developed with single-family residences and are zoned "RS-3.5" Residential Single Family District. The large parcel adjacent to the project site to the east is developed with a single-family residence and a barn and is zoned "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District, 12 units per acre. To the south across Old Alturas Road is a recently approved multiple-family residential development (SDP-35-03), currently under construction, zoned "RM-12" Residential Multiple Family District, 12 units per acre. The project area generally slopes downward to the south. Elevations vary between about 605 feet in the northeastern portion of the project area and about 568 in the southern portion of the site. The site is primarily vegetated with blue oak-gray pine woodland with an assortment of native and nonnative grasses. Approximately .5 acre of the site has slopes exceeding a 20 percent grade.

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.

- ❑ 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 and Service Systems
- ❑ Aesthetics
- ❑ Cultural Resources
- ❑ Recreation
- ❑ Agricultural Resources
- ❑ Mandatory Findings of Significance
- ❑ None After Mitigation Measures Incorporated

DETERMINATION. (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☒

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ❑

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ❑

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ❑

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. ❑

Signature

Date

Linda Burke
(Name)

Associate Planner
(Title)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

- **No Impact.** The development will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.

- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.

- **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.

- **Potentially Significant Impact**. The development will have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

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

List of attachments:

A. Location Map
B. Zoning Map
C. Proposed Zoning
D. Tentative Map
E. Planned Development
F. Grading and Drainage Plan

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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a. The project is a medium-density residential development providing a transition between lower-density residential uses and commercial uses. 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)?	❑	❑	☒	❑
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a, b, c. The project would provide 34 single-family residential homes consistent with the Redding General Plan. The proposed density of 14.2 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. The project would not induce unplanned population growth, and the proposed access and utilities are consistent with the General Plan.

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.	❑	❑	❑	☒
(2) Strong seismic ground-shaking?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(4) Landslides?	❑	❑	☒	❑
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒

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 proposed project designates all steep-slope (20 percent or greater) areas to be preserved, and a retaining wall will be placed at the base of the slope. The area to be developed 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 areas with slopes greater than 20 percent will be left undeveloped and a retaining wall will be placed at the base of the steep-slope area, 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 4,950 cubic yards of material to be cut and 3,300 cubic yards of material to be used for fill. Excess material must be hauled away to an approved site. Areas of undisturbed soils correspond to the location of preserved trees and slopes in excess of 20 percent. The project site contains one primary soil classification: Newtown Gravelly loam (NeD). The Newtown Gravelly loam classification represents soils of slow permeability and rapid runoff with high erosion hazards. The developed area of 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 Liquifaction 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., May 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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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)?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
h. Place within a 100-year flood-hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	❑	❑	❑	☒

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. Stormwater runoff from the project site generally drains from the northeast to the south and west toward underground drainage facilities in Browning Street and Old Alturas Road. This area is tributary to Churn Creek, located east of Victor Avenue. City of Redding Policy 1806 requires that the project include stormwater-detention facilities designed to maintain existing predevelopment rates of runoff during a 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm event with a 6-hour duration. Stormwater detention is proposed for this project via an on-site stormwater-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., May 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?	❑	❑	☒	❑

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (PM_{10}). 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 PM_{10}) that contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions; and (2) fugitive dust (particulate/PM_{10}) 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**	**PM_{10}**
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	3.99	4.43	4.34

These results indicate that the project would result in ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} emissions below the Level "A" threshold. Hence, application of SMMs is 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 May 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)?	❑	❑	☒	❑
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	❑	❑	☒	❑
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	❑	❑	❑	☒
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	❑	❑	❑	☒
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a, b, d. Access to the project would be via two driveways from Browning Street, which is a planned four-lane arterial street that currently operates at an adequate level of service. There is a signal scheduled to be installed at the intersection of Old Alturas Road and Browning Street (southwest corner of the project site). The traffic counts taken in 2003 showed an average daily traffic (ADT) of 3,604 trips on this portion of Browning Street . The General Plan Background Report identified a carrying capacity of 19,400 ADT on this portion of Browning Street between Old Alturas Road and Friendly Road. Traffic counts taken in 2005 showed an ADT of 11,624 trips on this portion of Old Alturas Road between Browning Street and Victor Avenue. The General Plan Background Report

identified a carrying capacity of 15,800 ADT on this portion of Old Alturas Road. Additional traffic (340 average daily trips based on 10 trips per unit at 34 units) would be generated with construction of the proposed 34 residential units. The additional trips would not be considered significant in relation to the capacity of the surrounding streets given the current traffic volumes for this portion of Browning Street or Old Alturas Road. 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 Browning Street and Old Alturas Road, 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 less than significant levels.

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 two private entrance roads off Browning Street. 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, the portion of Old Alturas Road adjacent to 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 three fixed routes on Old Alturas Road along the property frontage, connecting Old Alturas Road to the Mt. Shasta Mall, Downtown, Shasta and Simpson Colleges, and Enterprise Park. There are currently bus stops on Old Alturas Road and Bradford Way, approximately 450 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
City of Redding General Plan Background Report 1998

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a, b, c, d. Vegetation within the project vicinity consists of blue oak-gray pine woodland, with and assortment of native and introduced grasses. A majority of the project area appears to have been cleared over time, and the landscape has been modified extensively in the southern portion of the project area adjacent to Old Alturas Road and where a residence and associated outbuildings were built during the 1970s. No wetlands or sensitive species have been observed on the subject property, and impacts associated with these resources are anticipated to be less than significant. The site is not a part of any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

e. The City has adopted a Tree Management Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The project site has 62 trees (oak and pine), ranging in size from 6 to 30 inches in diameter located within the area of development. The applicant is proposing to retain 25 of the 62 existing trees. In addition, trees are located in areas of steep slopes. These will be retained as part of the aforementioned nondisturbed area. 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 common open-space areas. Preserved trees range in size from 8–30 inches in diameter. Section 18.45.120 of the Tree Management 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. This will result in the planting of approximately 136 trees to offset the loss of the 37 trees to be removed. The project is compatible with the applicable polices and regulations of the City of Redding Tree Management 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 Management Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code)
Tree Preservation Plan, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., May 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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

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

Documentation

City of Redding Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒

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 is urban and 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?	❑	❑	☒	❑
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❑	❑	☒	❑
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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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 Noise Element of the Redding General Plan establishes exterior and interior noise thresholds in residential areas of 60dB and 45 dB Ldn/CNEL, respectively. An Environmental Noise Analysis of the project site was conducted in January 2006 by J.C. Brennan & Associates. Future traffic noise levels at the project site were predicted for the nearest backyards to both Browning Street and Old Alturas Road. The backyards nearest to Browning Street and Old Alturas Road would be subject to noise levels up to 60 dB Ldn and 63 dB Ldn respectively.

Standard residential construction results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of 25 dB with windows closed and approximately 15 dB with windows open. Based upon a 25 dB exterior to interior building-facade noise reduction provided by standard residential construction, future interior traffic noise levels would comply with an interior noise-level criterion of 45 dB Ldn.

The predicted exterior traffic noise levels for areas located nearest to Browning Street is 60 dB Ldn, which would comply with the City of Redding exterior noise level of 60 dB Ldn. The predicted exterior traffic noise levels within the backyards of the six residences located nearest to Old Alturas Road is 63 dB Ldn. The Environmental Noise Barrier Analysis concludes that construction of a 6-foot solid noise barrier would result in a 57 dB Ldn future traffic noise level, thus exceeding the City of Redding's 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level criterion. With the installation of a six-foot-high solid block or masonry wall, which is a standard condition of developing lots along an arterial street, traffic noise would be attenuated to an acceptable level; therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant.

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

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

Environmental Noise Analysis, Browning Street Residential, J.C. Brennan & Associates, Inc., January 19, 2006

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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(2) Police protection?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(3) Schools?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(4) Parks?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(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 XV (Recreation) below.

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

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, stormwater 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. Stormwater runoff collected from the project would be detained on-site in an underground system and then discharged into existing storm-drain improvements in Browning Street. 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.

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., May 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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	❑	❑	☒	❑
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	❑	❑	☒	❑
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	❑	❑	☒	❑

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. The noise attenuation structure along Old Alturas Road would be set back from the sidewalk and be located at the top of the slope above a retaining wall and landscaped slope.

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

Discussion

a, b, c, d. A cultural resources inventory survey of the project site was completed by ENPLAN in January 2006 in accordance with accepted professional archaeological standards and in compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, acts, and regulations relating to cultural resources. Archival research was conducted and consultation provided with interested historical/prehistorical groups. The entire project area was subjected to an intensive pedestrian-level survey. No cultural resources were identified within the project area as a result of work conducted by ENPLAN. No impacts are anticipated.

Documentation

Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, ENPLAN, January 2006

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

The proposed residential project allows for common usable open space, an on-site walking trail for use by residents, a small park area with a picnic table and barbeque area, and a play structure. The closest neighborhood park in the vicinity of this project is Bobwhite Park in the Quail Ridge neighborhood, approximately ¾ 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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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 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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
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)?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	❑	❑	☒	❑

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.

RFPEIR\S606-PD406-RZ506-Traviata-LB-IS.wpd