

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

General Plan Amendment 13-002
Zone Amendment 13-004
Tract Map 2003

Stephens

December 2, 2016

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY &
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
with
References and Documentation

Prepared by
SHASTA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, California 96001

**SHASTA COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

- 1. Project Title:**
General Plan Amendment 13-002, Zone Amendment 13-004, and Tract Map 2003
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, CA 96001-1759
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Lio Salazar, Associate Planner (530) 225-5532
- 4. Project Location:**
The approximately 122.69-acre project site is located in the Cottonwood area on the west side of Rhonda Road, approximately one-mile north of the intersection of Castlewood Drive and Rhonda Road.
- 5. Applicant Name and Address:**
Mark Stephens
1171 Canyon Drive
Hollister, CA 95023
- 6. General Plan Designation:**
Rural Residential A (RA)
- 7. Zoning:**
Planned Development (PD)
- 8. Description of Project:**
The project is a General Plan and zone amendment from the Rural Residential A (RA) General Plan land use designation to the Suburban Residential-One Unit Per Acre (SR-1) General Plan land use designation and from the current Planned Development (PD) zone district to a PD zone district specific to the proposed project or other appropriate General Plan and Zoning designations to facilitate the merger and re-subdivision of three parcels of land totaling approximately 122-acres to create a proposed 102-parcel residential land division including 98 suburban residential lots ranging from 6,000-square-feet to 16,645-square feet in size, a 36.6-acre open space parcel, a 59.1-acre residential parcel, and two approximately one-acre residential parcels. Extension of urban water and sewer services to the project would require annexation to the Cottonwood Water District and County Service Area #17, respectively. Required project improvements would include street, electric, water, and sewer utilities. The project could be developed in four phases.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project site is situated between approximately 600 and 650 feet above sea level and is located in a blue oak woodland. The topography of the site is dominated by the presence of numerous canyon features. The canyon bottoms are bordered by moderately steep hillsides that transition to relatively level terraces. Numerous seasonal drainages are present on the site. The seasonal drainages originate at the terraced areas, pass through the canyon features, and confluence into a single drainage that flows off-site near the south east corner of the property. This drainage historically

discharged to Cottonwood Creek, but now appears to discharge to the Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District canal. Several of the seasonal drainage features and stream courses have been impounded creating ponds that currently provide stock water for livestock operations on the property.

The blue oak woodland canopy is dominated by blue oaks. The understory is composed of a patchy shrub layer consisting of representative blue oak woodland shrub species interspersed with annual grasses. The seasonal drainages and stock ponds are mostly dry by late spring and the shallow man made ponds (impoundments) are mostly dry by mid-summer. As a result, the seasonal drainage features and ponds at the property generally lack riparian vegetation, although a few cottonwoods and willows are present along some of the ponds. Existing improvements at the property include the ponds natural surface perimeter access road, natural surface interior access road, cross-fencing, and livestock pens. Some areas of terrace have been disturbed by trespass and illegal dumping of junk and refuse.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

Local Agency Formation Commission / Annexation to Cottonwood Water District and County Service Area #17

Shasta County Department of Public Works / Encroachment Permit

Cottonwood Fire Protection District (CFPD) /Mello-Roos District or other CFPD financing mechanism

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.

	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation / Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

9 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

9 I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a **Potentially significant impact** or **Potentially significant unless mitigated** impact 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. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

9 I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Lio Salazar, Associate Planner at (530) 225-5532.

Lio Salazar, AICP
Senior Planner

Date

Richard W. Simon, AICP
Director of Resource Management

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except ANo Impact@ answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A ANo Impact@ answer is adequately supported if all the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A ANo Impact@ answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. APotentially Significant Impact@ is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more, APotentially Significant Impact@ entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) ANegative Declaration: Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated@ applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from APotentially Significant Impact@ to a ALess-than-significant Impact.@ The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, AEarlier Analyses,@ may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are ALess-than-significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,@ describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. General Plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project=s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify the following:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

I. <u>AESTHETICS</u>: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			Y	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				Y
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		Y		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		Y		

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a-b) The areas that would be developed within the project site are generally at the same elevation as lands east and west of the project site and higher in elevation than lands to the north and south. Scenic vistas in the vicinity include the Klamath and northern Coast mountain ranges to the west; and the southern Cascade and northern Sierra Nevada mountain ranges to the east. Views of these features from nearby developed properties are generally obscured by trees. Many of these view obscuring trees are of similar or greater in height than a typical single story residential building. The nearest developed property is approximately 200 feet from the project site. The front and rear elevations of the single-family residence on this property face south and north, respectively. The project site is not visible from a designated scenic highway. Therefore, the project would not substantially impact scenic resources or vistas or scenic resources within a state highway.
- c) The project surroundings are rural in character. The development pattern in the vicinity consists of large parcels, generally 10 acres or more in size, which developed primarily with single family residential uses or are undeveloped. Other uses in the vicinity include a church and pet cemetery. The church and pet cemetery parcels are also developed with single-family residences for the church parson and pet cemetery owner/manager. Existing buildings developed on residential properties along Rhonda Road are setback 30-feet or more from the road. Some of these properties have built solid (stucco) walls and/or decorative (climbing vegetation on open wire or wrought iron) fencing.

The project site is located within the Cottonwood Water District sphere of influence. The District has committed to providing water service for the project with the condition that the property be annexed to the district. The Shasta County Service Area #17 (CSA) has made a commitment to provide sewer service for the project based on its 2013 Sewer Master Plan and on the condition that CSA sphere of influence be extended to the property and that the property be annexed to the CSA. The project site is also located within the Cottonwood Fire Protection District and is near goods and services offered in downtown Cottonwood and a relatively recently developed commercial area in the City of Anderson. Therefore, the project is or will be served by a range of existing and planned urban services that are consistent with the property being positioned within the Cottonwood Town Center and the proposed SR-1 (maximum residential density of one dwelling units per acre) General Plan land use designation.

Nevertheless, while the proposed development density of one-dwelling unit per acre is significantly less dense than the potential maximum residential density allowed by the suburban General Plan land use designation (3 d.u./acre), the project incorporates variable lot sizes and density averaging to allow for minimum parcel sizes that are significantly less than one acre in size with 98 of the 102 proposed lots ranging from 16,645 square-feet down to 6,000 square-feet in size. This pattern of development will significantly impact the existing visual quality of the existing rural setting which is currently characterized by a relatively open landscape. Twenty-nine (29) of the proposed 98 urban lots would front Rhonda Road and/or a new subdivision road (Road E) that may serve as a collector road for potential future development on lands west of the project site. The following measures are recommended to reduce the visual impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level.

- 1) A building setback line of 20 feet from the rear property line and/or street side lot line shall be established for those lots with frontage on Rhonda Road and proposed subdivision Road "E";
- 2) The developer shall, prior to recording a final map to create lots

1,2,5,6, 33, and 77 through 98, construct a 7-foot-tall solid wall along and/or setback from the rear property and/or street side lot lines of said lots. The architectural design of the wall shall incorporate at least three unique materials and/or finishes and design elements that provide architectural relief. If landscaping is incorporated in the design of the wall it shall not be in lieu of the wall, but shall be considered to represent a unique material. Any associated landscaping shall comply with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO). The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. Maintenance of the wall and landscaping shall be provided through the formation of a homeowners association.

The proposed building setback line would reduce building bulk and potentially encourage landscaping of rear yards, including tree planting, along the street frontage. The proposed wall would create a uniform and aesthetically pleasing presentation along the street frontage and reduce the negative visual impacts that may be associated with a potential hodge podge of good neighbor fencing constructed of various materials and in varied states of maintenance and repair, and/or unobstructed views into rear yards. If these measures are implemented the negative impact of the project on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less-than-significant.

- d) The existing nighttime environment in the vicinity of the project site is relatively dark. There is no existing street lighting in the vicinity of the project site and lighting associated with existing development is relatively minimal and dispersed. Sky glow from lighting in the urbanized areas of Cottonwood and the City of Anderson is visible from properties in the vicinity.

The project does not include any potential source of glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The project would introduce new sources of light, residential outdoor lighting fixtures potentially including street lighting. As discussed in section I (c) above, urban services available to the project site are consistent with the property being positioned within the Cottonwood Town Center and the proposed urban General Plan land use designation. Nonetheless, the introduction of suburban development in this area would substantially increase light over existing baseline conditions nearby. The following measures are recommended to reduce the impact of new light sources from the project.

1) All outdoor lighting, including street lighting shall be fully shielded and down directed; 2) Accessory lighting that is located to the rear of the main residential buildings on lots that front Rhonda Road and Road "E and which is not affixed to a building shall not be elevated above the height of the first story of the main building, except for holiday decoration or similar lighting. If these measures are implemented the negative impact new lighting associated with the project would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

I. Aesthetics

A.c.1) A building setback line of 20 feet from the rear property line and/or street side lot line shall be established for those lots with frontage on Rhonda Road and proposed subdivision Road "E;"

A.c.2) The developer shall, prior to recording a final map to create lots 1,2,5,6, 33, and 77 through 98, construct a 7-foot-tall solid wall along and/or setback from the rear property and/or street side lot lines of said lots. The architectural design of the wall shall incorporate at least three unique materials and/or finishes and design elements that provide architectural relief. If landscaping is incorporated in the design of the wall it shall not be in lieu of the wall, but shall be considered to represent a unique material. Any associated landscaping shall comply with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO). The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. Maintenance of the wall and landscaping shall be provided through the formation of a Home Owners Association (HOA).

A.d.1) All outdoor lighting, including street lighting shall be fully shielded and down directed. Prior to submitting a building permit application(s) to Shasta County for residential outdoor lighting, the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

A.d.2) Accessory lighting that is located to the rear of the main residential buildings on lots that front Rhonda Road and Road "E and which is not affixed to a building shall not be elevated above the height of the first story of the main building, except for holiday decorations or similar lighting. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural, Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Mode (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or 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?				Y
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				Y
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?			Y	

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2010.
- b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) The subject property is identified as Grazing Land on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2010 and is currently being utilized as dryland winter range. The proposed development would displace existing agricultural improvements, including a corral and cross-fenced graze lots, and the proposed change in the General Plan and zoning would exclude agricultural uses. The parcels involved in the proposed merger and re-subdivision are too small to support full-time agricultural/grazing operations and have since 1984 been designated Rural Residential A (RA) in the Shasta County General Plan. There is an abundance of similar Farmlands in the South Central Region of the County. Therefore, the conversion of the subject Farmland to non-agricultural use would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			Y	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			Y	
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 emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		Y		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			Y	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			Y	

Discussion: Based on related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, and an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses Impact Assessment prepared for the project

by Ambient Air Quality and Noise Assessment the following findings can be made:

a,b,c) The Shasta County General Plan has established project level air quality impact thresholds of significance. If the thresholds identified in the General Plan are exceeded a project would have a significant impact on air quality which in turn would in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Board Attainment Plan (NSVAB), violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or 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 emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). These quantitative impact thresholds are two-tiered. The Level “A” threshold, if exceeded, requires the application of standard measures to the project (SMMs and BMMs). The Level “B” threshold, if exceed, requires the application of specific mitigation measures to reduce emission levels below the Level “B” threshold in order to recommend a determination that potentially significant air quality impacts of the project have been mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

The Level “A” air quality thresholds established by the General Plan are 25 lbs/day for Oxides of Nitrogen(NOx), 25 lbs/day for Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG), and 80 lbs/day for Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM10). The project would result in an increase of approximately 19.41 lbs/day of ROG, 74.97 lbs/day of NOx, and 80lbs/day of PM10, which are below the adopted threshold and would not exceed the Level “B” threshold 137 lbs/day for each of these pollutants.

The project would not result in the installation of any major stationary sources of emissions, but would generate short-term construction emissions of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) that would exceed the Level “A” General Plan threshold and, while the project will not exceed Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM10) thresholds, construction activities would generate uncontrolled dust. The recommended project conditions of approval would include standard measures to address NOx and PM10 emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the NSVAB Attainment Plan, violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or 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 emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) and standard measures recommended by the General Plan will be applied as conditions of approval for the project.

As discussed in the Greenhouse Gasses Impact Assessment prepared for the project, “Neither the State of California nor the Shasta County AQMD have identified quantitative thresholds of significance for the evaluation of project-generated GHGs. However, other agencies within the State of California, such as the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) have Identified recommended GHG thresholds of significance to be used for the analysis of project-related impacts. For construction and operational activities, the SMAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold is 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MTCO2e/year). Project-generated GHG emissions exceeding the recommended threshold would be considered to have a significant impact on the environment and could conflict applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. For project’s exceeding the operational emissions threshold, SMAQMD recommends the incorporation of mitigation that would demonstrate consistency with AB 32[AB 32 being the centerpiece of the State’s global climate change and greenhouse gas mitigation strategy]. Accordingly, projects implementing mitigation sufficient to achieve a reduction of 21.7% in comparison to projected Business as Usual (BAU) emissions in year 2020 would be considered to have a less than significant impact (SMAQMD 2014).”

These potential thresholds were reviewed by the Shasta County Air Quality Management District and approved for use as thresholds for this project. For purposes of this analysis, project-generated construction and operational GHG emissions that exceed 1,100 MTCO2e/year would be considered to have a significant impact on the environment and could conflict applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. For operational GHG emissions, the incorporation of mitigation measures sufficient to achieve a reduction of 21.7% in comparison to projected BAU would be considered to reduce a potentially significant greenhouse gas impacts to a less than significant level, with BAU being that which is referenced in the California Air Resources Board’s AB 32 Scoping Plan as emissions occurring in 2020 if the average baseline emissions during the 2002-2004 period were grown to year 2020 levels, without implementation of mandatory GHG-reduction measures that may have been implemented after 2004, such as CalGreen standards.

Greenhouse gases generated from short-term construction activities would not exceed the GHG level of significance threshold established for the project. However, it is estimated that long-term operational GHG emissions would total 2,342 MTCO2e/year from the project would exceed the project level of significance threshold of 1,100 MTCO2e/year. The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses Impact Assessment recommends and evaluated the effectiveness of several measures that would reduce long-term operational greenhouse gas emissions from the project and determined that they would result in a 23.4% which exceeds the target reduction of 21.7%. Therefore, the potential GHG impacts of from the project would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. This in addition

to qualitative considerations of the project impacts, including that it would increase residential density within an area that is able to be served by public water and sewer systems and is near social, educational, and commercial opportunities located within the Cottonwood Rural Community Center and City of Anderson.

Several project mitigation measures, including some of which are now mandatory elements of CalGreen codes, are proposed to reduce the potentially significant greenhouse gas impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level, including 1) To the extent practical, the proposed project shall reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard). 2) The installation of wood-burning hearth devices shall be prohibited. 3) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate drought-resistant and native plants. 4) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate water-efficient irrigation systems. 5) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate low-flow water fixtures. 6) The proposed project shall install high-reflectance roofing materials (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated), to the extent practical, to reduce building heat absorption and summer energy costs. 7) The proposed project shall install energy-efficient lighting, (e.g., LEDs) for traffic, street and other outdoor lighting. 8) Interior and exterior lighting for residential dwellings (includes controls) shall be energy efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). Unnecessary exterior lighting should be reduced, to the extent practical and where reductions in lighting would not pose a risk to public safety. 9) Appliances (e.g., ceiling fans, dishwashers) and process systems such as water heaters and furnaces installed in residential units shall be energy-efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). The implementation of these measures, some of which are required by the California Green Building Code, would reviewed/monitored through the building permit review and approval process, including review by a Home Owners Association formed for the project and review by the Shasta County Planning and Building Divisions.

- d-e) There are six single-family residences located within a quarter-mile areas of the project site. Two of these residences are situated approximately 250 feet from where construction would take place. Substantial pollutant concentrations and/or objectionable odors are not anticipated as a result of the project. Generation of air emissions would be primarily from short-term construction which would be subject to standard measures required by the Shasta County General Plan for the purpose of addressing air quality concerns and impacts. Exposure of residents to air emission from the project would be relatively limited as construction activities would take place periodically, intermittently, and primarily during the daytime.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

III. Air Quality

AQ.c.1) To the extent practical, the proposed project shall reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).

AQ.c.2) The installation of wood-burning hearth devices shall be prohibited. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for heating devices and/or appliances the device and/or appliance plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.3) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate drought-resistant and native plants. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for landscaping and irrigation, the proposed landscaping and irrigation plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.4) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate water-efficient irrigation systems. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for landscaping and irrigation, the proposed landscaping and irrigation plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.5) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate low-flow water fixtures. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.6) The proposed project shall install high-reflectance roofing materials (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated), to the extent practical, to reduce building heat absorption and summer energy costs. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for roofing, the roofing plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.7) The proposed project shall install energy-efficient lighting, (e.g., LEDs) for traffic, street and other outdoor lighting. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for

compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.8) Interior and exterior lighting for residential dwellings (includes controls) shall be energy efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). Unnecessary exterior lighting should be reduced, to the extent practical and where reductions in lighting would not pose a risk to public safety. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

AQ.c.8) Appliances (e.g., ceiling fans, dishwashers) and process systems such as water heaters and furnaces installed in residential units shall be energy-efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). Prior to submitting building and/or electrical permit application(s) to Shasta County the proposed building and/or electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial 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?		Y		
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?				Y
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?				Y
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?		Y		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				Y
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?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, pre-consultation comments from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), and a Biological Report, Supplemental Biological Report for the Proposed Offsite Sewer Line Corridor Memorandum, and Response to DFW Comments prepared by ENPLAN and the following findings can be made:

a,b,c) No 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 Wildlife (DFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have been identified on the project site or in the project area. The professional biologists who conducted field studies for the project did not observe any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species within the project site, but noted that the blue oak woodland and seven man-made ponds within the project site could potentially provide habitat for several special status plant and animal species, including silky cryptantha,

Henderson's, western pond, turtle, several species of bat, vernal pool fairy shrimp, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. Additionally, the DFW expressed concern that property may also provide habitat for the spadefoot toad.

Riverine habitat (characterized by intermittent or perennially flowing water) and lacustrine habitat (lakes, reservoirs, and ponds) within the project site were mapped based on field observation of physiographic features and wetland indicator plant species. It was noted that several ephemeral and intermittent streams, wet swales, and potential seasonal wetland and vernal pools are present within the project site. The potential seasonal wetlands and vernal pool habitat consist of the seven man made ponds and wide shallow areas located along the intermittent stream courses all of which are located outside of areas that would be directly disturbed by construction activities. These features have the potential to provide habitat for vernal pool brachiopods (shrimp).

The project has been designed to avoid direct disturbance of all potential seasonal wetlands and vernal pools observed within the project site. Construction activities would be carried out on a flat terrace where seasonal wetland and vernal pool indicators were not found to be present. Nonetheless, the project has the potential to significantly impact the potential seasonal wetland and vernal pool habitat because the potential habitat is within 250-feet of areas where construction activities would occur; upland areas that are likely hydrologically supportive of the potential habitat would be modified; and urbanization of the upland areas has the potential to generate and transmit polluted runoff to potential downstream habitat.

As, discussed, in Section VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality (f), implementation of low impact development strategies to mitigate potential downstream discharge of polluted run-off from the project are proposed for the project. In addition, the applicant shall prior to recording a final or phased map for the project shall for every acre of habitat indirectly affected (land area, in acres, within 250-feet of the areas proposed lots 1 thorough 98 and area improved for Road "E" as shown on final or phased map) obtain and dedicate at least two vernal pool credits within a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved ecosystem preservation bank, or, based on USFWS Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values, three acres of vernal pool habitat may be preserved on the project site or on another non-bank site as approved by the USFWS; or the applicant shall in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife hire a professional biologist to survey the seasonal wetland and vernal pool habitat identified within the project site for the presence of vernal pool brachiopods. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are not present, it shall be deemed that no further action by the applicant is necessary. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are present, the applicant shall obtain and dedicate vernal pool credits as described above.

The project has potential to directly and indirectly affect potential western pond turtle habitat. No western pond turtles were observed during on-site biological field surveys conducted at the property. Habitat on the site is not optimal for pond turtles because the majority of the ponds present within the project site are shallow, offer minimal cover, have few or no basking sites available, and most are dry by mid-summer. Female western pond turtles generally nest in soft, sandy soils. Approximately 98 percent of the on-site soils are gravelly loams, and less than two percent are sandy loams. None of the sandy loam soils are located within areas planned for development. Female western pond turtles generally nest within 100 meters of aquatic sites, less than 13 percent of the lands within 100 meters of the ponds are proposed for development (6.5 acres of the 51 acres within 100 meters). Several of the ponds are separated from the planned residential development by steep slopes (>20%), which would minimize accessibility to nesting turtles. Nonetheless, it is proposed that ground disturbing activities be limited to the dry season (May 1st through October 15).

Western spadefoot toads are primarily a species of lowland habitats such as washes, floodplains of rivers, alluvial fans, playas, and alkali flats. However, they also occur in the foothills and mountains. Western spadefoot toads prefer areas of open vegetation in short grasses, where the soil is sandy or gravelly. They are found in the valley and foothill grasslands, open chaparral, and pine-oak woodlands. Vernal pools and other temporary wetlands are optimal for breeding, but a variety of other temporary and permanent waters may be used. Adult spadefoot toads are primarily terrestrial and spend most of the time underground in constructed burrows, particularly during their long (8-9 month) dry-season dormancy.

Little is known regarding the distance that western spadefoot toads may range from aquatic breeding sites. California Department of Fish and Wildlife reports that movements to and from breeding ponds are rarely extensive, that few movements occur during most of the year, and that adults may travel up to several meters on rainy nights for foraging. Potential impacts on western spadefoot toads are considered less than significant because no spadefoot toad tadpoles were observed during a breeding-season inspection of the onsite waters, and because very little land near the potential breeding sites is proposed for development. Therefore, potential impacts of the project on spadefoot toad would be considered less than significant.

Numerous seasonal drainages are present within the property. Most are dry by late spring and generally lack riparian vegetation. The riparian zone of influence of the drainages within the property is generally narrow. There are no seasonal drainage features or riparian habitat located within the areas where construction activity will take place. Therefore, potential impacts of the project on riparian habitat area considered less than significant.

- d) The project would result in the removal of oak woodland habitat, that among other values, may provide roosting and nesting habitat for special status bat species and migratory birds. The loss of potential roosting and nesting habitat would be less-than-significant and not cumulatively considerable given the extent of suitable roosting and nesting habitat in the vicinity of the project site, but potential direct impacts on individual roosting or nesting bats or birds would be considered potentially significant. In order to avoid, reduce, and/or minimize the potential direct impacts on individual roosting or nesting bats or birds it is proposed that pre-construction surveys for the presence of roosting bats and/or nesting birds be conducted prior to any tree removal for the purpose of developing the proposed subdivision and for construction of structures on the individual subdivision lots.
- e) The potential project impacts on oak woodlands were evaluated based on both a canopy cover/retention threshold and Oak Woodland Impact Matrix methodology published by the UC Integrated Hardwood Management Program. While it is likely that some individual oak trees are likely to be retained within the sub-urbanized area of the project, it was assumed that all oak trees within the sub-urbanized area would be removed. Under both analytical scenarios, the potential impacts of the project would be considered potentially significant. It is proposed that the applicant shall acquire either (a) a conservation easement on existing oak woodlands or (b) fee title to existing oak woodlands for the purpose of oak woodland preservation. In-kind mitigation shall be provided at a 2:1 ratio (off-site) for direct effects. To account for indirect impacts due to fuel management activities, the acreage of oak woodland affected by fuel management activities shall be offset at a 1:1 ratio (off-site). Any proposed conservation of existing on-site oak-woodlands shall be considered to offset on-site direct and fuel management activities at a .25:1 and .5:1 ratio respectively. Accordingly, a minimum of 72 acres of blue oak woodland shall be acquired in Shasta County as a mitigation site.

An Operations and Management Plan acceptable to Shasta County shall be prepared to define allowable uses on the mitigation site(s), annual monitoring and reporting provisions, and measures to be undertaken if compliance with the Plan is not achieved. In addition, deed restrictions shall be established in conjunction with Shasta County upon identification of the mitigation site, and shall require that the land remain undeveloped in perpetuity to maintain the natural habitat values of the oak woodland. Regardless of land ownership, a conservation easement shall be established and shall be held by a third-party conservation oriented entity that shall be responsible for ensuring that the conditions of the Operations and Management Plan are implemented. As a condition of the conservation easement, Shasta County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be granted access/inspection rights to the mitigation property. An endowment shall be established by the project proponent to provide for management, monitoring, reporting, and other compliance activities needed to ensure protection of the oak woodland habitat in perpetuity.

- f) No habitat conservation plans or other similar plans have been adopted for the project site or project area.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

IV. Biological Resources

BIO.a.1) The applicant shall prior to recording an final or phased map for the project shall for every acre of habitat indirectly affected (land area, in acres, within 250-feet of the areas proposed lots 1 thorough 98 and area improved for Road "E" as shown on final or phased map) obtain and dedicate at least two vernal pool credits within a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved ecosystem preservation bank, or, based on USFWS Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values, three acres of vernal pool habitat may be preserved on the project site or on another non-bank site as approved by the USFWS; or the applicant shall in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife hire a professional biologist to survey the seasonal wetland and vernal pool habitat identified within the project site for the presence of vernal pool brachiopods. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are not present, it shall be deemed that no further action by applicant is necessary. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are present, the applicant shall obtain and dedicate vernal pool credits as described above.

BIO.a.2) Ground disturbing activities for development of the subdivision and individual lots created by the Final Map shall be limited to the dry season (May 1st through October 15). Ground disturbing activities shall not include maintenance of existing landscaping, utilities, drainage systems and other similar existing improvements on the parcels and within the rights-of-way created by project.

BIO.d.1) Any vegetation removal or construction with the property should be conducted between September 1 - October 15 and between March 1 - March 31 to avoid the bat maternity season as well as the winter season when bats are torpor and are inactive. If vegetation removal or construction activities occur during the bat maternity season (April 1 - August 31) or the bats torpor period (October 16-February 28) then a bat roost survey shall be conducted by a biologist qualified to identify any bat roosting sites within the property, and who shall do the following:

- Conduct a pre-construction bat roost survey(s) within two (2) weeks of vegetation removal that involves the removal of potential

- diurnal roosting trees (e.g. trees 24" DBH and greater, snags, hollow trees).
- Surveys shall be conducted within the entire area where potential diurnal roosting trees are to be removed and within 100 feet of the area.
- If a maternity roost with young is observed then the biologist will map the location and establish an appropriate "no disturbance" buffer around the roost as determined by the biologist. Construction and vegetation removal activity shall be prohibited within the buffer until the young are volant (i.e. flying). Roosts shall be monitored at least once per week and a report submitted to the County Planning Division monthly.
- If a roost is observed without young then the biologist should establish a "no disturbance" buffer until the bats are excluded from the roost or there are no roosting bats present.

BIO.d.2) Nesting birds are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF). Any vegetation removal within the property should be conducted during the non-breeding season (September 1 – January 31). If vegetation removal or construction activities occur during the avian breeding season (February 1 – August 31) then a migratory bird and raptor survey shall be conducted by a biologist qualified to identify any active nests (i.e. nests that contain egg(s) or young), and who shall do the following:

- Conduct a survey for all birds protected by the MBTA and CFGF seven (7) days prior to vegetation removal or construction activities within 250 feet of the work areas.
- If an active nest is found then the biologist shall map the nest location and establish an appropriate "no disturbance" buffer around the active nest(s) as determined by the biologist. Construction and vegetation removal activity shall be prohibited within the buffer until the young have fledged (i.e. fly) or the nest fails. Nests shall be monitored at least once per week and a report sent the County Planning Division monthly.
- Conduct an additional migratory bird and raptor survey if vegetation removal and/or construction stops for more than 15 days. The survey shall be conducted within seven (7) days prior to the continuation of activities.

BIO.e.1) The applicant shall acquire either (a) a conservation easement on existing oak woodlands or (b) fee title to existing oak woodlands for the purpose of oak woodland preservation. In-kind mitigation shall be provided at a 2:1 ratio (off-site) for direct effects. To account for indirect impacts due to fuel management activities, the acreage of oak woodland affected by fuel management activities shall be offset at a 1:1 ratio (off-site). Any proposed conservation of existing on-site oak-woodlands shall be considered to offset on-site direct and fuel management activities at a .25:1 and .5:1 ratio respectively. Accordingly, a minimum of 72 acres of blue oak woodland shall be acquired in Shasta County as a mitigation site.

An Operations and Management Plan acceptable to Shasta County shall be prepared to define allowable uses on the mitigation site(s), annual monitoring and reporting provisions, and measures to be undertaken if compliance with the Plan is not achieved. In addition, deed restrictions shall be established in conjunction with Shasta County upon identification of the mitigation site, and shall require that the land remain undeveloped in perpetuity to maintain the natural habitat values of the oak woodland. Regardless of land ownership, a conservation easement shall be established and shall be held by a third-party conservation oriented entity that shall be responsible for ensuring that the conditions of the Operations and Management Plan are implemented. As a condition of the conservation easement, Shasta County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be granted access/inspection rights to the mitigation property. An endowment shall be established by the project proponent to provide for management, monitoring, reporting, and other compliance activities needed to ensure protection of the oak woodland habitat in perpetuity.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to ' 15064.5?				Y
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ' 15064.5?				Y
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				Y

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, and a Cultural Resources Inventory Survey prepared by ENPLAN, the following findings can be made:

- a) No historical resources are previously known to exist within the project site. A cultural resources inventory survey of the project site was conducted by ENPLAN archeologist, Elizabeth Cutright-Smith in April of 2014. No historical resources of significance were discovered within the project site during the cultural resources inventory survey. Therefore, the project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.
- b) No prehistoric resources are previously known to exist within the project site No prehistoric resources of significance were discovered within the project site during the survey. The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.
- c) Upon review of the Minerals Element of the General Plan, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- d) The project site is not on or adjacent to any known cemetery or burial site, nor were such sites discovered within the project site during the cultural resources inventory survey. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would disturb any human remains.

Information about the project was sent to the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, which reviewed the project and commented that the project area is considered to be highly sensitive for cultural resources. A field survey, as described above, found no prehistoric or historic resources within the project boundaries. Therefore, a clearance was recommended by the cultural resource specialist.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to historical, archeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resource, or human remains, there is always the possibility that such resources or remains could be encountered. Therefore, the ENPLAN archeologist recommends that if any human remains are encountered during any phase of construction, all earth-disturbing work shall stop within 50 feet of the find. The county coroner shall be contacted to determine whether investigation of the cause of death is required as well as to determine whether the remains may be Native American in origin. Should Native American remains be discovered, the county coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then determine those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American(s). Together with representatives of the people of most likely descent, a qualified archaeologist can make an assessment of the discovery and recommend/implement mitigation measures as necessary; and if any previously unevaluated cultural resources (i.e., burnt animal bone, midden soils, projectile points or other humanly-modified lithics, historic artifacts, etc.) are encountered, all earth-disturbing work shall stop within 50 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can make an assessment of the discovery and recommend/implement mitigation measures as necessary (this stipulation does not apply to those cultural resources evaluated and determined not Historical Resources/Historic Properties in the cultural resources inventory survey); and in the event that project plans change to include areas not surveyed, additional archaeological reconnaissance may be required. The recommended conditions of approval for the project would require that a note to this effect be placed on the coversheet of the final map for the project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			Y	

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
i) 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 Publications 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			Y	
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?				Y
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?				Y
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 waste water?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, and a Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Mid Pacific Engineering, Inc., the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault;

According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps for Shasta County, there is no known earthquake fault on the project site.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;

According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The entire County is in Seismic Design Category D. According to the Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, California, prepared by Woodward Clyde, dated July 6, 1995, the most significant earthquake at the project site may be a background (random) North American crustal event up to 6.5 on the Richter scale at distances of 10 to 20 km. All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted seismic standards of Uniform Building Code.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;

See VI.a.i and VI.a.ii above. The proposed parcels are located on the ridge tops in areas where soils are primarily composed of Red Bluff gravelly loam. The project site is located in an area which is considered to have moderate potential for liquefaction. The gravelly structure, relatively high clay content, and well to moderately well drainage characteristics of this soil are not common to soils that are highly susceptible to liquefaction.

iv) Landslides.

The project site is not located within or near areas where historic landslide deposits are known to exist. The proposed parcels are located on the ridge tops in areas where soils are primarily composed of Red Bluff gravelly loam. Red Bluff gravelly loam is a well to moderately well drained soil. The building sites would be located on relatively flat ground. Therefore, impacts from landslides are considered to be less-than-significant.

- b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The proposed parcels are located on the ridge tops in areas where soils are primarily composed of Red Bluff gravelly loam. The Soil Survey of Shasta County, completed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service in August, 1974, identifies Red Bluff gravelly loam as having a hazard of erosion ranging from none to slight. A grading permit is required prior to any grading activities. The grading permit includes requirements for erosion and sediment control, including retention of topsoil.

- c) The proposed parcels are located on the ridge tops in areas where soils are primarily composed of Red Bluff gravelly loam. The project would not 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) The site soils are not described as expansive soils in the ASoil Survey of Shasta County.®
- e) The project would be served by a sanitary sewer system through annexation to County Service Area #17 (Cottonwood).

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			Y	
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?			Y	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				Y
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?				Y
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?				Y
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?				Y
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				Y
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?		Y		

Discussion: Based on these comments, the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, and a Wildland-Fuel Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project by Tim MacLean, ASLA, CA Landscape Architect #4461, the following findings can be made:

Initial Study – GPA13-002, Z13-004, and TR2003 - Stephens

- a-b) Hazardous materials commonly used during construction activities would be transported and used at the project site. If such materials were to be stored in large quantities at the site, the contractor or other responsible party project would be required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMPB). The HMBP would include detailed information about the storage and use of such materials at the site and detailed plans for response plans and procedures in the event of reported or threatened release of hazardous materials at the site. However, it is not anticipated that significant quantities of hazardous materials will be stored at or transported to the project site. Development in the vicinity is rural in character and the population density near the project site is low. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- c) The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There is no historical evidence of any commercial activity on the site that would have used hazardous materials.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) A review of the project and the County of Shasta Multi-Hazard Functional Plan indicates that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) The project would urbanize ridgetops located within a "VERY HIGH" fire hazard severity zone. Large rural parcels about the project site on three sides and a large open space parcel is proposed to abut a number of the proposed urban lots. The project would be served with fire protection water through annexation to the Cottonwood Water District. Nonetheless, the applicant has proposed to implement a Wildland Fire and Vegetation Management Plan to reduce exposure of 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 wildland to a less-than-significant level.

The applicant would treat wildland fuels within the project site prior to recording a final map. In addition and prior to recording the map, a Homeowners Association (HOA) would be established to set fire protection fees to be collected annually for implementation of projects needed to maintain defensible space and defensible space easement would be granted and maintained in perpetuity for the benefit of the HOA for the purpose of maintaining defensible space in accordance with the treatment prescription described within the Wildland Fire and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HHM.h.1) Prior to recording a final map, the applicant shall treat wildland fuels within 100 feet and on slopes in excess of 30% between 100 and 200 feet of urban lots to be created by the recording of a final map. Fuels shall be treated according to the treatment prescription described in the Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. Subsequent to recording a final map a Home Owners Association shall maintain defensible space in accordance with the treatment prescription described in the plan and applicable regulations regarding defensible space.

HHM.h.2) Prior to recording a final map, a home owners association (HOA) shall be formed to maintain defensible space in accordance with the Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. The HOA shall provide for the determination of fees, annual collection of fees, and implementation of projects necessary to maintain defensible space in accordance with Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project.

HHM.h.3) Prior to or simultaneous with the recording of a final map, a defensible space easement(s) shall be granted for the benefit of the Homeowners Association created for the purpose of maintaining defensible space in accordance with the treatment prescription described in the Wildland Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. Said easement shall be granted over the proposed Open Space Parcel, Parcel D, and/or any remainder parcel or other open area adjacent to any urban parcels created by the recording of a final map.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			Y	

VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u>: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a new deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				Y
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		Y		
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 offsite?		Y		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		Y		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				Y
g) Place housing within 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				Y
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				Y
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?				Y
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, and a Preliminary Storm Drainage Analysis prepared for the project by Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, the following findings can be made:

- a) Construction of the subdivision improvements would require grading. The applicant would have to obtain a permit from the County prior to grading the site. If the grading would disturb an acre or more of the property, which is likely, the applicant would also have to obtain a construction general permit (CGP) from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. After the subdivision is recorded an individual grading permit would have to be obtained for any grading needed to develop individual lots. The provisions of the grading permit(s) and CGP, if needed, will address erosion and siltation containment on- and off-site. Through adherence to construction standards, including erosion and sediment control measures, water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated.
- b) Water service for the project is to be provided by the Cottonwood Water District. The District is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the project. The CWD has indicated that it has capacity to serve the proposed subdivision subject to approval of annexation of the property to the CWD and requirements for construction of infrastructure to serve the development. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c,d) Drainage from buildings and structures will be dispersed to adjacent unimproved or landscaped areas from where it will either infiltrate or sheet flow to existing natural drainages within the project site. Sidewalk and road drainage would be directed to curb and gutter system that would be required as part of the project road system. The curb and gutter system would direct road drainage to the head of existing drainages within project site or within the County road right-of-way. Therefore, the existing drainage pattern would

generally be maintained and significant alterations of the natural drainage courses would not occur from the project. The project would have the potential to increase the rate at which runoff would be discharged from the property.

A Preliminary Storm Drainage Analysis prepared for the project predicts that the rate of run-off would increase by 11 percent during a 100-year storm event. The increase would be primarily from road run-off. The potential impacts of this increase on downstream flooding is proposed to be mitigated through the construction of above ground detention basins and underground perforated drainage pipe as well as low impact development methods designed to disconnect impervious surfaces constructed on the urban lots from the curb and gutter system.

The detention/infiltration system final design would be detailed in the improvement plans for the subdivision. At a minimum the system would be designed to prevent an increase in post project downstream flow rates. The detention basin outlets would be designed with erosion control devices to reduce potential erosion or siltation. The detention basins would be maintained through a permanent road division formed for maintenance of the roads and associated drainage facilities. Measures to minimize potential flood and erosion impacts from run-off generated impervious surfaces constructed on the urban lots are described in sections VII Hydrology and Water Quality g) and h) below. The proposed detention basins and best management practices described below would reduce potential flooding and erosion impacts from alteration of the drainage pattern of the site, including the introduction of impervious surface area with the site.

- e) The final road drainage system would be designed to accommodate storm water from the project. Storm water would be discharged to natural drainages. The rate at which storm water is released downstream would be controlled as described above. Therefore, the project would not significantly exceed the capacity of the existing downstream natural drainage system.
- f) Run-off from residential driveways, landscaped areas, and other impervious surface could be potential sources of run-off polluted with motor oil and other mechanical fluids, fertilizers, soaps, and other common pollutants that may be deposited on the ground and transmitted downstream by run-off. Best Management Practices are proposed to reduce the potential impacts of polluted run-off from the project to a less-than-significant level; including the use of vegetative swales and/or bio-retention features in landscaped areas, and directing run-off from impervious areas to impervious areas.
- g,h) The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.
- i) There are no levees, dams, or impoundments within the project area which would create flooding in the event of levee or dam failure. The project would include three detention basins that in total would detain a minimum of 1.2-acre-feet of water. This is not a substantial amount of water and there are not a significant number of people or improvements immediately downstream.
- j) The project is not located near a large lake or the ocean so would not be subject to seiche or tsunami. It is not located on or near a mountainside or hillside which is subject to mudflows.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

VII. Hydrology and Water Quality

HWQ.d.1) The applicant shall, prior to recording the final map and consistent with the Preliminary Storm Drainage Analysis, design and construct a drainage system that utilizes above ground detention facilities and underground drainage rock with perforated pipe storm water detention facilities and/or other low impact development storm water facilities acceptable to the Shasta County Resource Management and Public Works Department. The final design and supporting documentation shall be detailed in and submitted with improvement plans prepared for the project and shall demonstrate that the metered run-off from the combination of facilities when combined with the undetained flow from the project will be equal to or less-than the predevelopment flow rates for the 10-, 25-, and 100-year design storm events.

HWQ.f.1) Downspouts and, where no roof gutter is proposed, roof drip lines shall be directed to pervious surfaces such as undeveloped, landscaped areas, and/or other pervious/semi-pervious surface. The locations of downspouts/roof drip lines and a description or detail of the area to which they discharge shall be included in construction plans submitted with a building permit application. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for the proposed building(s), the proposed building plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

HWQ.f.2) Paved driveways, except those paved with a pervious/semi-pervious surface, shall be constructed with a drainage swale or slotted channel drain that directs run-off from the driveway to as undeveloped, landscaped areas, vegetative swales, bio-retention features and/or other pervious/semi-pervious surface. A slotted channel drain shall be required for any driveway in excess of 5% slope. The drainage swale or slotted channel drain shall and a description or detail of the area(s) to which it discharges shall be included in construction plans submitted with a building permit application. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for grading and/or buildings, the proposed grading or building plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.

HWQ.f.3) A landscaping and irrigation plan (building permit) for construction of any project and/or residential new aggregate landscaped Initial Study – GPA13-002, Z13-004, and TR2003 - Stephens

area in excess of equal to or greater-than 500-square feet or rehabilitated aggregate landscaped area equal to or greater than 2,500 square-feet shall be submitted to the Department of Resource Management for review and approval prior to construction. The landscaping and irrigation plan building permit may be obtained individually or incorporated into the building plans for a structure for which a building permit application is otherwise required. The proposed landscaping and irrigation plan shall demonstrate compliance with the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (WELO) and incorporate low impact development features designed to receive run-off from landscaped and impervious surfaces, reduce discharge of polluted runoff from the site, and to facilitate compliances with other low impact development features and methods required for the project. Such features shall include vegetated swales, bio-retention, infiltration, and/or other features designed and located to minimize discharge of runoff from the site. The locations and a description or detail of these features shall be included the construction plans submitted with the building permit.

IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				Y
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?			Y	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project does not include the creation of any road, ditch, wall, or other feature which would physically divide an established community.
- b) The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project is located within the sphere of influence of the Cottonwood Water District and the Shasta County Cottonwood Service Area 2013 master plan. Both of these agencies have provided the applicant with a will serve letter indicating that the respective districts are willing to provide water and sewer service subject to annexation and construction of certain infrastructure improvements (see attached will serve letters). The project site is also served by the Cottonwood Fire Protection District and is located near social, educational, and commercial opportunities located within the Cottonwood Rural Community Center and City of Anderson.

As proposed the overall development density of the project is approximately one-dwelling unit per 1.17-acres. Further study of sewer system capacity would be necessary before the project site could be developed at greater densities. The development standards for the proposed Planned Development (PD) zone district would establish the proposed parcel sizes as the minimum parcel size for the respective parcels that would be created by the Final Map. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment from a rural designation to a suburban designation and application of the recommended zone districts would be appropriate and consistent with objective and policies of the Shasta County General Plan and the 2013 Cottonwood Sewer Master Plan which assumed that maximum development potential for the subject property and other similar properties in the vicinity would be one dwelling unit per acre.

The project is unlikely to induce significant growth inducing impacts as it would not include the development of extensive new roads, sewer and water infrastructure or capacity, or other facilities or services that would be expected to induce growth in the vicinity of the project site. The project would be served by an existing paved County road (Rhonda Road) and be served by existing water and sewer systems with capacity to serve the project subject to approval of annexation by the Local Agency Formation Commission, extension of a waterline to server the development from an existing water storage facility adjacent to the site, and utility extensions and upgrades to transmit effluent to existing CSA facilities for treatment.

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

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				Y
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?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project would not 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) The project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource. There is no other land use plan which addresses minerals. Therefore, the project would not 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.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>XI. NOISE</u> B Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				Y
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels				Y
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				Y
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		Y		
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?				Y
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?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a-b) The General Plan Noise Standard is 55 hourly L_{eq} daytime, and 50 hourly L_{eq} nighttime. The project does not include any noise sources that would result in 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. Nor does the project include the use of any equipment or activity that would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The project is located on Rhonda Road between Gas Point and Deschutes Road. The Shasta County General Plan anticipates that uses within 33-feet of the centerline of the roadway may be exposed to transportation noise in excess of County Standards by the year 2020. The required road right-of-way dedication and improvements along the Rhonda Road frontage would be maximum 76-feet with a minimum of 38-feet from the centerline of Rhonda Road. Therefore, noise sensitive residential uses would not be located within the area potentially affect by unacceptable transportation noise.

- c) It is likely that there will be an increase in ambient noise levels from the establishment of residential uses on the proposed parcels. Noise sources would include traffic, residential appliances such as heating and air systems, and general noise generated by activities related to a residential lifestyle. However, noise from such equipment and these activities would not exceed the General Plan Noise Standard is 55 hourly Leq daytime, and 50 hourly Leq nighttime. Therefore, there would be no substantial or significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project resulting from the potential development of residences at the project site.
- d) The project would create temporary and periodic noise increases which would be generated by construction of the subdivision improvements and the eventual development of home sites on the parcels that will result from the subdivision. Post subdivision development activities will likely take place over a number of years. Noise sensitive uses in the vicinity are few in number and in most cases would be situated more than 200 feet from areas subject to construction. Nonetheless, the most significant noise in both duration and intensity is likely to occur during construction of the improvements for the subdivision. To minimize negative impacts from construction noise to a less-than significant level, construction of the proposed subdivision improvements should be suspended on Sundays, federal holidays, and during the nighttime hours.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

XI. Noise

N.d.1) Construction of the proposed subdivision improvements shall be suspended on Sundays, federal holidays, and during the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).

<u>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> B Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				Y
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Y
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

The population growth resulting from the potential 102 new residences or approximately 255 persons given a total County population of approximately 183,023 is not substantial. Upon build-out and full occupancy of the subdivision 255 persons would represent an approximately 7% increase in population over the estimated 2010 Cottonwood population of 3,316 persons. If the build-out and full occupancy of the subdivision were to occur over ten years this rate of growth would be below the annual growth rate of Cottonwood between 2000 and 2010 (approx.. 1% annually). If build-out and full occupancy were to occur over five years it would result in a less than doubling of the Cottonwood annual growth rate between 2000 and 2010. Potential impacts to infrastructure (including roads and schools) will be mitigated by the developer, e.g. road improvements, or by future home builders (school, traffic, and general impact fees). The project will create temporary construction jobs and potentially have a multiplier effect on the local economy, but does not include new businesses, nor does it include any significant extension of any permanent roads or other infrastructure as discussed in Section IX.b. above. Therefore, the project is not expected to induce substantial growth in the area.

- b) The project does not include destruction of any existing housing.
- c) The project would not displace any number of people.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?		Y		
Police Protection?			Y	
Schools?			Y	
Parks?			Y	
Other public facilities?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

The project would not 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:

Fire Protection:

The project is located in a “VERY HIGH @ fire hazard severity zone. Fire hydrants will be installed according to the County Fire Safety Standards. The project is located within the Cottonwood Fire Protection District. The district has reviewed the project and determined that, due to the size of the proposed development and its location at the northern extent of the district, the project would cumulatively impact the District’s ability to provide fire protection services within the district. To mitigate the potential impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level, the District has recommended that a specific funding mechanism be created to finance future fire protection infrastructure needed to serve the project, which may include financing a proportional fair share of personnel costs needed to serve the project. The district has also recommended that the developer deed to the District a lot for potential future development of a fire sub-station near the project and in the northern extent of the fire district. Development of a future fire sub-station would be subject to approval of a future use permit or rezoning, including specific environmental review of a specific fire sub-station proposal.

Police Protection:

The County has a total of 59 sworn and 29 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff=s deputies) for the County population of 67, 343 (Calif. U.S. Census American Community Survey Estimates as of July 2015) persons in the unincorporated area of the County. The project could potentially result in 102 additional residences, with an additional population of approximately 266 at build out and full occupancy. In 2009 Shasta County adopted general development impact fees, a portion of which are dedicated Sheriff’s Office. In addition, development and population growth that may occur as a result of the project would contribute to general County revenue through property and sales tax as may be directed by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors.

Schools:

The project may bring more school age residents to the area which in turn may increase enrollment at local schools. The resultant development from the project will be required to pay the amount allowable per square foot of construction to mitigate school impacts. Increases in enrollment may also increase school district revenue generated by attendance figures.

Parks:

The County does not have a neighborhood parks system. See also section XIV. Recreation, b).

Other public facilities:

None.

Initial Study – GPA13-002, Z13-004, and TR2003 - Stephens

Mitigation/Monitoring:**XIII. Public Services**

PS-Fire Protection.1) Developer shall provide documentation, prior to approval of the first final map, to the satisfaction of the Cottonwood Fire Protection District that a Mello-Roos district, or other financing mechanism approved by the Cottonwood Fire Protection district has been established to provide a proportional fair share of financing costs for construction, acquisition, maintenance and operations, including but not be limited to the proportionate personnel costs, of fire protection infrastructure to serve the project. Computation of said proportional fair share shall take into account the proposed agreement to deed to the Cottonwood Fire Protection District land or a future sub-station.

PS-Fire Protection.2) Prior to recording the first final map, the Developer shall enter into an agreement to deed to the Cottonwood Fire Protection District an area of level land not less-than one-half acre in size to be used for a future fire sub-station. The land should be situated with easy access to Rhonda Road.

XIV. <u>RECREATION:</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				Y
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?				Y

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) Cottonwood Community Park (CCP) is a private recreational facility located in Cottonwood. The facility is operated by a private non-profit organization. The facility includes a community building and a small children's playground. Maintenance of the facility is funded by rents from the community building, private donations, and other CCP fundraising efforts. The terms of public use of CCP is at the discretion of the CCP. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would not 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) The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding also has a number of recreational facilities. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public land available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by Bureau of Land Management.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				Y
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highway?				Y

XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u>: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				T
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		T		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				T
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				T
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				T

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, a Transportation Study Impact Report for Stephens Parcel in Shasta County, CA prepared by Fehr & Peers, a Rhonda Road Sight Distance evaluation prepared by Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer and the following findings can be made:

- a) A traffic impact study was prepared to analyze the potential transportation impacts of the project. They study assumes that build out of the proposed project will result in 78 and 102 new weekday AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips, respectively, and that these trips would be distributed north and south on Rhonda Road towards goods, services, employment centers and highway/freeway access in the City of Anderson and unincorporated community of Cottonwood. The majority of vehicle trips (60%) are assumed to be distributed north on Rhonda Road.

The study evaluated potential weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic circulation impacts at four existing intersections (Rhonda Road/Gas Point Road, Rhonda Road/Robinson Glen Drive/Matthew Lane, Rhonda Road/Pleasant Hills Drive, and State Route 273/Pleasant Hill Drive); two of which are located outside unincorporated Shasta County and fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Anderson (Rhonda Road/Pleasant Hills Drive) and The State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) (State Route 273/Pleasant Hill Drive). The study also evaluated the proposed main project access/Rhonda Road intersection.

A “no project” and “plus project” scenario were analyzed for existing (2015), cumulative (2025), and cumulative (2035) conditions. The “existing plus project” scenario analyzes the impacts of the project on existing traffic circulation conditions while the “cumulative (2025) plus project” and “cumulative (2035) plus project” scenarios analyze the project’s potential cumulative impacts on traffic circulation when viewed in conjunction with reasonably foreseeable projects that may occur in the vicinity over time.

The study found that for the existing (2015) and cumulative (2025) no project scenarios all study intersections would operate acceptably and that based on Shasta County General Plan, City of Anderson, and Caltrans traffic circulation impact significance thresholds, the project would not result in any weekday AM and PM peak hour significant traffic circulation impacts.

The study found that for the cumulative (2035) no project scenario the State Route 273/Pleasant Hill Drive intersection would not operate acceptably. Where an intersection would operate unacceptably under a no project scenario, Shasta County has in the past utilized as a project level of significance threshold of an additional five or more seconds of delay over the predicted level of service for the applicable no project scenario. Therefore, for this project, intersections that are predicted to operate unacceptably without the project would be significantly impacted, if traffic from the project is predicted to create 5 or more additional seconds of delay over the predicted level of service for the applicable no project scenario.

The study predicts for the cumulative (2035) plus project scenario an additional 3.5 seconds of delay over the predicated cumulative (2035) no project scenario at the SR 273/Pleasant Hills Drive intersection. Therefore, the cumulative (2035) plus project traffic circulation of the project would be less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

- b) There is no County congestion management agency, and no level-of-service established by such an agency.
- c) The project would result in the construction of single-family residences which would not affect air traffic patterns.
- d) The proposed new intersections on Rhonda Road meet County development standards for corner sight distance at rural intersection.

The Shasta County Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposed road pattern and intersections and has not indicated that the design of the road system presents and significant safety concerns. The project site is located in a rural area of the County where there is no existing street lighting and therefore, darkness at the proposed Rhonda Road intersection could pose a potentially significant traffic safety impact.

In order to minimize potential nighttime traffic conflicts/hazards at the proposed Rhonda Road intersections, the applicant shall prior to recording a final map for the project either provide street lighting at the proposed intersections or provide a street lighting warrant analysis prepared by qualified traffic engineer according to Federal Highway and Traffic Administration or other applicable guidelines or methodology for review and approval of the Shasta County Department of Public Works, Development Services and/or Traffic Divisions. If the analysis demonstrates that street lighting is not warranted, no further action is required by the applicant.

- e) The project has been reviewed by the Cottonwood Fire Protection District which has determined that there is adequate emergency access. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency access to the project would be provided by two access points on Rhonda Road.
- f) There is more than adequate parking available for on-site parking. Two covered parking spaces, would be provided for each residence developed those parcels that would be located in the proposed PD zone district.
- g) The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project is consistent with the Shasta County General Plan Circulation Element policies for transit and pedestrian bicycle modes, the 2010 Shasta County Bikeway Plan, and with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

XV. Transportation and Traffic

TR.d.1) The applicant shall prior to recording a final map for the project either provide street lighting at the proposed Rhonda Road intersections and provide for street light maintenance through participation in CSA#15 (lighting district) or provide a street lighting warrant analysis prepared by qualified traffic engineer according to Federal Highway and Traffic Administration or other acceptable guidelines or methodology for review and approval of the Shasta County Department of Public Works, Development Services and/or Traffic Divisions. If the analysis demonstrates that street lighting is not warranted, no further action is required by the applicant.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			T	
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?			T	
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?		T		
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project which serves or may serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			T	
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?			T	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs?			T	
g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				T

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

- a) The project, subject to Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation approval, would be served by the Shasta County Cottonwood CSA#17 wastewater treatment system which is in compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to water quality. A grading permit would be required for construction of the subdivision improvements. If the grading would disturb an acre or more of the property, which is likely, the applicant would also have to obtain a construction general permit (CGP) from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. After the subdivision is recorded an individual grading permit would have to be obtained for any grading needed to develop individual lots. The provisions of the grading permit(s) and CGP, if needed, will address erosion and siltation containment on- and off-site. Through adherence to construction standards, including erosion and sediment control measures, water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated.
- b) The project would be served by the Cottonwood Water District subject to Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation approval of the project site and all land between the current CWD district boundary and the project site. The Cottonwood District has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project. The applicant would be required to extend electrical service to an existing CWD water storage tank facility immediately south of the project site, construct a booster pump station at the facility, and cross-country water line extension from the facility to the subdivision. The scope of improvements required by the water district, some of which would occur at a previously disturbed existing facility, are relatively minor. The impacts from construction of these improvements would be, where applicable, consistent with the general impact discussion and conclusions of relevant prior sections of this document, and where applicable would be subject to relevant mitigation measures.

The project would be served by the Cottonwood CSA#17 subject to Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation approval of the project site. CSA #17 has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project. The applicant would be required to extend a sewer line from its existing infrastructure to serve the project, the applicant would also be required to evaluate the system's ability to transmit effluent from the project site to the existing CSA treatment plant and, if necessary, make improvements at/to an existing booster station. The scope of improvements required by CSA#17, some of which would occur at a previously disturbed existing facility, are relatively minor. The impacts from construction of these improvements would be, where applicable, consistent with the general impact discussion and conclusions of relevant prior sections of this document, and where applicable would be subject to relevant mitigation measures.

- c) The project would require in the construction of curb and gutter storm water drainage facilities. As described in Section VIII e. and f., the proposed storm water drainage facilities would direct storm water to and terminate at natural drainages features within the project site. Potentially significant impacts from construction of these facilities on biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and from noise would be similar to those potential significant impacts from general construction activities discussed in Sections IV, VIII, and XI of this document. These impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in these sections of the document, including All biological resource mitigation measures described in Section IV, mitigation measure HWQ.d.1) described in Section VIII, and mitigation measure N.d.1) described in Section XI.
- d) The project would be served by the Cottonwood Water District subject to Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation approval of the project site and all land between the current CWD district boundary and the project site. The District currently serves 1,220 existing water service connections. The project at build out would require 102 water service connections, which is an increase of less than 10 percent in the number of the public water system's existing service connections. Therefore, the proposal is not a project, as defined in California Water Code section 10912 and would not require a water supply assessment prior to adoption of the proposed mitigated negative declaration. The Cottonwood District has evaluated the applicant's request to be served by the District and provided a will serve letter to indicate that it has adequate capacity to serve the project.
- e) The project will be served by the Cottonwood CSA#17 wastewater treatment system. The CSA has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
- f) The West Central Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional residence and is in compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
- g) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Recycling facilities are available in the major shopping areas available to the project site.

Mitigation/Monitoring: See all biological resource mitigation measures described in Section IV, mitigation measure HWQ.d.1) described in Section VIII, and mitigation measure N.d.1) described in Section XI.

XVII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact

XVII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the 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?		T		
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)?			T	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		T		

Discussion:

- a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the potential of the project 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 the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the discussion and findings in Section V. Cultural Resources, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is evidence to support a finding that the potential of the project to have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly would be mitigated to a less-than-significant.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

PROJECT NUMBER GPA13-002, Z13-004, and TR2003

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Special Studies: The following project-specific studies have been completed for the proposal and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Negative Declaration. These studies are available for review through the Shasta County Planning Division.

1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses Impact Assessment, Ambient Air Quality and Noise Assessment, 2015
2. Biological Study Report, ENPLAN, 2012
3. Supplemental Biological Report for the Proposed Offsite Sewer Line Corridor Memorandum, ENPLAN, 2013
4. Response to DFW Comments, ENPLAN, 2016
5. Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, ENPLAN, April 2014 (Confidential)
6. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Mid Pacific Engineering, Inc., 2014
7. Wildland-Fuel Vegetation Management Plan, Tim MacLean, ASLA, CA Landscape Architect #4461, 2014
8. Preliminary Storm Drainage Analysis prepared for the project by Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, 2014
9. Rhonda Road Sight Distance Evaluation, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, 2014
10. Transportation Study Impact Report for Stephens Parcel in Shasta County, CA, Fehr & Peers, 2015

Agency Referrals: Prior to an environmental recommendation, referrals for this project were sent to agencies thought to have responsible agency or reviewing agency authority. The responses to those referrals (attached), where appropriate, have been incorporated into this document and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Negative Declaration. Copies of all referral comments may be reviewed through the Shasta County Planning Division. To date, referral comments have been received from the following State agencies or any other agencies which have identified CEQA concerns:

1. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
2. California Department of Fish and Wildlife
3. Cottonwood Fire Protection District

Conclusion/Summary: Based on a field review by the Planning Division and other agency staff, early consultation review comments from other agencies, information provided by the applicant, and existing information available to the Planning Division, the project, as revised and mitigated, is not anticipated to result in any significant environmental impacts.

SOURCES OF DOCUMENTATION FOR INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All headings of this source document correspond to the headings of the initial study checklist. In addition to the resources listed below, initial study analysis may also be based on field observations by the staff person responsible for completing the initial study. Most resource materials are on file in the office of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001, Phone: (530) 225-5532.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

1. Shasta County General Plan and land use designation maps.
2. Applicable community plans, airport plans and specific plans.
3. Shasta County Zoning Ordinance (Shasta County Code Title 17) and zone district maps.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.8 Scenic Highways, and Section 7.6 Design Review.
2. Zoning Standards per Shasta County Code, Title 17.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands.
2. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.

III. AIR QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan Section, 6.5 Air Quality.
2. Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin, 2006 Air Quality Attainment Plan.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Air Quality Management District.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timberlands, and Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
2. Designated Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Plants and Candidates with Official Listing Dates, published by the California Department of Fish and Game.
3. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Game.
4. Federal Listing of Rare and Endangered Species.
5. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
6. State and Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, published by the California Department of Fish and Game.
7. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Game.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.10 Heritage Resources.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. The Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico.
 - b. State Office of Historic Preservation.
 - c. Local Native American representatives.
 - d. Shasta Historical Society.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.1 Seismic and Geologic Hazards, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands, and Section 6.3 Minerals.
2. County of Shasta, Erosion and Sediment Control Standards, Design Manual
3. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.
4. Alquist - Priolo, Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.4 Fire Safety and Sheriff Protection, and Section 5.6 Hazardous Materials.
2. County of Shasta Multi-Hazard Functional Plan
3. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.

- b. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
- c. Shasta County Sheriff's Department, Office of Emergency Services.
- d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
- e. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.2 Flood Protection, Section 5.3 Dam Failure Inundation, and Section 6.6 Water Resources and Water Quality.
- 2. Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Shasta County prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, as revised to date.
- 3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Public Works acting as the Flood Control Agency and Community Water Systems manager.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- 1. Shasta County General Plan land use designation maps and zone district maps.
- 2. Shasta County Assessor's Office land use data.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

- 1. Shasta County General Plan Section 6.3 Minerals.

XI. NOISE

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.5 Noise and Technical Appendix B.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.1 Community Organization and Development Patterns.
- 2. Census data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- 3. Census data from the California Department of Finance.
- 4. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.3 Housing Element.
- 5. Shasta County Department of Housing and Community Action Programs.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.5 Public Facilities.
- 2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
 - b. Shasta County Sheriff's Department.
 - c. Shasta County Office of Education.
 - d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

XIV. RECREATION

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.9 Open Space and Recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- 1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.4 Circulation.
- 2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - b. Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
 - c. Shasta County Congestion Management Plan/Transit Development Plan.
- 3. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Rates.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- 1. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
 - b. Pacific Power and Light Company.
 - c. Pacific Bell Telephone Company.
 - d. Citizens Utilities Company.
 - e. T.C.I.
 - f. Marks Cablevision.
 - g. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
 - h. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM (MMP)
FOR GPA13-002, Z13-004, and TR2003**

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
I. Aesthetics A.c.1) A building setback line of 20 feet from the rear property line and/or street side lot line shall be established for those lots with frontage on Rhonda Road and proposed subdivision Road “E;” A.c.2) The developer shall, prior to recording a final map to create lots 1,2,5,6, 33, and 77 through 98, construct a 7-foot-tall solid wall along and/or setback from the rear property and/or street side lot lines of said lots. The architectural design of the wall shall incorporate at least three unique materials and/or finishes and design elements that provide architectural relief. If landscaping is incorporated in the design of the wall it shall not be in lieu of the wall, but shall be considered to represent a unique material. Any associated landscaping shall comply with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO). The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. The wall and any associated landscaping shall not encroach on the public right-of-way. Maintenance of the wall and landscaping shall be provided through the formation of a Home Owners Association (HOA). A.d.1) All outdoor lighting, including street lighting shall be fully shielded and down directed. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. A.d.2) Accessory lighting that is located to the rear of the main residential buildings on lots that front Rhonda Road and Road “E and	Final Map Review Building Permit Review Final Map Review In Perpetuity Improvement Plan Review Building Permit Review	Planning Division Planning Division/HOA Planning Division/HOA	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
which is not affixed to a building shall not be elevated above the height of the first story of the main building, except for holiday decorations or similar lighting. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.	Building Permit Review	Planning Division/HOA	
III. Air Quality AQ.c.1) To the extent practical, the proposed project shall reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard). AQ.c.2) The installation of wood-burning hearth devices shall be prohibited. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for heating devices and/or appliances the device and/or appliance plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.3) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate drought-resistant and native plants. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for landscaping and irrigation, the proposed landscaping and irrigation plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.4) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate water-efficient irrigation systems. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for landscaping and irrigation, the proposed landscaping and irrigation plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a	Improvement Plan Review Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection	Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.5) The proposed project shall be designed to incorporate low-flow water fixtures. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.6) The proposed project shall install high-reflectance roofing materials (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated), to the extent practical, to reduce building heat absorption and summer energy costs. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for roofing, the roofing plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.7) The proposed project shall install energy-efficient lighting, (e.g., LEDs) for traffic, street and other outdoor lighting. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.8) Interior and exterior lighting for residential dwellings (includes controls) shall be energy efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). Unnecessary exterior lighting should be reduced, to the extent practical and where reductions in lighting would not pose a risk to public safety. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for outdoor lighting the proposed lighting/electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association	Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection	HOA Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division HOA Planning Division Building Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
(HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. AQ.c.8) Appliances (e.g., ceiling fans, dishwashers) and process systems such as water heaters and furnaces installed in residential units shall be energy-efficient (e.g., EPA “Energy Star”-rated). Prior to submitting building and/or electrical permit application(s) to Shasta County the proposed building and/or electrical plan(s) shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision.	Building Permit Review Building Permit Inspection	HOA Planning Division Building Division	
IV. Biological Resources BIO.a.1) The applicant shall prior to recording an final or phased map for the project shall for every acre of habitat indirectly affected (land area, in acres, within 250-feet of the areas proposed lots 1 thorough 98 and area improved for Road “E” as shown on final or phased map) obtain and dedicate at least two vernal pool credits within a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved ecosystem preservation bank, or, based on USFWS Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values, three acres of vernal pool habitat may be preserved on the project site or on another non-bank site as approved by the USFWS; or the applicant shall in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife hire a professional biologist to survey the seasonal wetland and vernal pool habitat identified within the project site for the presence of vernal pool brachiopods. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are not present, is shall be deemed that no further action by applicant is necessary. If it is determined from the survey that vernal pool brachiopods are present, the applicant shall obtain and dedicate vernal pool credits as described above. BIO.a.2) Ground disturbing activities for development of the subdivision and individual lots created by the Final Map shall be limited to the dry season (May 1st through October 15). Ground disturbing activities shall not include maintenance of existing	Prior to Recording the Final Map Improvement Plan Review Grading/Building Permit Review	Planning Division Planning Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
• Conduct a survey for all birds protected by the MBTA and CFGC seven (7) days prior to vegetation removal or construction activities within 250 feet of the work areas. • If an active nest is found then the biologist shall map the nest location and establish an appropriate “no disturbance” buffer around the active nest(s) as determined by the biologist. Construction and vegetation removal activity shall be prohibited within the buffer until • Conduct an additional migratory bird and raptor survey if vegetation removal and/or construction stops for more than 15 days. The survey shall be conducted within seven (7) days prior to the continuation of activities. BIO.e.1) The applicant shall acquire either (a) a conservation easement on existing oak woodlands or (b) fee title to existing oak woodlands for the purpose of oak woodland preservation. In-kind mitigation shall be provided at a 2:1 ratio (off-site) for direct effects. To account for indirect impacts due to fuel management activities, the acreage of oak woodland affected by fuel management activities shall be offset at a 1:1 ratio (off-site). Any proposed conservation of existing on-site oak-woodlands shall be considered to offset on-site direct and fuel management activities at a .25:1 and .5:1 ratio respectively. Accordingly, a minimum of 72 acres of blue oak woodland shall be acquired in Shasta County as a mitigation site. An Operations and Management Plan acceptable to Shasta County shall be prepared to define allowable uses on the mitigation site(s), annual monitoring and reporting provisions, and measures to be undertaken if compliance with the Plan is not achieved. In addition, deed restrictions shall be established in conjunction with Shasta County upon identification of the mitigation site, and shall require that the land remain undeveloped in perpetuity to maintain the natural habitat values of the oak woodland. Regardless of land ownership, a conservation easement shall be established and shall be held by a third-party conservation oriented entity that shall be responsible for	Prior to Recording a Final Map	Planning Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
ensuring that the conditions of the Operations and Management Plan are implemented. As a condition of the conservation easement, Shasta County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be granted access/inspection rights to the mitigation property. An endowment shall be established by the project proponent to provide for management, monitoring, reporting, and other compliance activities needed to ensure protection of the oak woodland habitat in perpetuity.			
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials HHM.h.1) Prior to recording a final map, the applicant shall treat wildland fuels within 100 feet and on slopes in excess of 30% between 100 and 200 feet of urban lots to be created by the recording of a final map. Fuels shall be treated according to the treatment prescription described in in the Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. Subsequent to recording a final map a Home Owners Association shall maintain defensible space in accordance with the treatment prescription described in the plan and applicable regulations regarding defensible space. HHM.h.2) Prior to recording a final map, a home owners association (HOA) shall be formed to maintain defensible space in accordance with the Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. The HOA shall provide for the determination of fees, annual collection of fees, and implementation of projects necessary to maintain defensible space in accordance with Wildland-Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. HHM.h.3) Prior to or simultaneous with the recording of a final map, a defensible space easement(s) shall be granted for the benefit of the Homeowners Association created for the purpose of maintaining defensible space in accordance with the treatment prescription described in the Wildland Fuel and Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the project. Said easement shall be granted over the proposed Open Space Parcel, Parcel D, and/or any remainder parcel	Prior to Recording the Final Map In perpetuity Prior to Recording the Final Map Prior to Recording the Final Map	Planning Division HOA Planning Division Planning Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
or other open area adjacent to any urban parcels created by the recording of a final map.			
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality HWQ.d.1) The applicant shall, prior to recording a final map and consistent with the Preliminary Storm Drainage Analysis, design and construct a drainage system that utilizes above ground detention facilities and underground drainage rock with perforated pipe storm water detention facilities and/or other low impact development storm water facilities deemed acceptable to the Shasta County Resource Management and Public Works Department. The final design and supporting documentation shall be detailed in and submitted with improvement plans prepared for the project and shall demonstrate that the metered run-off from the combination of facilities when combined with the un-detained flow from the project will be equal to or less than the predevelopment flow rates for the 10-, 25-, and 100-year design storm events. HWQ.f.1) Downspouts and, where no roof gutter is proposed, roof drip lines shall be directed to pervious surfaces such as undeveloped, landscaped areas, and/or other pervious/semi-pervious surface. The locations of downspouts/roof drip lines and a description or detail of the area to which they discharge shall be included in construction plans submitted with a building permit application. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for the proposed building(s), the proposed building plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. HWQ.f.2) Paved driveways, except those paved with a pervious/semi-pervious surface, shall be constructed with a drainage swale or slotted channel drain that directs run-off from the driveway to as undeveloped, landscaped areas, vegetative swales, bio-retention features and/or other pervious/semi-pervious surface. A slotted channel drain shall be required for any driveway in excess of 5%	Prior to Recording the Final Map In Perpetuity	Planning Division Department of Public Works	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
slope. The drainage swale or slotted channel drain shall and a description or detail of the area(s) to which it discharges shall be included in construction plans submitted with a building permit application. Prior to submitting building permit application(s) to Shasta County for grading and/or buildings, the proposed grading or building plans shall be reviewed for compliance with this requirement and approved by a Home Owners Association (HOA) formed for the proposed subdivision. HWQ.f.3) All landscaping and irrigation plan (building permit) for the construction of any new aggregate landscaped area in excess of equal to or greater-than 500-square feet or rehabilitated aggregate landscaped area equal to or greater than 2,500 square-feet shall be submitted to the Department of Resource Management for review and approval prior to construction. Said plans may be incorporated into the building plans and building permit application. The proposed landscaping and irrigation plan shall demonstrate compliance with the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (WELO) and incorporate low impact development features designed to receive run-off from landscaped and impervious surfaces, reduce discharge of polluted runoff from the site, and to facilitate compliances with other low impact development features and methods required for the project. Such features shall include vegetated swales, bio-retention, infiltration, and/or other features designed and located to minimize discharge of runoff from the site. The locations and a description or detail of these features shall be included the construction plans submitted with the building permit.			
XI. Noise N.d.1) Construction of the proposed subdivision improvements shall be suspended on Sundays, federal holidays, and during the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).	During Construction	Planning Division	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
XIII. Public Services PS-Fire Protection.1).Developer shall provide documentation, prior to approval of the first final map, to the satisfaction of the Cottonwood Fire Protection District that a Mello-Roos district, or other financing mechanism approved by the Cottonwood Fire Protection district has been established to provide a proportional fair share of financing costs for construction, acquisition, maintenance and operations, including but not be limited to the proportionate personnel costs, of fire protection infrastructure to serve the project. Computation of said proportional fair share shall take into account the proposed agreement to deed to the Cottonwood Fire Protection District land or a future sub-station. PS-Fire Protection.2) Prior to recording the first final map, the Developer shall enter into an agreement to deed to the Cottonwood Fire Protection District an area of level land not less-than one-half acre in size to be used for a future fire sub-station. The land should be situated with easy access to Rhonda Road.	Final Map Review Final Map Review	Planning Division Cottonwood Fire Protection District Planning Division Cottonwood Fire Protection District	
XV. Transportation and Traffic TR.d.1) The applicant shall prior to recording a final map for the project either provide street lighting at the proposed Rhonda Road intersections or provide a street lighting warrant analysis prepared by qualified traffic engineer according to Federal Highway and Traffic Administration or other acceptable guidelines or methodology for review and approval of the Shasta County Department of Public Works, Development Services and/or Traffic Divisions. If the analysis demonstrates that street lighting is not warranted, no further action is required by the applicant.	Final Map Review	Planning Division	