

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION
SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION SDP-14-05
PARCEL MAP APPLICATION PM-13-05**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Site Development Permit Application SDP-14-05 and Parcel map Application PM-13-05
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Linda Burke, (530) 225-4020
4. **Project Location:** 3094 Crossroads Drive, Assessor's Parcel Number 110-270-018
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Steve Schade, 2520 Hartnell Avenue, Redding, CA 96002
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Heavy Commercial"
7. **Zoning:** "HC" Heavy Commercial
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is requesting a parcel map application to divide approximately 3.7 acres into 4 commercial parcels. A site development permit is also requested for development of 3 of the 4 parcels with commercial warehouse buildings to be used for auto repair and related uses; contractor's office; and/or shop buildings, consisting of a total of 25,335 square feet of building area.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The site is approximately 3.7 acres in size and has previously been graded with development of this small industrial park created by Parcel Map LS-7-87. A drainage runs parallel to the fence line adjacent to State Highway 44, bordering the property to the south, then flows under the highway, eventually tributary to Stillwater Creek. Vegetation on-site includes scattered willow and cottonwood trees and natural grasses along the drainage; however, the rest of the site is mostly devoid of vegetation. The remainder of the lots on this cul-de-sac street have been developed with commercial warehouse and storage-type uses or are vacant. The multiple-family residential project, Stillwater Heights, is located adjacent to the west boundary of the project site.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** The project will most likely require a permit from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for loss of waters of the United States contained in the area of the drainage along the State highway as well as a 1600 permit from the California Department of Fish and Game. A Caltrans encroachment permit may also be required for any work done within the State right-of-way. The project will be required to obtain a Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION. (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Signature

May 2, 2006
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. Site plan
- C. Parcel map

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

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have social or economic impacts resulting in a physical deterioration of the environment (economic blight)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- a. The project site is surrounded by existing heavy commercial and industrial warehouse-type development. The project does not have the potential to physically divide the community.
- b. Under the City's Zoning Ordinance, the project site is zoned "HC" Heavy Commercial and is designated "Heavy Commercial" on the Redding General Plan. The project 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 Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
 City of Redding Natural Resources Element

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, c. The project is a commercial project but would not induce substantial population growth. It does not propose the extension of any new roads or utilities not anticipated by the General Plan. The project does not displace substantial numbers of people or substantial numbers of existing housing.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Housing Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposal:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Strong seismic ground-shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, c, d. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Faults designated in the Redding area of Shasta County. There are no other documented earthquake faults in the vicinity that pose a significant risk, and the site is located in an area designated in the Health and Safety Element of the General Plan as having a low ground-shaking potential. The project is not located on or near any documented landslide hazard areas, and there is no evidence of ground slippage or subsidence occurring naturally on the site. The type of soils and underlying geology is identified as having no potential for liquefaction. No portion of the site falls within the 100-year floodplain of the Sacramento River or any creek.

b. The project site contains two soil classifications, Redding-Red Bluff Gravelly Loam (ReB) and Red Bluff Gravelly Loam (RcB). These soils are characterized by slopes of 0 to 3 percent and are moderately well-drained with very slow permeability. Runoff is slow to medium, and the hazard of erosion is slight to moderate with these soils. Construction of the project will involve removal of an existing stockpile of dirt in the southeastern portion of the site and a minor amount of grading, including work in the existing drainage along the highway, in order to detain storm waters and help drain the project more efficiently. However, the site is relatively flat and the potential for erosion would not be considered a significant impact. The project would, however, be subject to certain erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations in order to reduce the potential for erosion. These requirements will be incorporated into the project and include:

- ▶ *City of Redding Grading Ordinance.* This ordinance requires the application of "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (Redding Municipal Code Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, E). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final subdivision grading plan and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts.
- ▶ *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Construction Activity Storm Water Permit."* This permit somewhat overlaps the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion-control measures during construction of the project.
- ▶ *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)."* This plan emphasizes storm water best management practices and is required as part of the Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that affect the quality of storm water discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in storm water discharges. This Plan is especially pertinent to any potential erosion that could affect the drainages leading to Stillwater Creek and eventually the Sacramento River.

- ▶ *California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) "1600 Agreement."* This notification is required for any work within a defined streambed.
- e. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal.

Documentation

City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
 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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, c, f. Since the proposed buildings would be served by City sanitary sewer service, the project would not involve any permitted discharges of waste material into ground or surface waters. However, with development of the site, there is the risk that construction activities could contribute silt and sediment into Stillwater Creek by way of the drainage that parallels the fence along the State highway; however, with standard measures incorporated into the project as identified under Section III above, potential water quality impacts would be less than significant.

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

d, e. Storm-water runoff from the project site drains toward a drainage that runs parallel to the State highway. This drainage accepts water from three storm-drain pipes—one centrally located 24-inch pipe which drains Crossroads Drive and accepts overland storm-water runoff from the parcel to the northwest in an existing concrete valley gutter, another 24-inch storm-drain pipe that cuts across the

southeasterly portion from a system to the north, and storm water from an existing storm-drain pipe on the multiple-family property to the south. Three underground culverts are located within the State Highway right-of-way and convey water from the drainage ditch and the storm-drain pipes under the highway and are eventually tributary to Stillwater Creek farther downstream. Construction of the project will include drainage improvements for more efficient flow to the highway culverts. The existing ditch is proposed to be cleaned, graded, and utilized for on-site detention of storm waters in order to maintain existing predevelopment rates of runoff during a 10-, 25-, and 100-year-storm event downstream of the project. These improvements may include a minor loss of jurisdictional waters for which a 404 Permit from the Army Corps of Engineers may be required. A Caltrans encroachment permit may also be necessary for improvements within the State right-of-way.

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

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

Documentation

Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations, FIRM map 060360-0020D, dated 3/2/98
 City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

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

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

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

If a project has unmitigated emissions less than the Level "A" threshold, then it is viewed as a minor project (from an air quality perspective) and only application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) is required to try to achieve at least a 20 percent reduction in emissions, or the best reduction feasible otherwise. Land uses that generate unmitigated emissions above Level "A" require application of appropriate Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMMs), in addition to the SMMs, in order to achieve a net emission reduction of 20 percent or more. If, after applying SMMs and BAMMs, a use still exceeds the Level "B" threshold, then a minimum of 25 percent of the unmitigated emissions exceeding 137 pounds per day must be offset by reducing emissions from existing sources of pollution; otherwise, an Environmental Impact Report is required.

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

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

	ROG	NO_x	PM₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	1.62	1.52	1.49

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

1. Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
 2. All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.
 3. Temporary traffic control shall be provided as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
 4. Construction activities that could affect traffic flow shall be scheduled in off-peak hours.
 5. Active construction areas, haul roads, etc., shall be watered at least twice daily or more as needed to limit dust.
 6. Exposed stockpiles of soil and other backfill material shall either be covered, watered, or have soil binders added to inhibit dust and wind erosion.
 7. All trucks hauling soil and other loose material shall be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
 8. All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads. Wheel washers shall be used where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or trucks and any equipment shall be washed off leaving the site with each trip.
 9. Alternatives to open burning of cleared vegetative material on the project site shall be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the City Planning Division. Suitable alternatives include, but are not limited to, on-site chipping and mulching and/or hauling to a biomass fuel site.
- d.** Potential impacts to neighboring homes (sensitive receptors) from fugitive dust caused during construction is mitigated by application of the SMMs discussed above and under *Mitigation* below.
- e.** The project does not involve land use that could generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Documentation

- Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
- Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
- Redding General Plan Natural Resources and Air Quality Elements, 2000
- Project Calculations of Unmitigated Operational Emissions using URBEMIS 7G for Windows, V.5.1.0, report prepared March 17, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, d. Access to the property is derived from Crossroads Drive, a small cul-de-sac street developed with other heavy commercial/light industrial-type uses. Crossroads Drive is located adjacent to the Old Oregon Trail and Old 44 Drive intersection, a 4-way stop intersection. This is in close proximity to the Old Oregon Trail and State Highway 44 interchange. The General Plan Transportation Element and the General Plan Background Report indicate that these intersections are operating at acceptable levels; however, Caltrans District 2 has commented that several signal warrants have been met for the signalization of the ramp terminal intersections. Signalization of the eastbound ramp is currently under contract and scheduled for completion in September 2006. Although the westbound ramp does not appear to be scheduled in the current Capital Improvement Plan, Caltrans recommends that it be included in the Traffic Impact Fee program and prioritized in the next Capital Improvement Plan.

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 Crossroads Drive. Additionally, adequate access through the parking facilities, including proper turning radius for emergency-response vehicles, is provided. The Redding Fire Marshal has deemed this to be adequate access for fire protection. Fire hydrants will be provided on-site and possibly off-site in accordance with the requirements of the Fire Marshal.

f. Adequate parking can be provided on-site with development of the project in accordance with the City's Parking Ordinance.

g. The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) does not operate any fixed routes in the vicinity of the project; therefore, development would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000
- City of Redding Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan 2004
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
- Caltrans District 2 letter dated July 11, 2005
- City of Redding Traffic Impact Fee Program Table 8.5
- Redding Fire Marshal memorandum dated June 28, 2005

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, c, d, e. The project site has been completely disturbed in the past through clearing and installation of utilities with development of this small cul-de-sac street, including sewer and storm-drain systems. The only significant vegetation is located along the existing drainage ditch adjacent to State Route 44 and consists of scattered willow and cottonwood trees and natural grasses. This drainage accepts water from three storm drains—one centrally located 24-inch pipe which drains Crossroads Drive and accepts overland storm-water runoff from the parcel to the northwest in an existing concrete valley gutter, another 24-inch storm drain pipe that cuts across the southeasterly portion from a system to the north, and storm water from an existing storm-drain pipe on the multiple-family property to the south.

A Biological Resource Assessment was prepared by Galloway Consulting, Inc., for the property. A formal wetland delineation was conducted, and a total of .390 acre of jurisdictional features was identified, consisting of .347 acre of jurisdictional wetland, .042 acre (1,062 linear feet) of Other Waters of the United States, and .001 acre (19.4 linear feet) of culverts. A nationwide or individual permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404) and final approval by the California Department of Fish and Game will also be required with construction of the project.

No Federal or State endangered, threatened, or sensitive species were observed within the project site; however, as noted under Section III, *Geology and Soils*, and Section IV, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project site is tributary to Stillwater Creek, which is eventually tributary to the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River hosts four special-status fish species: winter-run chinook salmon (Federal endangered), Central Valley steelhead (Federal threatened), Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon (Federal threatened and State endangered), and Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon (Federal candidate). As discussed previously under Sections III and IV, conditions are included in the project to minimize potential sediment and soil-erosion impacts resulting from construction in the drainage that could emigrate to the Sacramento River and affect the fishery.

Due to the extensive amount of previous grading activities on this site and the fact that there are only a limited number of oak trees located adjacent to the State highway, the project site's potential for providing suitable nesting habitat for raptors species is negligible.

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

Documentation

California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base
 Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

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

Documentation

City of Redding Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 commercial warehouse buildings to be used for auto repair and related uses, contractor's office, and/or shop buildings 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. Although the project site is located within the Airport Influence Area, it is located outside the established approach/departure clear zones for Redding Municipal Airport. The project's commercial land use would not conflict with operations of the Airport or present a safety hazard to people working in the project area. 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 commercial lots.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8 (Health and Safety)
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10, Health and Safety Element, 1998.

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, c. It is not anticipated that the project would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan Noise Element and the Noise Standards established in Section 18.40.100 of the Zoning Ordinance; however, a minimum 20-foot-wide buffer yard is required along the east property line adjacent to the existing residential land uses in order to provide a greater separation and screening and buffering landscape. The closest buildings are located a distance of 40 feet from the residential property line. The project will not generate any groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

d. During the construction of the project improvements, there will be a temporary increase in noise in the project vicinity above existing ambient noise levels. The most noticeable construction noise would be related to grading, utility excavation, and land-clearing activity. The City's Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12.120.H) limits grading-permit-authorized activities to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No operations are allowed on Sunday. Since the heavy construction work associated with the project is limited in scope and by existing regulation, the anticipated noise impact to neighboring residents is considered less than significant.

e, f. The proposed project site is not located within any of the noise contours of Redding Municipal Airport and is located a distance of more than 2 miles from the airport property. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Noise Element, 2000
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12.120

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

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

Discussion

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

a (3). The project proposes medical office space which would not impact school facilities or services.

a (4). The project will not generate the need for community or regional park facilities.

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

Discussion

- a. Wastewater generated from this commercial project would be discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. The intensity of land use activity does not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. The proposed development does not generate the need for the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.
- c. As discussed under Section IV, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, storm-water runoff collected from the project would be discharged into the existing drainage located adjacent to State Route 44. The drainage is proposed to be cleaned, graded, and utilized for an on-site detention facility for the project, which may result in a minor loss of jurisdictional waters, but would not, however, result in any significant environmental effects.
- d. Potable water is available from the Bella Vista Water District to serve the project, and adequate pressure for commercial use and flows for fire suppression will be required.
- 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 service, which the project would utilize. Adequate capacity is available to serve the needs of the project without need of special accommodation.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Housing and Public Facilities Elements, 2000
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
- City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
- Sewer Atlas, City of Redding Engineering Division

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

- a. The proposed project would not obstruct any documented scenic vistas and would not represent a significant change to the overall scenic quality of the area.
- b. The project site is not located adjacent to a State-designated scenic highway.
- c. The buildings proposed are in character with the adjacent commercial buildings located on this small cul-de-sac street. Proposed buildings constructed as a result of development of the project must comply with the height standards of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, which would allow for up to 45 feet in height; however, the proposed building elevations indicate the buildings would be a maximum of 18 feet to the roof line. The buildings proposed closest to the residential property to the southeast would be 16 feet to the roof line.
- d. The project would generate light that is customary for the intended uses and additional night or security lighting. The project alone would not generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from the lighting of the facility and some additional parking lot security lighting. The project would not create substantial light or glare that would be considered an adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area. Conditions of approval would require any exterior building or parking lot lights be shielded in a manner to prevent light from being cast onto adjacent residences.

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. An Archaeological Evaluation of the Schade Development Project was prepared for Galloway Consulting, Inc, by Lori Harrington, Cultural Research Associates. No historic or prehistoric sites have been recorded within the current project area; however, the project area had never undergone an archaeological survey. A pedestrian survey was negative for surface indication of prehistoric or historic sites, and there are no historic architectural resources in or adjacent to the project area. There is a low potential for buried artifacts to be found during construction; however, because there is always a potential for finding subsurface artifacts or possibly human remains, the following condition would be included with approval of the project:

If, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, construction activities in the affected area shall cease; and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the City of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant, appropriate mitigations shall be required prior to any resumption of work on the project.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000
 Archaeological Evaluation of the Schade Development Project, prepared for Galloway Consulting, Inc, by Lori Harrington, Cultural Research Associates, April 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

There are no neighborhood or regional parks in the vicinity of this project. The proposed project would not generate homes or residents that would increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or recreational facilities, nor does the project propose any recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. There would not be any potentially significant impacts to recreation resources associated with the proposed project.

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVI. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

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

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources, 2000

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

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, August 1974

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion

- a. As discussed under Item VII, Biological Resources, the project has the potential to result in a minor loss of jurisdictional waters with drainage improvements proposed; however, impacts would be considered less than significant.
- 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 measures will reduce potential impacts from this project to a level less than significant.
- c. As discussed herein, the project does not have characteristics which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.