

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

SCH # _____

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION**

**USE PERMIT UP-3-06
WEST VENTURE MEDICAL OFFICES**



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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

This document has been prepared by the City of Redding acting as
Lead Agency in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, "CEQA"
(Public Resource Code, § 21000 *et seq.*).

1. **Project Title:** Use Permit UP-3-06, WestVenture Medical Office Building
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ron Adams, Associate Planner, 530-245-7112
4. **Project Location:** 1031, 1033, 1037 Butte Street
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Mr. Kevin Mack, WestVenture Development, 1015 Butte Street, Redding, CA 96001
6. **General Plan Designation:** "General Office"
7. **Zoning:** "PF" Public Facility District
8. **Description of Project:** Proposal to develop a 60,000-square-foot medical office building at the southwest corner of Continental Street and Butte Street. The total development area is roughly one acre. The building would have three stories of medical offices over a basement parking area containing 47 stalls. In order to meet off-street parking requirements (267 spaces), approval is also requested to allow a portion of required parking to be provided off-site on adjacent properties/facilities owned by Shasta Regional Medical Center (SRMC). This includes 180 existing stalls to be dedicated in the existing SRMC garage and 40 surface parking stalls to be developed on a lot owned by SRMC adjacent to the proposed building.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The project site involves underdeveloped land located behind the Shasta Regional Medical Center (SRMC) in Downtown Redding, next door to the hospital's parking garage. The site is largely surrounded by existing medical office development in the City's urban core and is void of any sensitive habitats. An old office building was recently demolished to make way for the project. Topography slopes gradually downhill towards Continental Street.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** Off-site road improvements required as mitigation near Auditorium Drive and State Route 44, as discussed in this document, could possibly trigger the need for an encroachment permit from the California Department of Transportation depending on the final location and design of the work.

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)
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation
- Agricultural Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

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)

August 17, 2006

(Date)

Ron Adams

(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/references:

- A. Zoning Location map
- B. Aerial photo
- C. URBEMIS version 8.7 air quality computer model results (located in application file)
- D. Traffic Impact Study for WestVenture Office Development, prepared by DEW Traffic, dated August 2006 (located in application file)
- E. Parking Agreement between WestVenture Development LLC and Shasta Regional Medical Center LLC, dated August 31, 2005 (located in application file)
- F. Site plan and building elevations (reduction)

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

Transportation/Circulation

Mitigation Measure 1. Prior to building occupancy, the following off-site traffic-control and street improvements shall be completed:

- a. A traffic signal shall be installed at the intersection of East Street and Yuba Street, along with any necessary lane-delineation revisions.
- b. The intersection of Auditorium Drive, Butte Street, and Park Marina Drive shall be modified based on the recommendations of the project traffic study to reduce PM peak-hour congestion for the eastbound ramp approach of State Route 44, including, but not limited to, adding an eastbound ramp storage lane, lane-delineation revisions, adjustments in signal timing, adding camera detection, and additional street signage and markings.

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 is located on an urban infill site in Downtown Redding, surrounded by other medical office-related development. Thus, the project has no potential to physically divide an established community.
- b. The project site is designated "General Office" under the General Plan and is zoned "PF" Public Facility District (RMC Chapter 18.36). The site is also technically located within the Downtown Redding Specific Plan area, but outside the special downtown land use districts that have unique development standards. Although the subject medical office building is not directly related to SRMC, the "PF" zoning reflects the property's close physical relationship to the hospital. Hospitals, urgent care facilities, medical offices, and clinics are allowable uses in the in the "PF" District in accordance with issuance of either a site development permit or use permit; development over 30,000 square feet triggers the need for the use permit. The underlying General Plan designation also clearly supports these uses. The "PF" District does not have specific site development and performance standards. Final design criteria may be as specified in the use permit. For this reason, reasonable flexibility is available in this case when considering building height and setback issues.
- c. There are no local habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the project.
- d. The project would provide positive social and economic impacts by facilitating orderly development of land as is supported by the General Plan, by supporting job opportunities for the local construction industry and by promoting growth of the City's important medical-based economy.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Community Development and Design, Housing, and Natural Resources Elements
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title18)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 does not involve residential development and would not induce unplanned population growth. No existing homes or residents are affected by the project.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan
 City of Redding Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 18)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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:

<p>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(2) Strong seismic ground-shaking?</p> <p>(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>(4) Landslides?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

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 soils and underlying geology on-site have low potential for liquefaction.

b. Customary excavation and grading work would be needed to construct building foundations, develop driveways and parking areas, and for the installation of utilities. The project is subject to uniformly applied erosion- and sediment-control requirements mandated by existing regulations. These requirements include:

- ▶ City of Redding Grading Ordinance. This ordinance requires the application of 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 project improvement plans 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 BMPs 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.

Actions for compliance with these regulations are addressed under standard conditions of approval, which are uniformly applied to land development projects. Since the project is subject to uniformly applied ordinances and policies and the overall risk of erosion is very low, potential impacts related to soil erosion and sedimentation are less than significant.

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

Documentation

- City of Redding Health and Safety Element, Figures 4-1 (Ground Shaking Potential) and 4.2 (Liquefaction Potential)
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report
- City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
- City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices
- City of Redding Standard Development Conditions for Discretionary Approvals (subdivisions, use permits, site development permits, etc.)
- Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974
- Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42, Titled: Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California; Figure 4G, Official Maps of Earthquake Fault Zones
- State Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Regulations related to Construction Activity Storm Water Permits and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste-discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project does not involve any permitted discharges of waste material into ground or surface waters. City sanitary sewer is readily available to serve the project.
- b. City water service is readily available to serve the project for domestic use and fire protection. Groundwater supplies would not be impacted.
- c. There is little risk that the project could contribute significant silt and sediment into area creeks. This issue is addressed under Section 3 (Geology and Soils) above.
- d. The proposed building and related improvements would cause increased stormwater runoff rates from the project site. However, the relatively small footprint of development proposed would not generate substantial increased flows beyond the capacity of the area’s public storm-drain system. City Council Policy 1806 and General Plan Policy HS2H require that new development incorporate measures as needed to ensure that project-generated increases in stormwater runoff do not increase peak flooding off-site. This issue is addressed during the final improvement plan review process, prior to issuance of a building permit, subject to City Construction Standards.
- e, f. The final improvement plans for the project must incorporate specific design measures intended to limit pollutant discharges in stormwater from urban improvements as established under the State’s National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) general permit, which the City is now obligated to follow in accordance with State Water Quality Control Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ. Feasible Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be incorporated in the final design of the project’s storm-drain system, as approved by the City Engineer, based on the BMPs listed in the latest edition of the California Storm Water Quality Association, Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook.
- g, h, i. The project site has no potential for flooding and is not located within any regulatory floodplain.
- 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 sites.

Documentation

- City of Redding Health and Safety Element
- Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain Regulations, FIRM map 060360-0030D, dated 3/02/98
- City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
- City of Redding Construction Standards
- State Water Quality Control Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ; National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit; Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water Discharges From Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) General Permit
- California Storm Water Quality Association, Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 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 SMM, 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, the proposed medical office development has the potential to impact air quality primarily in two ways: (1) The project would generate vehicle trip emissions (with NOx, ROG, and PM10) that would contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions. (2) Fugitive dust (particulate/PM10) emissions could occur from construction activities. In order to calculate the unmitigated emissions related to these development factors, the current URBEMIS air quality computer model was used as prescribed in the Air Quality Element. The project was modeled assuming total buildout by year 2008. The results are as follows:

	ROG	NOx	PM₁₀
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	17.16	21.61	23.58

These results indicate that the project would result in ROG, N_{ox}, and PM₁₀ emissions that are 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 California Building Codes. 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 from fugitive dust caused during construction are mitigated by application of the SMMs discussed 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
 City of Redding General Plan Air Quality Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8.6, Air Quality
 CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, as adopted by the Redding City Council on October 3, 2000, by Resolution 2000-166
 City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.7, Natural Resources and Air Quality
 URBEMIS (2002,v8.7) air quality computer model results

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b, d. At 60,000 square feet, the proposed medical office building has the potential to produce notable additional vehicle trips on Downtown streets near SRMC and State Highway 44. For this reason, a traffic study was required by the City. The following is a summary of the key points and findings of the study. Please refer to the full traffic study for a complete discussion and background information.

- Parking facilities serving the office building will have access from Butte Street, Liberty Street, and Yuba Street.
- At buildout the project would have the potential to generate 2,168 new daily vehicle trips, including 146 AM peak hour trips and 220 PM peak hour trips.
- A total of seventeen intersections and related roadway segments were analyzed.
- Traffic evaluations were completed for the following scenarios: (1) "Existing No Project Condition," (2) "Year 2010—No Project Condition," (3) "Year 2010 Plus Project Condition," (4) Cumulative Year 2030 No Project Condition," and (5) "Cumulative Year 2030 plus Project Condition."

- Evaluation of the various scenarios revealed two potentially significant intersection conditions impacted directly by the project that require mitigation. These include the intersection of East Street and Yuba Street and the left-turn approach onto the eastbound ramp of State Route 44 at Auditorium Drive and Park Marina Drive. Other potential impacts identified were more cumulative in nature and are mitigated by payment of the City's Traffic Impact Fee in accordance with Chapter 16.20 of the Redding Municipal Code, which is collected at the time of issuance of a building permit.
- At the intersection of East Street and Yuba Street, the "Year 2010 Plus Project Condition" identified a reduction in level of service (LOS) and warrants met, justifying need for installation of a traffic signal. The project's proportionate fair share of the cost of the signal is 29 percent; the City typically requires installation of improvements at the time of development for a project having over a 25 percent share.
- For the ramp approach onto eastbound State Route 44 at Auditorium Drive and Park Marina Drive, the study identifies a "Back of Queue" (cars stacked waiting to turn) problem that would be greatly exacerbated by the project. During the weekday PM peak hour, the existing lane geometry, signal timing, and slowed traffic flow on eastbound State Route 44 often contribute to prevent the Back of Queue from clearing in one signal cycle. Caltrans expressed concerns over this problem during review of the draft traffic study. For these reasons, the final study identifies various intersection and traffic signal enhancements to help reduce the severity of the "Plus Project" problem (see traffic study Figure 13).

Based on the issues summarized here, with installation of a new traffic signal at the intersection of East Street and Yuba Street, and various intersection and traffic signal enhancements at Auditorium Drive and Park Marina Drive, the project would not result in significant adverse effects related to traffic capacity, congestion, or road-design features. See mitigation measure below.

c. The project site is located well outside the approach and departure zones for both the Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark and therefore has no potential to interfere with airport operations. SRMC currently operates an emergency service helipad atop the main hospital building. A specific approach and departure path is used for the helipad, oriented to/from the northeast, that is regulated and approved by the State Division of Aeronautics. The path extends out from the top of the hospital building in a way that it covers the airspace above the proposed building. Although this situation exists, the project would not interfere with operation of the helipad or encroach into controlled airspace. This is due to the fact that the highest point of the proposed building (top of roof parapet facing Liberty Street - Elevation 600) would be roughly 22 feet lower than the deck of the helipad (Elevation 622). Additionally, the structure is situated at the south edge of the approach and departure path.

e. Adequate emergency access is available to the proposed medical office building from surrounding City streets and private driveways.

f. The off-street parking standard for "medical-clinic" office uses as specified in Chapter 18.41.040 of the Zoning Ordinance is one space for each 225 square feet of gross leaseable area. Based on this standard, the proposed office building requires 267 parking spaces. Typically, required parking is provided on-site. In this case, the required parking is being met by a combination of basement parking in the proposed building (47 stalls), a small open parking lot at the front of the building (40 stalls), and by acquiring permanent rights to surplus parking in the existing SRMC garage (180 spaces). The Zoning Ordinance allows such off-site parking arrangements, so long as the off-site stalls are convenient to the related use and binding legal arrangements are made that ensure the off-site stalls will always be available. In this case, the off-site stalls are immediately adjacent to the proposed building; there is a reasonable and convenient connection. A formal parking agreement has been approved between SRMC and WestVenture Development.

g. The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) currently operates three fixed routes in the vicinity of the project. This includes Bus Route 2, running along Continental Street, and Routes 3 and 6, along East Street. A passenger shelter is available in front of the hospital for the East Street routes. Thus, convenient public transportation is available nearby to support the project.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Transportation and Health and Safety Elements
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 4, Transportation and Circulation
- City of Redding Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan 2004
- City of Redding Capital Improvement Plan, September 2004
- Redding Municipal Airport Specific Plan Area
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Chapter 16.20 of the Redding Municipal Code (Development Impact Fee Ordinance)
- Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide
- Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 7th Addition
- Traffic Impact Study for WestVenture Office Development, prepared by DEW Traffic, dated August 2006.
- SRMC helipad approach and departure path exhibit
- Parking Agreement between WestVenture Development LLC and Shasta Regional Medical Center LLC, dated August 31, 2005

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 1. Prior to building occupancy, the following off-site traffic-control and street improvements shall be completed:

- a. A traffic signal shall be installed at the intersection of East Street and Yuba Street, along with any necessary lane-delineation revisions.
- b. The intersection of Auditorium Drive, Butte Street, and Park Marina Drive shall be modified based on the recommendations of the project traffic study to reduce PM peak hour congestion for the eastbound ramp approach of State Highway 44, including , but not limited to, adding an eastbound ramp storage lane, lane-delineation revisions, adjustments in signal timing, adding camera detection, and additional street signage and markings.

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

VI. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion

a, b, c, d. The General Plan identifies four habitat types as potentially sensitive and requiring special consideration or protection. These include: riparian, vernal pools, aquatic, and wetlands. Most special status species common to the region are associated with these habitat types. The project site is located in the urban core of the City and is void of any sensitive habitats. Likewise, no special status species are known to frequent the site.

e. There are no significant trees remaining on the project site that are worthy of attention under the City’s Tree Management Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.45). New tree planting will be provided, along with required landscape in accordance with the Tree Management Ordinance and the off-street parking provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 7.3 (Wildlife Habitat)
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.5 (Biological Resources)
- City of Redding Zoning Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18)
- City of Redding Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.45)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 significant mineral resource value or as being located within any "Critical Mineral Resource Overlay" area.

Documentation

- City of Redding Natural Resources Element
- City of Redding General Plan EIR
- City of Redding Zoning Map

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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. The proposed medical office building does not present a significant risk for hazardous materials or emissions.

d. There are no documented or otherwise known hazardous conditions existing on the site from past activity.

e, f. The project is located well outside the approach and departure safety zones for both the Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark. The project also would not impact operation of the SRMC helipad or create an unsafe condition for office works or visitors in the office building due to the proximity of the helipad (see discussion in Section 6.c).

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

h. The project site is not located in an area with wildland-fire-hazard potential.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element and Transportation Element
- 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)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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

Discussion

a, b, c. Overall, the project does not involve a noise-sensitive land use and does not have the potential to be a permanent significant source of noise. State Highway 44 and other transportation-related activity downtown are the primary sources of noise in the surrounding area. Table 5-4 of the Noise Element of the General Plan establishes transportation-noise thresholds for office uses of 45 Ldn/CNEL dB for interior spaces. In this case, use of modern construction and energy-efficient design mandated by the California Building Codes would result in interior noise levels well below General Plan criteria. Thus, the project would not result in exposure of persons to transportation noise levels in excess of established standards.

d. During the construction of project improvements, there could be a temporary increase in noise in the project vicinity above existing ambient noise levels. 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. The City's Zoning Code contains additional restrictions (RMC Chapter 18.40.100.F.2) on the times of construction in close proximity to existing residential uses. Since the heavy construction work associated with the project is limited in scope and by existing regulation, the potential temporary noise impact is considered less than significant.

e, f. As noted above, the project does not involve a noise sensitive land use and would not be affected by the occasional operations of the SRMC Helipad.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Noise Element
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8.7 (Noise)& Appendix C (Noise)
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 11 (Noise)
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 18.40.100 (Noise Standards)
- Redding Municipal Code Chapter 16.12.120.H (Grading Construction Standards)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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), a(5). The City would provide police and fire protection to the project from existing facilities.

a(3), a(4). The project generates no direct demand for other public services such as schools and parks.

Documentation

- City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities and Recreation Elements
- City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 6 (Other Public Facilities and Services)
- City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 7 (Public Facilities and Services)
- Chapter 16.20 of the Redding Municipal Code (Development Impact Fee Ordinance)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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"/>

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 by the project would be limited to that associated with domestic uses discharged into the City sanitary sewer system and has no potential to exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b. Adequate domestic water and sanitary sewer system capacity is available from existing facilities to accommodate the project.
- c. The construction of project-related stormwater drainage improvements has no potential to cause significant environmental effects (also see discussion under Item 4 *Hydrology*).
- d. Potable water is available from the City to serve the project. The demands of the project can be accommodated within existing water allotments.
- e. As noted, the project would utilize the City's sanitary sewer system to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity is available to accommodate the project.
- f, g. The City provides solid waste disposal service, which is available to serve the project. Adequate capacity is available without need of special accommodations. The City also regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 5, Public Facilities and Services
 City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 7, Public Facilities and Services, 1998

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 project site is designated in the General Plan primarily for office development. There are no unique physical or historic land features present on the site or in the vicinity that the General Plan has designated as having significant public value. A physical change

would be noticeable at first, upon the start and duration of construction, but this would be an expected result of normal land development supported under the General Plan. The proposed building height would extend to 4 stories as viewed from Continental Street; 3 stories from Liberty Street. The adjacent SRMC parking structure and main hospital building have similar height characteristics as viewed from westbound State Route 44 and Butte Street east of the site. Thus, the proposed office building would be visually compatible in scale to the adjacent hospital improvements. The nearest homes to the site are located along Yuba Street at the edge of the Garden Tract neighborhood, approximately 450 feet southeast of the site. A shadow study prepared for the project demonstrates that the proposed building would not significantly shade nearby residences. Additionally, the building would not be readily seen from the homes along Yuba Street.

b. The project site is not located adjacent to a State-designated scenic highway.

d. The proposed development would result in typical lighting for security, parking lots, interior spaces and streetlights. Lighting design is subject to the lighting/glare-reduction standards established under Chapter 18.40.090 (Lighting) of the Zoning Code.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Community Development and Design Element and Natural Resources Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report
 City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.40.090 (*Lighting*)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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, d. The project is located on a relatively small urban infill site that has a very low potential for the presence of any historic or prehistoric cultural resources. The City’s standard subdivision and development conditions include a requirement that if any cultural materials are discovered by chance during construction, all work must stop in the area of the find, and the City must be notified. A qualified archaeological professional must then be retained by the developer to review the discovered item(s) and to determine its significance and any appropriate measures.

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

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 7.5 Historic and Cultural Resources

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- 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. The proposed medical office building has no potential to impact park facilities.
- b. The project does not include development of any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources, Recreation, and Public Facilities Elements
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 6.4 Parks and Recreation
 Chapter 16.20 of the Redding Municipal Code (Development Impact Fee Ordinance)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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 by the General Plan or by zoning for agricultural use and is not located in a prime farmland-designated area.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element; Figure 3-4 Prime Farmland
 City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 7.2, Agricultural Resources
 CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, as adopted by the Redding City Council on October 3, 2000, by Resolution 2000-166
 Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974

Mitigation

No mitigation is required under this subject.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project has no potential to directly impact any sensitive habitat or special status species. Additionally, no potential impacts to cultural resources have been identified.
- b. The project would contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) will reduce potential impacts to a level less than significant as explained under Item 5 (Air Quality).
- c. As discussed herein, the project does not have characteristics which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

RFPEIR\UP306-WestVenture-RA-IS.wpd