

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GPA-10-06
REZONE RZ-15-06
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PD-9-06**

THE SPRINGS RETIREMENT COMMUNITY

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** General Plan Amendment GPA-10-06, Rezone Application RZ-15-06, Planned Development Plan Application PD-9-06, The Springs Retirement Community.
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Assistant Planner André Benoist at 530.225.4020
4. **Project Location:** The project site is located in the north portion of the City of Redding, adjacent to and southeast of Hilltop Drive, ±400 feet south of Lake Boulevard, located on Assessor's Parcel Nos. 113-300-028, 116-150-005, and 116-150-008 (See attached Figure 1: Site Location Map and Figure 2: Aerial Site Map)
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** McGregor Development Company, P.O. Box 1513, Wilsonville, OR 97070
6. **General Plan Designation:** "Neighborhood Commercial" and "General Commercial"
7. **Zoning:** "NC-PD" Neighborhood Commercial with Planned Development Overlay District and "GC" General Commercial District
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is requesting a General Plan amendment, rezone, and Planned Development Plan that would affect approximately 10.1 acres and change the General Plan from "Neighborhood Commercial" and "General Commercial" to "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" and change the zoning from "NC-PD" Neighborhood Commercial District with Planned Development Overlay District and "GC" General Commercial District to "RM-15-PD" Residential Multiple Family District, 15 units per acre, with a Planned Development Overlay District. The purpose of the General Plan amendment and rezone would be to accommodate a senior residential care facility. The facility consists of a 211,000-square-foot, 3-story senior-living facility that includes a 77-unit (104-bed) independent living facility, 87-unit (96-bed) assisted living facility, and 34-unit (34-bed) memory care unit. In addition, the project includes 31 independent-living cottages housed in 10 buildings, totaling 60,000 square feet. The project will include ±3.7 acres of on-site driveways/parking, and ±2.8 acres of landscaped areas. The project includes construction of on-site utility and storm-drainage improvements necessary to serve the facility, as well as street-frontage improvements, consisting of 2 travel lanes, a center turn lane, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and a Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) bus turnout and shelter. Further details are included in the Planned Development Plan.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The project site is relatively flat and ranges in elevation from approximately 708 to 712 feet above sea level. The property is now a vacant parcel that, at one time, was developed with a highway patrol station; however, that facility and all related appurtenances have since been removed. In recent times, the property has been the site for unauthorized roadside merchant vending, vehicle trespassing, and unpermitted stockpiling of excavated fill material and construction debris. The site does support a scattered population of blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*) with an understory of native and nonnative grasses and scattered shrubs. Existing land uses adjacent to the site include condominiums, apartments, and single-family residential development to the south; Hilltop Drive and North Market Street/Highway 273 and commercial development to the west; Hilltop Drive, commercial development, and Lake Boulevard/Lake Boulevard 299 East to the north; and commercial development and a mobile home park to the east.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).** The project must obtain a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project may be subject to Section 404 Permit approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE); a Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board may be necessary as well. The most commonly used Section 404 Permit, a Nationwide 29 Permit, is the most likely permit to be required for the project. An Individual Permit is not anticipated for this project, due to the particular circumstances of the site.

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 (Fire) & 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 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

Date

André Benoist
(Name)

Assistant Planner
(Title)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

List of attachments:

- A. Site Location Map
- B. Site Plan
- C. Building Elevations
- D. URBEMIS Air Quality Report Results (on file with the City of Redding)
- E. Traffic Report (on file with the City of Redding)
- F. Biological and Wetlands Screening (on file with the City of Redding)
- G. Wetlands Delineation (on file with the City of Redding)
- H. Archaeology Survey (on file with the City of Redding)
- I. Arborist's Report (on file with the City of Redding)
- J. Planned Development Plan (on file with the City of Redding)

Prior Environmental Evaluations applicable to all or part of the project site:

1. City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH#1998072103

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure 1. Construction of Hilltop Drive improvements, consisting of 2 travel lanes, a center turn lane, and curb/gutter/sidewalk in accordance with the specifications of the City and the requirements of the City Engineer.

Mitigation Measure 2. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall mitigate for the total net loss of seasonal wetlands and any other jurisdictional waters which are impacted by the project, based on the project's final improvement plans, through the purchase of mitigation credits from a valid wetland mitigation bank as reviewed and approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). An alternate means of securing off-site mitigation credits may be used if supported and approved under the ACOE 404 Permit approvals required for the project.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 will serve as a transitional use between existing commercial and residential development. No features of the project will physically divide an established community.

b. The project site is currently zoned "NC-PD" Neighborhood Commercial District with Planned Development Overlay District and "GC" General Commercial District, and the General Plan designates the project site as "Neighborhood Commercial" and "General Commercial." The proposal includes a General Plan amendment to "Residential, 10 to 20 units per acre" and a rezone to "RM-15-PD." The project includes 108 residential dwelling units on approximately 5.8 acres of the total project area. Institutional uses such as the assisted-living facility and memory care unit are not considered residential units and are therefore not factored into the overall density of the project. If approved, the residential density for the development would be 18.4 units per acre, which is the maximum density allowed under the proposed "RM-15-PD" zoning designation and is consistent with the General Plan density range of 10 to 20 units per acre.

Chapter 18.53 ("PD" Planned Development District) of the Zoning Code provides a process, or "zoning tool," that can be used where greater flexibility in design is desired to provide a more efficient use of land than would be possible through strict application of base zoning standards. The "PD" process can be used to customize use and development standards to fit a project, as long as specific findings can be made, which largely center on consistency with the General Plan. "PD" projects are also expected to provide appropriate amenities and design enhancements, thus providing something extra/unique to support justification for variation to standards. To be eligible for the "PD" process, a site must be zoned to include "PD" as an Overlay District, which is part of the requested rezone. Preparation of a planned development plan, such as that attached, is required to illustrate the standards that are specific to the project. In this case, the use of the planned development process is appropriate to support the proposed use and design goals.

c. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the site. The project is consistent with the goals stated in the Natural Resources Element of the City of Redding General Plan.

d. The project would ultimately provide positive social and economic impacts by facilitating orderly residential and institutional development of natural lands within the urban core as is fully supported by the General Plan.

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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. The project will induce a limited amount of direct population growth by providing 108 residential dwelling units; however, the property has direct access to public utilities and streets that are already in place to serve the surrounding area that is almost entirely developed. While an amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance will introduce a small amount of population growth in the area, it is not substantial, either directly or indirectly, and will provide housing and opportunities for aging individuals. It is anticipated that most of the residents of the facility will relocate from other locations in the greater Redding area.

b and c. No existing homes or residents would be displaced by this project.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Housing Element, 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Community Development & Design Element, 2000
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2002

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| (1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (2) Strong seismic ground-shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 range of low to medium ground-shaking potential, between 0.10 – 0.45 g. 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.

b. The project site contains one primary soil classification, Redding gravelly loam, 0-3 % slopes (RdA). This classification is characterized by little or no slope (0 to 3%). Permeability is very slow, runoff is very slow, and hazard of erosion is none to slight.

**Table 1
Soil Type and Characteristics**

Soil Name	Soil Type	Permeability	Slope (%)	Erosion Potential	Run Off Rate
Redding (RdA)	Gravelly loam	Slow	0-3	None-slight	Very Slow

Overall, the amount of grading necessary to support the project would be relatively minimal, given the size of the project. This is due to the relatively flat terrain of the property. Typical site construction in accordance with City construction standards would be needed for the installation of utilities, driveways, parking areas, building foundations, and street improvements. Only minor cut-and-fill work would be needed. A preliminary grading plan for the project estimates 8,245 cubic yards of cut and the placement of 7,017 cubic yards of fill. Standard grading-control measures already applicable to the project by City ordinances and other government-agency regulations will be applied, ensuring that potential grading impacts are less than significant.

- ▶ **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.). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final improvement plans and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts. Typically, a qualified erosion- and sediment-control specialist is retained for preparation of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that establishes specific measures and Best Management Practices to minimize soil erosion during and after construction activities. Grading work shall be of a scale so that all grading can be completed in a single construction season.
- ▶ **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 describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.
- ▶ **California Department of Fish and Game.** DFG Section 1600 Agreement. This notification is required for any work within a defined streambed and is potentially applicable to the unnamed, intermittent, roadside drainage ditch on the north side of the project boundary.
- ▶ **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.** A new Nationwide 29 Permit (residential development) may be required from the ACOE to address impacts to jurisdictional waters.

e. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan, Health and Safety Element; Figures 4-1 (Ground-Shaking Potential) and 4.2 (Liquefaction Potential), 2000
- City of Redding General Plan Final EIR, 2000
- Redding Municipal Code, 2003
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
- City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
- Soils Survey of Shasta County Area, California, 1974
- Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, Woodward-Clyde, 1995

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, c, f. The facility will be connected to the City sewer. The project will 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 will utilize City water service for domestic uses and fire protection. The proposed facility would not impact groundwater supplies.

d, e. The project site is located in the Boulder Creek drainage basin, which is tributary to Churn Creek. City of Redding Policy 1806 requires that all development 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. The application includes a proposal for stormwater detention incorporated into the parking area of the facility and a supporting hydrology analysis concluding that the City’s detention standards can be met. This analysis is contained in the project application file. By including appropriate stormwater detention into the project design, the risk of flooding off-site is considered to be less than significant.

g, h, i. The project site is not located within an identified 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 Lake or Whiskeytown Lake during an earthquake. However, neither lake has been identified in the Health and Safety Element of the General Plan as having any risk to the City under such circumstances. There is no documented threat of mudflows potentially affecting the project site.

Documentation

Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain Regulations, FIRM maps 0603602585 E and 0603602605E, dated 6/16/06
 City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
 City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
 Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
 The Springs Project, Preliminary Storm Drain Analysis, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., 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?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, although it should be noted that overall vehicle emissions for the project are considerably less than what would be generated by development consistent with the existing General Plan and zoning classifications of the property. Any project that generates vehicle trips has the potential of contributing to the problem. The Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan acknowledged this; and as a result, a Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted by the City Council for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan, such as the proposed residential retirement development. Nevertheless, the Air Quality Element of the General Plan incorporates strategies to reduce emissions associated with new and modified indirect sources of pollution in an effort to accurately determine and mitigate project-related impacts. Emission-reduction goals of 20 to 25 percent are established, depending on the projected level of unmitigated emissions for a project. Mitigation thresholds are established for the important regional/local pollutants, including: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), which are ozone precursors, and Inhalable Particulate Matter, 10 Micron (PM10). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

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 PM10	137 pounds per day of PM10

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

In order to calculate the unmitigated emissions for the key pollutants noted above, the current URBEMIS air quality computer model (version 8.7) was used as prescribed in the Air Quality Element of the City of Redding General Plan. The independent-living facility and cottages were classified as "Apartments low-rise," the assisted living facility and memory care unit were classified as "Congregate care (Assisted Living) Facility." The results were as follows:

	ROG	NOx	PM10
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	13.56	13.45	15.18

The analysis indicates that the project would result in emissions of key pollutants that are well below the Level "A" threshold. Hence, application of SMM is required in accordance with General Plan policy. SMM applicable to the project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction. For the most part, these requirements are standard development regulations of the City, promulgated in the City Grading Ordinance and California Building Code. Application of special mitigations 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.

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

The project applicant shall ensure that the following Standard Mitigation Measures are implemented during construction of the proposed project:

1. Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
 2. Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering before final occupancy.
 3. Suspend all grading operations when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour as directed by the Shasta County AQMD.
 4. Provide temporary traffic control (e.g., flag person) as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow.
 5. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours.
 6. Water active construction sites at least twice daily as directed by the Engineering Division.
 7. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials or maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
 8. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads.
 9. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site on each trip.
- d. Potential impacts from fugitive dust caused during construction are mitigated by application of the SMM identified above.
- e. The project does not involve land use that could generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Documentation

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
Redding General Plan Natural Resources and Air Quality Elements, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary

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

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b. Hilltop Drive is identified in the Transportation Element of the City of Redding 2000-2020 General Plan as an arterial street. At the time the study was completed, Hilltop drive was a two-lane street and projected to be a four-lane street. The traffic-volume capacity of Hilltop Drive as a two-lane street is 15,800 vehicle trips per day. The number of trips occurring on Hilltop Drive at the time of the General Plan traffic study was 12,000 vehicle trips per day. A more recent traffic study conducted in 2005 shows the number of vehicle trips has grown to 15,193. The project is expected to contribute an additional 845 vehicle trips per day, which would exceed the level of service capacity. The project frontage is currently a two-lane street; however, at the north and south ends of the property, Hilltop Drive is built at four lanes. Adding 2 traffic lanes and a center turn lane to Hilltop Drive will increase the traffic capacity an additional 14,080 vehicle trips per day, according to the City's Traffic Engineer, sufficient to handle project-related traffic. Development of the site will include dedication of necessary right-of-way and street-improvement construction to make this section of Hilltop Drive a four-lane street, which will complete this section of Hilltop Drive and connect the 2 four-lane segments, nearly doubling the traffic capacity.

The applicant has submitted a traffic study that concludes that acceptable levels of service will not be exceeded at the intersection of Lake Boulevard and Hilltop Drive traffic signal. The traffic study also states that the level of service will not be exceeded at that intersection from cumulative development in the area.

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

d. The project's frontage along Hilltop Drive is a long, sweeping curve. The driveway entrances have been located away from the curve to ensure adequate sight distance at the two driveway intersections. The project does not propose any changes to the design of Hilltop Drive, nor does it conflict with any adjacent land uses.

e. The proposed facility has incorporated emergency-vehicle access throughout the site. The Fire Marshal has reviewed the plans and determined that adequate access does exist to provide emergency services to all portions of the project.

f. The parking requirements for the project are based on the number of bedrooms for each type of residential unit provided. Based on the number and type of residential units provided, the project is required to provide 107 parking spaces. The project plans include 240 parking spaces distributed throughout the site. This exceeds the minimum number of required parking by 134 spaces.

g. Project development does not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. In 2004, the City of Redding prepared, and the City Council adopted, a Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan. When the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan was prepared, Hilltop Drive was classified as an "existing, Class III bike lane." Improvements to Hilltop Drive will be in accordance with the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan, including adequate paved width for a Class III bike lane at this location.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) provides public bus service in the Redding area. The project site is served by RABA Routes 11 and 14. It is reasonable to expect that the project will contribute to the use of public transportation. In turn, a bus turnout and shelter will be constructed as part of the project.

Documentation

- Transportation Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
- Redding Parks, Trails and Bikeways Map, 2004
- City of Redding Overflight Zones Map, 2000
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 18.41.040
- The Springs at Redding, Redding, California, Traffic Impact Analysis Memorandum, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., 2006

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 1. Construction of Hilltop Drive improvements, consisting of 2 travel lanes, a center turn lane, and curb/gutter/sidewalk in accordance with the specifications of the City and the requirements of the City Engineer.

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

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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. The City's General Plan identifies four habitat types as potentially sensitive and requiring special consideration. These consist of: riparian wetlands, vernal pools, and water courses. The project site has been extensively disturbed by illegal dumping, off-road vehicle activity, and large amounts of dumped fill material. However, the site does support a scattered population of oak trees and a few shrubs. The property also contains a small roadside drainage ditch which would be disturbed by construction of Hilltop Drive frontage improvements.

A Prejurisdictional Wetland Delineation Report dated February 2007, prepared by the consulting firm ENPLAN, was submitted in conjunction with the planned development application. This report is incorporated herein by reference and is on file with the Redding Development Services Department. This report concludes that there are no special-status plant or wildlife species on the project site; however, there are two types of potentially jurisdictional waters found on-site identified as a roadside drainage ditch and scattered seasonal wetlands. The roadside drainage ditch is identified as potentially a jurisdictional water of the United States and consists of approximately 0.029 acre (1,260 square feet). The anticipated disturbance due to development of Hilltop Drive street improvements appears to be close to the entire length of the on-site drainage. A loss of less than 0.3 acre of jurisdictional waters may be allowed by a Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The drainage ditch may also fall under the purview of the State Department of Fish and Game Section 1600 Agreement regulations. The wetlands delineation concludes that none of the on-site features meet the definition of jurisdictional water of the U.S. Furthermore, based upon the findings of the ENPLAN report that no sensitive, endangered, or protected habitat or associated plant or animal species exist on the site, no adverse biological effects are anticipated as a result of development of the project.

The City has not established its own mitigation standards for replacement of wetlands impacted by development and, instead, relies on criteria recognized by State and Federal resource agencies. Federal and State policies promote a no net loss of wetland resources. This can be accomplished in a number of ways, but a common approach is the purchase by the developer of mitigation credits at an established wetland mitigation bank. In this case, a replacement ratio of 2:1 would be anticipated. Hence, mitigation measures are established below to ensure that the necessary mitigation credits are secured prior to issuance of a grading permit.

e. The City has adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 18.45 of the Redding Municipal Code) that promotes the conservation of mature, healthy trees in the design of new development. The Ordinance recognizes that the preservation of trees will sometimes conflict with normal land development consideration. The project site supports approximately 90 blue oak trees between 6 and 35 inches in diameter (dbh) and a few shrubs; however, the trees are very scattered and only 11 of them could be considered a candidate tree eligible for preservation. The current project plan incorporates ten trees for preservation, six of which are candidate trees. The remaining five candidate trees could not be preserved, as proposed streets and buildings could not be designed to provide adequate protection for these trees. Section 18.45 of the Tree Preservation Ordinance requires tree planting upon construction of the facility to offset the anticipated loss of trees resulting from land development allowed by the General Plan.

The report prepared by ENPLAN states that the oak trees found on the property could provide nesting habitat for migratory birds. As a result, tree and brush clearing is not permitted between April 1 and July 31, unless a nesting survey is conducted and the results conclude that there are no nests located at the site.

f. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area.

Documentation

- City of Redding Tree Ordinance, Redding Municipal Code Title 18, Zoning, 2003
- Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Biological and Wetland Screening for Shasta County APN 113-300-028, ENPLAN, 2007
- Pre-jurisdictional Delineation Report, The Springs at Redding, Redding, California, ENPLAN, 2007
- The Springs at Redding Tree Survey Report, ENPLAN, 2007
- A Tree Survey Report for Dean McGregor, McEntire Landscaping, Inc., 2006

Mitigation Measure 2. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall mitigate for the total net loss of seasonal wetlands and any other jurisdictional waters which are impacted by the project, based on the project’s final improvement plans, through the purchase of mitigation credits from a valid wetland mitigation bank as reviewed and approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). An alternate means of securing off-site mitigation credits may be used if supported and approved under the ACOE 404 Permit approvals required for the project.

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?

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion

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

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 a senior-living facility, does not present a risk related to hazardous materials or emissions to the public. There are no documented hazardous material sites located on or near the project; however, it should be noted that Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) does maintain a high-pressure, natural-gas line that bisects the property in a north-south orientation. The gas line is located underground, several feet below the surface. PG&E monitors and maintains similar facilities which can be found in densely populated urban areas throughout the state. PG&E representatives have reviewed the development proposal and stated no compatibility

concerns with regard to the facilities and the proposed use. They did, however, request to review the grading plans when they are submitted for final review to ensure their facilities are not impacted by construction of the site.

e, f. The property is located outside the established approach/departure clear zones for Redding Municipal Airport. The project would not conflict with operations of the Airport or present a safety hazard to people residing in the subdivision. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity.

g. The proposed facility does not involve a use or activity that could interfere with emergency-response or emergency-evacuation plans for the area. Access corridors have been designed into the project to facilitate emergency access and evacuation for both on-site occupants and for the residences in the neighborhoods to the east and south.

h. The project site is surrounded by commercial development, major roads, and residential subdivisions. There is little or no threat from wildland fires.

Documentation

- Underground Storage Tanks, Shasta County Department of Environmental Health, 2006
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2007
- Hazardous Materials Search, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, 2007
- EnviroStor, Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2007
- Hazardous Waste and Substances, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2007
- Health and Safety Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety, Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
- Health and Safety, General Plan Background Report, City of Redding 1998

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

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

Discussion

a, b, c. The Noise Element of Redding General Plan establishes exterior and interior noise thresholds in residential areas of 60 and 45 Ldn/CNEL, dB, respectively (Table 5-4). Table 5-2 of the Noise Element presents projected noise contours from the major road segments in the City. The property has frontage on Hilltop Drive, which is an arterial street; however, this portion of the property's frontage on Hilltop Drive is a long, sweeping curve which has the effect of slowing traffic speeds and nearly eliminating potential noise impacts. Outdoor activity areas would be located within the inner area of the development, also lessening potentially significant impacts resulting from exterior noise levels. These two factors combined lessen noise impacts to a level that is less than significant. Interior noise level thresholds will not be exceeded with the use of standard construction practices.

There are no non-transportation-related noise or vibration generating sources in the general vicinity of the project.

d. During the construction of the facility, 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 development is not located within an airport land use plan area, nor is it located within two miles of an airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Documentation

Noise Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000
 Transportation Element, City of Redding General Plan, 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 and type of facility proposed does not require the need for additional police or fire facilities.

a (3). Based on the nature of the project as a retirement residence, no impacts are anticipated to student enrollment in local schools.

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

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

Documentation

Public Facilities and Services Element, City of Redding General Plan, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a. Wastewater generated from the project would be that associated with domestic use and will be discharged into the City sanitary sewer system. This land-use activity would not generate wastewater demands that would exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b. The City maintains existing water service in the area and will be able to provide domestic water supplies to the proposed facility. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the proposed project.

c. The surrounding area has storm-drain facilities in place to serve the project. As a standard condition of development, City Council Policy 1806 will require that the development detains stormwater on-site and the water enters the storm-drain system at the same rate it did before the project was developed. There will be no impact to the existing storm-drain system.

d. The project site is located within the City of Redding Water District. Potable water is available from the City of Redding 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 facility will utilize the City's sanitary sewer system to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity is available in the City's existing system to accommodate the proposed project.

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. The City regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials from institutional facilities, including those created by the facility.

Documentation

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

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, c. The main facility is a three-story building complex that is nearly 53 feet tall. Topographically, the project site is at the north end of a ridge on the north side of town. Due to the size and height of the building complex combined with its location in the City, it is expected that this building will be visible from a mile or more away and highly visible at one of the City's busiest intersections (Lake Boulevard and North Market Street).

To ensure that the development projects a positive image for the City and surrounding area and efficiently as possible serves as a transition from commercial to residential uses, the City-adopted "Design Criteria" will be judiciously followed. The criteria establishes objective measures to evaluate the aesthetic merits of a proposed project. The design review criteria requires that buildings use variation in wall plane and roof lines that serves to visually break up the appearance of what would otherwise be a long, flat wall and roof. The criteria further requires that a variety of building materials be used to add texture and interest to the building, as well as the use of form and color to enhance the visual appeal of a building. To this end, the stated architectural design for the main building complex is a Spanish Colonial/Mission style, with design features including an architectural roof, stucco walls, building projections, decorative windows and trim, stone accents along the base of the buildings, and heavy timber brackets along the eaves. A large porte cochere and colored concrete roundabout will be located at the entrance of the main building. The entire project site will be extensively landscaped.

b. The project site is not located adjacent to a State-designated scenic highway. There are no State-designated scenic highways within the City of Redding.

d. Once constructed, the project would generate new lighting that is customary for commercial development. The project alone does not have the potential to generate substantial light or glare beyond that typically expected from commercial use and streetlighting. Furthermore, the City requires that all lighting on-site is shielded from casting onto adjacent properties and public right-of-ways. Thus, there would not be an adverse effect from lighting on daytime or nighttime views in the area.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000
 City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, Section 18.40.090

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"/> |

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, d. An archaeological survey, including a records search and pedestrian survey, was completed for the project by ENPLAN (2006). The report is incorporated herein by reference and is on file with the Redding Development Services Department. There is no evidence of, or no known, historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources on the property, nor is the property in an area of potential resource sensitivity. The site has been heavily impacted by previous development, street construction, grading, illegal dumping and off-road activity. No impacts in this area are anticipated.

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

Documentation

Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Willow Creek Residential Subdivision Project, ±10 acres in the City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 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

a, b. The nearest developed City park is Caldwell Park, which is a 70-acre community park located along the Sacramento River, providing a wide range of active and passive recreational opportunities. This park is intended to serve residents of Redding and would not be overburdened by the future residents of the proposed development. In addition, the proposed development will include meandering sidewalks, benches, gazebos, outdoor gardens, and extensive landscape for outdoor recreational use. The City's Community Services Department has reviewed the proposed development and has determined that no additional park area is required.

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 is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element. The site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes, is not governed by the Williamson Act, nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000
 USDA, SCS, and Forest Service, Soil Survey of Shasta County, California, 1974
 Important Farmlands of Shasta County, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2002

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion

a. As documented in the Initial Study, the project area does not contain sensitive habitats or sustain any population of rare, endangered, or threatened plants or animals.

b. As discussed in Section V, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. This condition was identified in the Environmental Impact Report approved for the City of Redding General Plan adopted in October 2000. This approval by the Redding City Council included adoption of a Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for impacts to air quality resulting from growth supported under the General Plan. In addition, under policy of the Air Quality Element of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) as conditions of development applied to any project approval will specifically 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.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan, 2000
City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2002
Redding Municipal Code, 2003
City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain Regulations, FIRM map 060360-0015, dated 9/29/89
City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
Soils Survey of Shasta County Area, California, 1974
Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, Woodward-Clyde, 1995
Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000
Redding Parks, Trails and Bikeways Map, 2004
City of Redding Overflight Zones Map, 2000
DMG Open File Report 97-03, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1997
Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
City of Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base Search, 2006
Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Willow Creek Residential Subdivision Project, ±10 acres in the City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2006
Biological and Wetland Screening for Shasta County APN 113-300-028, ENPLAN, 2006
Pre-jurisdictional Delineation Report, The Springs at Redding, Redding, California, ENPLAN, 2007
The Springs at Redding Tree Survey Report, ENPLAN, 2007
A Tree Survey Report for Dean McGregor, McEntire Landscaping, Inc., 2006
Underground Storage Tanks, Shasta County Department of Environmental Health, 2006
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2007
Hazardous Materials Search, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website, 2007
EnviroStor, Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2007
Hazardous Waste and Substances, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2007
USDA, SCS, and Forest Service, Soil Survey of Shasta County, California, 1974
Important Farmlands of Shasta County, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2002
The Springs at Redding, Redding, California, Traffic Impact Analysis Memorandum, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., 2006
The Springs Project, Preliminary Storm Drain Analysis, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., 2006

RFPEIR\TheSprings-GPA1006-PD0906-RZ1506-AB-IS.wpd