ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTATION
USE PERMIT UP-6-03, AMENDMENT
HILLTOP VI RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Hilltop VI Retail Development, Use Permit UP-6-03, Amendment

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Redding Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Douglas DeMallie, (530) 225-4028

4. **Project Location:** 1085/1101 Hilltop Drive and 851 Browning Street, Redding, California

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Gateway Pacific Properties, P.O. Box 13250, Sacramento, CA 95813

6. **General Plan Designation:** "RC" Regional Commercial

7. **Zoning:** "RC" Regional Commercial

8. **Description of Project:** Amendment of a previous use permit approval (UP-6-03), granting authorization for development of a multi-tenant retail center of up to a total of 106,548 square feet on property located at 1085 Hilltop Drive. The amendment consists of the addition of parcels located at 1001 Hilltop Drive and 851 Browning Street and an increase in the total building area to 178,000 square feet. The net project area is now 17.2 acres and has street frontage on Hilltop Drive, Browning Street, and Canby Road. The retail development will provide consumer goods and services determined to be acceptable uses under the City of Redding's "RC" Regional Commercial zoning district.

   The project site is currently undeveloped and vegetated with grasses, manzanita, blue oaks, and live oaks. Some grading has occurred under the existing use permit entitlement.

   The proposed project is bound by existing residential (apartments) and commercial uses to the north, existing commercial uses to the east and west, and existing residential (apartments) and commercial uses to the south. Measures have been incorporated into the proposed project design to mitigate potential noise impacts to the residential uses. These include screening walls at trash enclosures and loading docks, parapet walls, and 20-foot rooftop mechanical-unit setbacks.

   The Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans indicates that the proposed 177,528-square-foot project will generate approximately 5,949 daily weekday trips (491 during the PM peak hour) and 7,853 daily weekend trips (765 during the weekend midday peak hour). Two additional northbound lanes along the Hilltop Drive frontage between East Palisades Avenue and Browning Street and a free right-turn lane at the Hilltop Drive/Browning Street intersection will be constructed as part of this project. The lane configuration on the northbound Hilltop Drive approach to Browning Street will include a left-turn lane, two through lanes, a right-turn lane, and a landscaped median. The westbound Browning Street approach will include two left-turn lanes and a through/right-turn lane. The City of Redding Engineering Division plans for Browning Street include two through lanes in each direction, as well as a two-way left turn lane, with left-turn pockets at the approaches to Canby Road, Hilltop Drive, and the proposed project driveways. The southerly half of this cross-section will be completed as part of this project. Additional off-site traffic improvements are required as traffic mitigations as identified in this Initial Study.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** Residential, entailing apartments to the north and south; commercial to the west, east, north, and south.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement:** General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, Regional Water Quality Control Board (nondiscretionary permitting approval); Building Permit, City of Redding; Department of the Army Individual Permit, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Section 401 Water Quality Certification, Regional Water Quality Control Board; Streambed Alteration Agreement, California Department of Fish and Game.

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

Douglas DeMallie

Planning Manager

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.

Attachments:

A. Location map
B. Project site plan
C. Aerial photograph
D. ACOE letter
E. RWQCB letter
F. URBEMIS summary
G. Mitigation monitoring report

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. Have social or economic impacts resulting in a physical deterioration of the environment (economic blight)?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

The General Plan land use designation and zoning district for this site are "RC" Regional Commercial. The proposed development will create six commercial retail buildings totaling approximately 177,528 square feet, which the applicant has stated will be used for sales of general merchandise and possibly a restaurant. The proposed use as a commercial retail facility is consistent with the "Regional Commercial" zoning designation, which calls for areas to accommodate a mix of regional-level retail uses and associated services. As such, the project is considered to be consistent with the "Regional Commercial" General Plan designation and will not divide an existing community.

No land use or planning conflicts would occur in association with the proposed project. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to the project site. The project is not expected to result in physical deterioration of the environment.

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)?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

Based on the General Plan, the proposed development will provide commercial services to the existing population or future housing already anticipated by the General Plan. The project is consistent with the development assumptions anticipated by the land use and zoning specifications for the project site. The project will not displace any existing housing.

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.	❑	❑	❑	☒
(2) Strong seismic ground-shaking?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	❑	❑	❑	☒
(4) Landslides?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	❑	❑	☒	❑
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	❑	❑	☒	❑
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a. The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure, or landslides.

(1)-(3) The project site lies within Seismic Zone 3, which represents an area of moderate seismic risk. No active faults transverse the site. The project site is considered to have low seismic activity, relative to other areas in California, with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. Woodward-Clyde (1995) indicates that the risk of liquefaction at the site is low. Based on the shallow bedrock conditions, generally high fines content, and lack of shallow groundwater, the subsurface materials present at this site are not susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore, no impact would occur with regard to rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic-related ground failure.

(4) Landslides typically occur in saturated soils on steep slopes and in areas where natural/manmade conditions have altered supporting structures and vegetation. The existing and proposed slopes for this project are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. Therefore, no impacts associated with landslides are expected with regard to this project.

b. The project site contains one type of soil, Redding gravelly loam (RdB).

Table 2
Soil Type and Characteristics

Soil Name	Soil Type	Permeability	Slope (%)	Erosion Potential	Runoff Rate
Redding (RdB)	Gravelly loam	Slow	3-8	Slight-moderate	Slow-medium

Preliminary design indicates that the project will result in the grading of ±14.15 acres (cut area of 69,767 cubic yards, fill area of 49,725 cubic yards, export of 20,042 cubic yards) in order to facilitate construction. Some grading encroachment may occur on slopes in excess of 10 percent to accommodate commercial building pads and parking areas and ensure adequate drainage. These construction activities will result in the displacement and overcovering of soil and a change in topographic features. The greatest concern raised by the extent of the proposed grading is the potential for soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation of off-site drainages. Careful application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction will minimize soil erosion and related water quality impacts.

The project is subject to certain erosion-control requirements mandated by existing City and State regulations. These requirements include:

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

- *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit."* This permit overlaps with the City's Grading Ordinance provision by applying State standards for erosion-control measures during construction of the project.

- *California Regional Water Quality Control Board "Project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)."* This plan emphasizes storm water Best Management Practices and is required as part of the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that affect the quality of stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.

With incorporation of the following standard practices, potential impacts associated with grading and soil erosion will be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

1. All applicable provisions of the City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12) shall be met. This will require in part that a qualified erosion and sediment-control specialist be 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, including construction of sewer lines. Grading work shall be of a scale so that all grading can be completed in a single construction season.

2. The developer shall obtain a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit from the State Water Quality Control Board prior to commencement of construction of the subdivision in order to protect water quality from development activities. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared prior to construction activities in order to identify potential pollutants and to eliminate or minimize the potential for those pollutants to enter stormwaters.

3. The developer shall acquire all necessary letters of approval and/or permits from regulatory agencies (e.g., Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board) for altering or working within the existing natural drainage courses prior to the issuance of a City grading permit, commencement of grading activities, and/or construction of utility and drainage infrastructure.

4. Clearing and grading activities shall be limited to the boundaries of the project site being developed and to construction of off-site improvements necessary to serve that site. Off-site material borrowing or stockpiling shall be allowed only where there is no feasible alternative and must be appropriately mitigated.

c, d. The project site is not located in a sensitive geologic area and does not expose people to potential geologic impacts. The City of Redding Building Division will review construction plans before a building permit is issued, and the Engineering Division will review and approve all grading plans to ensure that all grading and structures would withstand shrink-swell potentials and earthquake activity in this area in accordance with applicable codes. The native loamy soils on-site are low to moderately expansive as identified in the Soil Survey of Shasta County. Therefore, the impacts are considered to be less than significant.

e. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impact to soils, relative to supporting use of septic tanks, would occur.

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

Discussion

a, c, f. Development of the site will not result in substantial water-related impacts, as the on-site storm water will be detained in accordance with the City of Redding Storm Water Management requirements. Construction of the proposed project and covering of the site with paving will have an effect on the absorption rate of water on-site; however, the project will include a drainage system designed in accordance with the City's improvement standards which will adequately handle on-site drainage associated with the development of the property. Stormwater detention will be designed to detain the increased storm drainage due to additional development of the property based on 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm frequencies at 6-hour durations. The detention will be designed by the applicant's engineer and approved by the City Engineering Division prior to issuance of a grading permit.

There may be minor amounts of wind and/or water erosion associated with construction of the facility. Standard erosion-control measures will be utilized during construction as delineated in the measures under IIIb above. With implementation of these measures, potential impacts associated with drainage would be reduced to a level less than significant.

b. No groundwater withdrawal is proposed and the proposed project is not anticipated to have a noticeable effect on groundwater supplies.

g, h, i. There are no identified 100-year floodplains associated with this site (Zone "X" on the FIRM panel); therefore, no structures would be placed in a floodplain, and no structures would impede any flood flows. There are no levees or dams in the project vicinity.

j. Since there are no large bodies of water nearby, the threat of seiche and tsunami is nonexistent. Similarly, mudflows are not a concern in the vicinity of the project site.

Documentation

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
City of Redding Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12)
Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	❑	☒	❑	❑
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	❑	☒	❑	❑
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	❑	❑	❑	☒
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

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

The proposed project's land uses would generate vehicle trips that would emit air pollutants. Emissions for future operation of the project are based on the daily trip-generation data provided by the draft W-Trans traffic report dated November 2005, based on the proposed retail commercial proposal. The projected daily average trips for the project are 6,223 trips on a weekday and 8,361 daily trips on weekends. (The projected trips for air quality analysis are actually greater than projected due to a reduction in the project size since the November 2005 draft traffic report.)

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 results were as follows:

	ROG	**NOx**	**PM10**
Total Emissions (lbs./day)	62.16	78.07	78.46

The analysis indicates that the project would result in emissions of key pollutants that are above the Level "A" threshold with regard to ROG and NOx, yet below the Level "B" threshold. Hence, application of SMM and BAMM are required in order to achieve a net emission reduction objective of 20 percent or more in accordance with General Plan policy. SMM applicable to the project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction and are noted below. Five BAMM emission credit categories have been determined as feasible and applicable to the project as follows:

1. Compact Urban Emission Credit (CUEC). The project is located within the CUEC core area identified in the City's Air Quality Element and therefore is eligible for a 15.5 percent emission mitigation credit. No project-specific mitigation is required for this credit, as it applies to the project's location.
2. Public Transit Credits. The project is located adjacent to Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) public bus routes on Hilltop Drive and Browning Street. RABA provides service at 30-minute headways in this area. Typical street frontage improvements would require a bus pull-out and widened sidewalk for a bus stop on Browning Street. A bus stop is not planned on the Hilltop Drive frontage of the project, since a better location is on the north side of the Hilltop Drive/Browning Street intersection. This bus stop improvement, with the **addition** of a standard bus shelter, provides an emission credit of 2.5 percent. The credit is mainly allowed by the shelter, which is beyond standard improvements and will encourage use of transit by making it more convenient.
3. Traffic Flow Improvement. The project will provide additional travel lanes and dedicated turn lanes on Hilltop Drive and Browning Street that will improve existing and project-related traffic-congestion conditions. The emission credit for these improvements is 2 percent.
4. Bicycle Rack. The project will include the provision of bicycle racks in accordance with the City's Parking Ordinance. The emission credit for this feature is 0.5 percent.
5. Carpool. The project will provide 10 on-site dedicated parking spaces for car/van pool service. The emission credit for this feature is 0.5 percent.

Based on these five BAMM categories, the project can achieve a net emission reduction credit of 20 percent, which is consistent with General Plan policy. The project's potential cumulative impact to air quality is therefore determined to be less than significant with incorporation of the BAMM and the applicable SMM identified below.

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 and the City shall ensure that the following 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.

PM10 emissions are found to be under the thresholds established by the City of Redding. A portion of the PM10 emissions would be generated by delivery trucks driving to and from the project site. It is estimated that, at most, 15 diesel trucks will access the site in a given day. Policy will be for trucks to spend less than 20 minutes at the site loading and/or unloading trailers and, when stationary during loading, the trucks are not to idle their engines. Accordingly, only a small portion of total diesel exhaust from these trucks would be emitted at the project site. The California Air Resources Board recognizes that a comprehensive statewide plan is superior to a project-by-project, or piecemeal, approach to addressing diesel exhausts and has developed a diesel risk-reduction plan designed to reduce health risks from on- and off-road mobile sources of diesel exhaust. Consequently, diesel emissions are considered to be less than significant and would not constitute a substantial health risk.

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
Hilltop VI Traffic Impact Study, prepared by W-Trans, November 2005

Mitigation

1. The SMM and improvements to achieve a 20 percent emission reduction per City policy listed under **a,c.** above are mitigation measures incorporated into the project or into the conditions of approval which will reduce potential air quality impacts to a level less than significant. The project will also incorporate existing Grading Ordinance measures for dust control during construction, including an erosion-control plan with the planting and seeding of bare ground, which will reduce dust.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	❑	☒	❑	❑
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	❑	❑	❑	☒
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	❑	❑	❑	☒
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	❑	❑	❑	☒
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a, b, d. As a proposal for 177,528 square feet of building space at the retail core of Redding, the project has the potential to produce notable additional vehicle trips on street within and leading to the project vicinity. To assess the potential for project-related impacts

on the nearby street system, a traffic analysis for the project was prepared by the consulting firm W-Trans. This project traffic impact study is dated September 15, 2006, and is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference.

The study assesses traffic conditions at 21 street intersections and on seven street segments in the project vicinity during the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday mid-day peak hour. The analysis also considers the four project driveway locations (one on Hilltop Drive, two on Browning Street, and one on Canby Road). The existing traffic conditions are identified at these locations and then assessed under the following scenarios: (1) Existing + Pending Projects, (2) Existing + Pending Projects + Proposed Project, (3) Year 2025 No Project, and (4) Year 2025 + Approved Projects + Proposed Project. The analysis factors in short-term circulation improvements planned in the area and the following improvements which are a component of the project proposal: (1) street widening and striping necessary to create two northbound vehicle lanes on Hilltop Drive between East Palisades Avenue and Browning Street; (2) widening of Hilltop Drive to create a free-right turn lane northbound Hilltop Drive to eastbound Browning Street; (3) widening of Browning Street adjacent to the project site to create one westbound vehicle lane, two eastbound vehicle lanes, and a center left-turn lane along the project frontage; and (4) frontage curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Utilizing operation standards established in the Transportation Element of the Redding General Plan, the analysis concludes:

- The project is expected to add 5,949 new daily trips to area streets and intersections on weekdays, including 491 trips during the PM peak hour. The project will add 7,853 new daily trips on Saturday, including 765 during the Saturday mid-day peak hour.

- Under existing conditions, the intersections of North Market Street/Lake Boulevard, Dana Drive/Churn Creek Road, and Hilltop Drive/Browning Street are operating unacceptably. All street segments are operating acceptably.

- With the addition of traffic associated with the Proposed Project and Pending Projects, it is projected that the intersection of Browning Street/Canby Road would operate unacceptably during the PM peak hour in addition to the intersections that are currently operating unacceptably and that the street segments of Hilltop Drive between Rockaway Drive and Browning Street, Hilltop Drive south of Lake Boulevard, and Churn Creek Road south of College View Drive will necessitate improvements.

- Under future Year 2025 conditions, the project will contribute to unacceptable operations at the intersections of N. Market Street/Lake Boulevard, Lake Boulevard/Hilltop Drive, Hilltop Drive/SR 44 EB ramps, Churn Creek Road/SR 299 WB ramps, and Churn Creek Road/SR 299 EB ramps.

Hilltop Drive/Browning Street/Mission de Oro Drive Intersection

The Hilltop VI traffic analysis references the Highland Park Subdivision project, a pending application for 420 residential units on 95 acres located approximately 0.7 mile north of the Hilltop 6 project site. This project is included under the Pending Projects and Year 2025 traffic scenarios of the Hilltop VI study. A draft traffic study has been prepared for the Highland Park project by the consulting firm Omni-Means. An emphasis of this study is impacts on the interface between the intersection of Hilltop Drive/Browning Street and Browning Street/Mission de Oro Drive. The close spacing of these two intersections, approximately 175 feet, at peak times currently restricts turning movements due to stacking on Browning Street through the Mission de Oro Drive intersection. This intersection is greatly impacted by both the Hilltop VI and Highland Park projects. In draft form, the Highland Park study initially proposed signalizing the Browning Street/Mission de Oro Drive intersection and having it operate as a single intersection in conjunction with the Browning Street/Hilltop Drive signal (i.e., single controller). City staff found this mitigation to be unacceptable. A revised draft of the Highland Park study offers two other alternative mitigations: (1) construction of a traffic roundabout at a new intersection of Hilltop Drive and Mission de Oro Drive to the north or (2) a realignment of Mission de Oro Drive to intersect Browning Street farther to the east. Due to engineering design constraints associated with the roundabout, at this time the realignment/relocation of the Browning Street/Mission de Oro Drive intersection is appears be the most feasible option. The Hilltop VI traffic study indicates that without use of the mitigations identified in the Highland Park report, left-turn movements from the project's westerly Browning Street driveway should be prohibited by signage and concrete obstruction. A more viable option identified by staff is to shift the driveway east a minimum of 215 feet east of the Mission de Oro Drive centerline to avoid the left-turn conflict. To facilitate this driveway shift *and* the potential relocation of the Mission de Oro Drive/Browning Street intersection, staff has also identified the need to modify the project site plan to realign the project's main internal driveway to match the future realigned intersection.

In addition, dual Browning Street westbound left-turn lanes are necessary at Hilltop Drive to avoid stacking through the Mission de Oro Drive intersection.

Hilltop Drive Median

The project site plan illustrates a median in Hilltop Drive that would prevent left-turn outbound movements from the project driveway but allow left-turn inbound movements. City staff has determined that this is not feasible, since adequate stacking cannot be provided in the left-turn pockets in Hilltop Drive, and the design does not accommodate adequate turning space for large vehicles. Staff has determined that the left-in movement is not necessary in view of the access from Browning Street for trips originating from the north and that superior access is provided to the property on the west side of Hilltop Drive from the signalized intersection at Browning Street and at Rockaway Drive.

Caltrans Comments

In its letter, Caltrans notes that the traffic study identifies that project traffic will add to trips to the State system at North Market Street/Lake Boulevard (SR 299), Lake Boulevard (SR 299)/Hilltop Drive, and SR 299 WB ramps/Churn Creek Road. (The study also looks at the Hilltop Drive/SR 44 EB ramps, but recommends an improvement already in place.) The project traffic analysis identifies that the intersection of N. Market Street/Lake Boulevard (SR 229) currently operates at a substandard Level of Service (LOS) "E" during the weekday PM peak hour and will be further degraded by Pending Projects to weekday PM peak hour LOS "F" and Saturday mid-day peak LOS "D." The project would add to the delay at this intersection, but not cause the service level to further degrade beyond the Pending Project levels. Project impacts at the other State facilities are not projected until the cumulative Year 2025 scenario. The payment of the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) in this case, is viewed as addressing cumulative impacts. While improvements to these facilities are currently not factored into the TIF, the purpose of the TIF program is to improve transportation facilities benefitting the entire community (as opposed to specific project-related facilities); and TIF funding priority is reevaluated on an ongoing basis to address pressing street/intersection needs that may include shared State/City facilities.

Caltrans also notes that the traffic study assumes 20 percent of project traffic coming from the south on Hilltop Drive. Caltrans suggests that given this, the I-5/Cypress Avenue interchange should be addressed, apparently on the assumption that the 20 percent travels through this intersection. City staff does not agree, as portions of the 20 percent volume are existing drive-by traffic, originate east of I-5, or exit off I-5 at the off-ramp north of Cypress Avenue.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Transportation Element, 2000

Hilltop VI Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans, September 15, 2006

Draft Highland Park Subdivision Traffic Impact Analysis Prepared by Omni-Means, July 27, 2006, *Unpublished*

Mitigation

The following improvements **included in the project proposal** serve to mitigate identified project traffic impacts:

2. Necessary pavement widening and striping of Hilltop Drive between East Palisades Avenue and Browning Street to create two northbound vehicle lanes and paved shoulder; curb, gutter, and sidewalk along project frontage.

3. Pavement widening to create a northbound Hilltop Drive to eastbound Browning Street free right-turn lane.

4. Construction of a complete raised median in Hilltop Drive the length of the project frontage with a left-turn pocket at Browning Street *(the project proposal included a break in the median to allow left-in turn movements; inadequate stacking distances and turn radii make this infeasible)*.

5. Widening of Browning Street based upon its ultimate centerline to accommodate one eastbound vehicle lane; two westbound vehicle lanes; a median left-turn lane; and curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the project frontage.

Additional mitigations necessary as identified in the project traffic analysis and City staff analysis:

6. Necessary right-of-way acquisition; pavement widening; curb and gutter improvements at the Rockaway Drive driveway, extending north to existing curb and gutter; and striping to create two southbound vehicle travel lanes and shoulder on Hilltop Drive between Browning Street and Rockaway Drive.

7. The Browning Street improvements shall include dual left-turn movements from westbound Browning Street to southbound Hilltop Drive.

8. Outbound (i.e., westbound) left-turn movements shall be prohibited at the westerly Browning Street driveway through construction of a raised median in Browning Street. As an alternative, the driveway may be shifted a minimum of 215 feet east of the centerline of Mission de Oro Drive, which would allow the left-turn movement.

9. The easterly Browning Street driveway shall be relocated from what is shown on the project application site plan to align with and facilitate a future realignment of the Mission de Oro Drive/Browning Street intersection as identified in the Draft Highland Park Subdivision Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Omni-Means and the site graded accordingly to allow for proper sight distance at the driveway.

10. A traffic signal shall be installed at the intersection of Canby Road and Browning Street prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

11. Payment of the City's Citywide Traffic Impact Fee and Dana Drive Traffic Impact Fee (fair share of impacts to Hilltop Drive, Churn Creek Road, Churn Creek Road/Dana Drive intersection and cumulative Year 2025 impacts; estimated fees are $1,452,010.39 for Citywide TIF and $217,757.62 for Dana Drive TIF).

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	❑	❑	☒	❑
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	❑	☒	❑	❑
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	❑	❑	❑	☒
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	❑	❑	❑	☒
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a. No special-status plant or animal species, or their potential habitats, were observed during a field survey (April 2003 and September 2005) of the project site, conducted by the firm ENPLAN in April 2003 and March 2005, nor have any been recorded in the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) on or near the project site. Discussions with Department of Fish and Game staff also indicated that there is little potential for special-status species to occur on or near the project site.

b, c. Field delineations completed in April 2003 and March 2005 show that one intermittent stream, with an adjacent wetted margin and emergent wetland, and two wet meadows are the only identified jurisdictional waters on-site, totaling ±0.09 acre. The principal source of water for the stream, adjacent wetted margin, and emergent wetland is flow from upstream lands. This flow is discharged to the site via a culvert under Hilltop Drive/Browning Street. Additional water sources include direct precipitation and runoff from the site itself. On the subject site, the intermittent stream is about 600 feet in length and flows in a southeasterly direction, exiting the site through a 36" culvert. The stream totals 0.053 acre, the adjacent wetland totals 0.022 acre, and the emergent wetland totals 0.006 acre. Also occurring on the site 0.009 acre of jurisdictional wet meadow. One wet meadow, 0.006 acre, is located approximately 40 feet east of the stream. A second wet meadow, approximately 0.003 acre, is located farther to the east of the jurisdictional intermittent stream and wet meadow. The wet meadows receive water primarily from surface runoff and subsurface flow. The applicant has secured an Individual Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Permit #200300394) and a Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, authorizing the placement of fill within jurisdictional waters to develop the project as proposed (July 19, 2006, letter from ACOE to Kent Hallen; December 13, 2005, letter from CRWCB to Kent Hallen). Mitigation for loss of these waters has been provided through purchase of mitigation credits in a wetlands bank. The project will also require a State Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement. The State does not issue such agreements until the project CEQA process has been completed.

d. The intermittent stream occurring on-site does not provide suitable habitat for anadromous fish; therefore, filling this stream channel will have no effect on migratory fish.

The on-site annual grassland and oak woodland communities have minimal potential to provide significant habitat for nesting birds given the extent of previous earth disturbance and location in an intense urban commercial setting. Migratory birds are provided protection under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which established that all migratory birds and their parts (including eggs, nests, and feathers) are fully protected. To ensure that migratory birds are not adversely affected by project implementation, vegetation removal should be completed prior to arrival of the migratory birds or after the young have fledged. According to Department of Fish

and Game staff, most birds nest between April 1 and July 31; removal of vegetation at other times of the year (August 1 through March 31) is unlikely to affect nesting (B. Deuel, pers. comm.). Because the site is entirely surrounded by commercial development and other urban uses and the site does not represent a contiguous connection to any other important or heavily wooded open space, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with raptor nesting or a migratory wildlife corridor.

e. The eastern portion of the project area is characterized as oak woodland vegetation, while the western portion is largely annual grassland vegetation. Loss of these resources is anticipated by the City's General Plan and its designation of the property for "Regional Commercial" land use and is not a significant impact in this setting. The project design will comply with the City's Tree Management Ordinance.

f. The project site is not located within any local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

Documentation

California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base Search, 2005
Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000
Prejurisdictional Delineation Report of the Hilltop Drive Parcel prepared by ENPLAN, April 2003, June 2004, March 2005
City of Redding Tree Management Ordinance (RMC Chapter 18.45)
City of Redding General Plan EIR

Mitigation

12. Mitigation for the loss of the on-site jurisdictional waters will be achieved through the mitigation agreement associated with the project ACOE 404 permit. The Department of Fish and Game has indicated that fulfillment of Corps mitigation requirements will be sufficient to offset adverse effects on habitat.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

The project site is not known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project is not considered to have any significant impacts on mineral resources.

Documentation

City of Redding Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

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

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

Discussion

a, b, c, g. The proposed development project does not include storage and/or use of toxic and/or flammable materials at the project site. The project does not include gasoline sales. This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services. The project will cause a less-than-significant impact with regard to the City's Disaster Response Plan. In addition, conditions have been applied to the project requiring compliance with all local, State, and Federal requirements for the handling and/or storage of hazardous materials. As such, potential impacts associated with hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.

d. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Reports prepared in 2003 and updated in 2006 for the proposed project did not identify the site as a hazardous materials site and found no significant hazards to the public or environment.

e, f. The project is not located within an airport land use plan area, no airports are located within two miles of the project site, and the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No significant impacts are anticipated with regards to safety hazards associated with airports or airstrips.

h. There are some undeveloped parcels to the northeast of the project site (separated from the project site by Browning Street) that are dominated by herbaceous and woody vegetation; however, the site is primarily surrounded by urban land uses and the threat of wildfire is less than significant.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Health and Safety Element, 2000
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-003, ENPLAN, June 2003
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-002, ENPLAN, November 2003
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-001, ENPLAN, March 2005
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report Update for AP Numbers 107-260-001, -003, -005, -006, -007, -008, ENPLAN, April 2006
City of Redding Disaster Response Plan, 1997
Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Update, Hilltop Drive at Browning Street, ENPLAN, April 2006

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?	❑	☒	❑	❑

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	❑	❑	☒	❑
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❑	❑	☒	❑
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❑	☒	☒	❑
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	❑	❑	❑	☒
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a, c. A noise analysis prepared by Eco-Analysts in October 2003 and updated by ENPLAN in 2005 to reflect project changes determined existing and projected noise levels at the project site and the adjacent apartment complex to the south of the project site. A noise analysis prepared by Bollard and Brennan, Inc. (2002) for the Browning Street Extension Project determined traffic noise contributions at the nearest residence (apartments) to the north. This study anticipated noise impacts due to future traffic levels on Browning Street, and mitigation was incorporated into the Browning Street project accordingly. The City of Redding General Plan (Table 5-4) lists 60 dB Ldn as the maximum exterior noise level allowable in residential areas resulting from transportation noise.

The study indicates that the noise levels along the portion of the southern property line shared with the adjacent apartment complex currently exceed the maximum noise level (60 dB Ldn) established in the City's General Plan and that development of the project site will act as a noise barrier for the complex by reducing noise originating from Canby Road. Noise generated from Canby Road and the Home Depot shopping center currently exceeds the General Plan standards for residential areas. The study concludes that the project will produce an overall increase of less than 1 dB, which will not be a significant impact, since a 1 dB increase in sound is not perceptible to the human ear. This increase is mainly attributed to the anticipated increase in traffic along Canby Road, which will access the site via the eastern driveway, to be located along the southern property line immediately adjacent to the apartments.

The project proposes a driveway from Canby Road on its southern boundary, directly adjacent to two-story apartment buildings on Jamieson Court. Based on a similar noise analysis of the potential impacts of parking lot and truck delivery noise (Acoustical Analysis for Wal-Mart Expansion Study) on adjacent residential uses, it is expected that the noise levels at the apartment property line would range from 50 dBA to 55 dBA, with up to 68 dBA instantaneous noise. In order to mitigate potential noise impacts to a level less than significant, the mitigation measures as identified below include construction of a sound barrier along this section of the south property line.

The noise analysis also addressed potential noise impacts from rooftop mechanical equipment, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by setting the equipment back from the south wall of Building C.

b. Groundborne vibrations (should they occur) are not expected to create an impact. Proposed construction activities (e.g., earthwork) could expose persons to ground vibrations; however, these activities are temporary in nature (being associated with construction of the facility) and are not anticipated to result in unusual or excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

d. Construction activities would not affect the permanent ambient noise level. Neighboring uses may experience short-term increases in noise levels during construction. However, these minor increases are associated with construction activities and would only occur for a short period of time. The project would be subject to the City of Redding Noise Ordinance, restricting construction hours within 500 feet of a residential district to the following periods:

- May 15 through September 15: Prohibited between the weekday hours of 7 PM and 6 AM and weekends and holidays between 8 PM and 9 AM.
- September 16 through May 14: Prohibited between the weekday hours of 7 PM and 7 AM and weekends and holidays between 8 PM and 9 AM.

e, f. The proposed project site 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

City of Redding General Plan Noise Element, 2000
City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, Noise Standards, Section 18.40.100
Letter related to refrigeration compressor noise, Perry Butcher & Associates, dated March 20, 2003
Environmental Noise Analysis for the Browning Street Extension Project, dated February 7, 2002, by Bollard and Brennan, Inc.
Noise Assessment submitted by Eco-Analysts, dated October 28, 2003
Noise Assessment update by ENPLAN, December 2005
Hilltop VI Traffic Impact Study, prepared by W-Trans, November 2005 and July 2006
Acoustical Analysis for Wal-Mart Expansion Study, June 2003

Mitigation

13. To minimize noise levels at the adjoining apartments, roof-mounted heating/cooling units will be placed at least 30 feet back from the southern edge of the Building C rooftop, and a solid screening wall will be constructed along the roof edges facing the apartments, with a minimum height equal to the height of the equipment.

14. To attenuate traffic and truck delivery noise in relation to the residential apartments on Jamieson Court to the south of the project site, an 8-foot-high, solid masonry perimeter wall will be constructed along the south property line adjacent to the Jamieson Court apartments' property line.

15. To attenuate truck delivery/loading noise, the truck delivery dock on the east side of Building B will incorporate a 10-foot-high solid masonry screen wall.

16. Truck delivery hours utilizing the Canby Road driveway will be limited to between 7 AM and 10 PM.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
(1) Fire protection?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(2) Police protection?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(3) Schools?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(4) Parks?	❑	❑	☒	❑
(5) Other public facilities?	❑	❑	☒	❑

Discussion

As the city grows, additional demands are placed upon its fire and police protection services. These services expand as revenues and budgeting decisions allow. The City has determined that development of the project will not have a significant adverse effect on its existing or future ability to provide fire and police protection services. The project will have minor secondary impacts to park use demands and school capacities, but at a less-than-significant level.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Public Facilities Element, 2000

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	❑	❑	❑	☒
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	❑	❑	☒	❑
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	❑	❑	☒	❑
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	❑	❑	☒	❑
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

Adequate services are available to the project; therefore, impacts to utilities are considered to be less than significant. Water and sewer services will be provided by the City of Redding, and are currently available to the site with adequate capacity. Stormwater will be collected and detained on-site and transferred via an underground conveyance system to the City's storm-drain system. The City of Redding Solid Waste Division will collect solid waste. The proposed project will provide the required trash enclosures/pallet enclosures and trash compactor units, as shown on the site plan. Pacific Gas & Electric Company will provide natural gas service, and the City of Redding will provide electrical services. Pacific Bell Telephone Company will provide telephone services.

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

Discussion

a, b. The project site is currently undeveloped land containing oak woodland and annual grassland communities. The proposed project will not affect any scenic vista, scenic highway, or area of scenic resources.

c. The City's Planning Division has reviewed the site design and building heights with regard to the City Zoning Code and Commercial Design Criteria. The proposed development will be in conformance with the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Commercial Design Criteria and will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d. Parking lot lighting and retail building lighting will be included as part of the proposed project. During the project review process, site lighting will be reviewed for aesthetic concerns, as well as on-site conflicts and off-site glare. The project is located next to sensitive receptors (e.g., residential); therefore, the lighting design will use shielded lights as required by Section 18.40.090 of the City of Redding Zoning Ordinance. The project has been designed to ensure that all exterior lighting is directed on-site, to reduce overspill and glare, and to ensure that light and glare impacts upon the adjacent residential properties and roadways are reduced to less-than-significant levels.

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

Discussion

A cultural resources survey of the project site was completed by ENPLAN in October 2003 and April 2005.

Evidence of prehistoric and historic use was encountered at 11 separate locations on APN 107-260-003. Of this total, six locations were determined to contain isolated occurrences of artifacts and were recorded as isolates. Of the remaining five locations, one prehistoric and two historic sites (dish drop and trash drop) were recorded. The remaining two locations were destroyed prior to recordation due to a fire and fire fuel-break construction. Subsurface testing was performed at the prehistoric site, and the site was subsequently determined to be a highly-disturbed, low-density sparse lithic scatter.

No prehistoric or historic resources were encountered on APN 107-260-001 or -007.

With research, it was determined that the historic sites are not significant under the criteria of Section 106 or of CEQA and are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources. Accidental encounter of buried cultural resources or human remains cannot be entirely disregarded. Therefore, if such resources are unearthed during construction activities, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Documentation

Extended Phase I Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Hilltop Retail Development Project, Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2003

Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for a Proposed Retail/Commercial Development in City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2005

Mitigation

17. A qualified archaeologist or local Native American representative shall be allowed on the site during the grading or other earth disturbance or removal activities. The designated representative shall be given 48 hours' notice of the commencement of the work with a copy to the City Planning Division. If, in the course of development, any historical or cultural resources are uncovered, construction activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the City of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant, appropriate mitigation(s) shall be required prior to any resumption of work on the project. The applicant is not obligated to compensate the monitor and may require liability indemnification for the monitor.

18. If buried human remains are encountered during grading or construction activities, all ground-disturbing activities shall be halted within a 100-foot radius of the discovery until the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist examine the remains and make a determination as to their significance and origin. Further treatment of any human remains shall be in accordance with California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

Impacts to park facilities are considered less than significant. As a nonresidential development project, the proposal is not expected to generate any significant additional demand for recreation opportunities or impact existing or proposed recreational facilities in Redding.

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?	❑	❑	❑	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?	❑	❑	❑	☒
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

No agricultural resources are present on the site, nor is it zoned for agricultural use. The RdB Redding gravelly loam soil type on the property is typically rated for agricultural use as range and dryland pasture. This soil type has low fertility, is characterized by hardpan and cobblestones, and is not adequate for crops or irrigation. The project site has not been used for agricultural purposes in the past. The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

Documentation

City of Redding General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000

USDA, SCS, and Forest Service Soil Survey of Shasta County, California, 1974

Mitigation

None necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	❑	☒	❑	❑
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	❑	☒	❑	❑
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	❑	❑	❑	☒

Discussion

a. As discussed under Section VI: Transportation/Circulation, if unmitigated, the project has the potential to add to a degradation of street facilities in the project vicinity. Mitigation Measures 2 through 11 reduce these impacts to less than significant. As discussed under Section VII: Biological Resources, if unmitigated, the project has the potential to result in the loss of approximately 0.09 acre of Waters of the United States, may potentially impact migratory bird nesting, and will affect trees currently present on the project site. Mitigation Measure 12, presented in Section VII: Biological Resources, has been established to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. As discussed in Section XIII: Cultural Resources, if unmitigated, the project has the potential to result in the loss of important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Mitigation Measures 17 and 18, presented in Section XIII: Cultural Resources, have been established to reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

b. As discussed in Section V: Air Quality, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the General Plan, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMM) and Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMM) will reduce potential impacts from this project to a level less than significant. The project may also add to cumulative traffic impacts in the project vicinity as identified in Section VI: Transportation/Circulation. Mitigation Measure 11 identifies project participation in existing City financing programs as offsetting the project's share of the impacts.

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 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000
Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures
California Department of Fish and Game: Natural Diversity Data Base Search, 2005
Prejurisdictional Delineation Report of the Hilltop Drive Parcel prepared by ENPLAN, April 2003, June 2004, March 2005
City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, 2005
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-003, ENPLAN, June 2003
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-002, ENPLAN, November 2003
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for AP Number 107-260-001, ENPLAN, March 2005
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report Update for AP Numbers 107-260-001, -003, -005, -006, -007, -008, ENPLAN, April 2006 Environmental Noise Analysis for the Browning Street Extension Project, dated February 7, 2002, by Bollard and Brennan, Inc.
Noise Assessment submitted by Eco-Analysts, dated October 28, 2003
Noise Assessment update by ENPLAN, December 2005
Acoustical Analysis for Wal-mart Expansion Study, June 2003
Hilltop VI Traffic Impact Study, prepared by W-Trans, November 2005 and September 2006
Extended Phase I Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for the Proposed Hilltop Retail Development Project, Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2003
Cultural Resources Inventory Survey for a Proposed Retail/Commercial Development in City of Redding, Shasta County, California, ENPLAN, 2005