ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

Zone Amendment 05-009
General Plan Amendment 05-004
TATOM

May 20, 2005

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
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

1. **Project Title:** Zone Amendment 05-009, General Plan Amendment 05-004, TATOM

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:** Brandon Rogers, Associate Planner (530) 225-5532

4. **Project Location**: The location of the project is at the south east intersection of Old Highway Forty - Four and Cedro Lane in the Palo Cedro area.

5. **Applicant Name and Address**: Palo Cedro Park Estates Investments, Inc., PO Box 233, Palo Cedro, CA, 96023.

6. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Residential "A" (RA).

7. **Zoning:** Rural Residential (R-R).

8. **Description of Project:** The project is located on a 2.54 acre parcel. The proposal is to amend the General Plan from the Rural Residential "A" (RA) to the Commercial (C) land use designation in conjunction with a Zone Amendment from the Rural Residential (R-R) to the Community Commercial (C-2) combined with the Design Review (DR) zone districts.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The surrounding land use is primarily rural residential to the south and to the east, with developed and undeveloped commercial uses to the west and north. The project setting is characterized by primarily level topography with grasses and oak trees.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** None.

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:

☒ 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.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "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.

☐ 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 of 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 Brandon Rogers, Associate Planner at (530) 225-5532.

Brandon Rogers
Associate Planner

05/20/05
Date

Richard Burnum / For:
Russ Mull, R.E.H.S., A.I.C.P.
Director of Resource Management

5-20-05
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No 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 "No 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. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more, "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less 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, "Earlier 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 "Less 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. AESTHETICS: 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?				✔
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				✔
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✔	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✔	

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

a) The project would not result in any adverse effect on a scenic vista because there is no view of the project site which includes a scenic vista.

b) The project would not substantially damage any scenic resource because the project site is not visible from a designated scenic highway.

c) The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The project surroundings are primarily rural residential to the south and to the east, with developed and undeveloped commercial uses to the west and north. Construction of a commercial development is consistent with the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area because glare would be eliminated by the use of non-reflective materials for construction of the project.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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?				✔
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				✔
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				✔

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, and staff review of the project and 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 1998.

b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are in a Williamson Act Contract.

c) The project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The site is not located in an area of significant agricultural soils.

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?				✔
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				✔
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				✔
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				✔
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✔

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

a) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2000 Attainment Plan for Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan.

b) The project would not violate any air quality standards and would not contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

c) The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, including ozone, ozone pre-cursors or PM10 (particulate matter), the pollutants for which the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin is in non-attainment under the applicable state ambient air quality standard.

d) No sensitive receptors have been identified adjacent to or near the project area. Substantial pollutant concentrations are not anticipated as a result of the project.

e) The project would not cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

a) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have been identified on the project site or in the project area and there are no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species located on or near the project site.

b) There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community on the project site or in the project area.

c) There are no wetlands on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. There are no vernal pools or wetlands identified on the subject property based on the Vernal Pools, Wetlands, and Waterways Map of Shasta County prepared by the Geographic Information Center, CSUC on August 24, 1996.

d) The project would not interfere with any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) The project would not conflict with any ordinances or polices which protect biological resources. Shasta County Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 95-157 provides guidance regarding use and protection of oak trees on a voluntary basis. At the time of Use Permit application, an oak woodland conservation plan will be submitted to the Planning Division for review. The oak woodland conservation plan will identify all native oaks to be removed which are greater than five inches in diameter at breast height and shall provide for on-site or off-site areas for conservation easements, specifications for replacement of oak tree planting or other mitigations deemed effective for the protection and conservation of oak woodlands.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – 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?				✔
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✔
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✔
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✔

Discussion: Comments regarding the potential for the project to have impacts on cultural resources were received during processing of Tract Map 1886, from the following agencies:

Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (See attached comment letter). Based on these comments, the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, and staff review of the project and observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

b) 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 area. 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 sensitive for cultural resources. An Archeology Report, by Trudy Vaughan of Coyote and Fox Enterprises, March 2004 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, if, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, mineral exploration activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – 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: xi) 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?				✔
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				✔
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				✔
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✔

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, and staff review of the project and observations on the project site and in the vicinity, 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 project site is located in Uniform Building Code Zone 3, described as an area of "moderate seismicity". 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 ½ 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 Uniform Building Code.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;

iv) Landslides.

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

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 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. The topography of the site is predominantly level, with small undulations. The threat of landslides, lateral

spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse is insignificant as the geology of the area shows demonstrates great stability.

d) The project would not be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property. The site soils are not described as expansive soils in the "Soil Survey of Shasta County."

e) The project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. Sewer service is available to the project site.

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?				✔
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				✔
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✔
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✔
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✔
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✔
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✔
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✔

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

a) The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed uses resulting from the project are commercial and no routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials is anticipated as a result of the project.

b) The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c) 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) The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is no emergency response plan for the project site area.

h) The project would not 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. The Shasta County Fire Department has indicated that the project is located in an area which is designated a "HIGH" Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Shasta County Fire Department regulations require that defensible space be provided by the removal of all flammable vegetation within a minimum of 100 feet of all structures.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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?				✔
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)?				✔
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?				✔
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?				✔
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?				✔
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				✔
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?				✔
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✔
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✔
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✔

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

a) The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Through adherence to construction standards, including erosion and sediment control measures, water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated. Grading may be needed for this project. A grading permit would be required. The provisions or the permit will address erosion and siltation containment on- and off-site.

b) The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

c) The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The drainage pattern will not be altered. Drainage will be disbursed to either the unimproved areas or landscape areas adjacent to the building and the parking areas. The runoff will sheet flow into the existing drainage channels on the site. This will preserve the existing drainage pattern and not require alteration of the natural drainage courses.

d) The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

e) The project would not 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.

f) The project would not substantially degrade water quality.

g) The project would not place housing within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

h) The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

i) The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. There are no levees, dams, or impoundments within or upstream from the project area which would create flooding in the event of levee or dam failure. The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

j) The project would not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. 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: None proposed.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				✔
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✔
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✔

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

a) The project would not physically divide an established community because the project is not located in any established community and 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 consistent with the proposed Commercial (C) General Plan land use designation and the proposed Community Commercial (C-2) zone district of the project site.

c) The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There are 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.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – 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?				✔
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✔

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

a) 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. There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site.

b) 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. 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.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XI. NOISE – 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?				✔
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels				✔
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✔
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✔
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✔
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✔

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

a) The project would not 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. The General Plan Noise Standard is 55 hourly L_{eq} daytime, and 50 hourly L_{eq} nighttime. The project will not generate noise levels in excess of this standard. The project is not located in a high noise area which will result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of the standard.

b) The project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. There is no identified source of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project area.

c) The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project will result in an amendment to the General Plan from the Rural Residential "A" (RA) to the Commercial (C) land use designation in conjunction with a Zone Amendment from the Rural Residential (R-R) to the Community Commercial (C-2) combined with the Design Review (DR) zone districts which will not cause any permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) The project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project will result in an amendment the General Plan from the Rural Residential "A" (RA) to the Commercial (C) land use designation in conjunction with a Zone Amendment from the Rural Residential (R-R) to the Community Commercial (C-2) combined with the Design Review (DR) zone districts which will cause less than significant temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. There will be increased noise levels during residential construction, and increased noise levels caused by the daily activities of new businesses. However, none of these increases are expected to be significant. It is likely that there will be an increase in nosie levels from the ultimate development of the project site. Noise sources include vehicles and human activities related to commercial businesses. However, there is no anticipated substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project resulting from the potential placement of commercial development at the project site.

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: None proposed.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – 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)?				✓
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Discussion: Based the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, and staff review of the project and 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 project does not include the development of new homes or businesses, it does not include the extension of any permanent roads or other infrastructure. Therefore, it is not expected to induce substantial growth in the area.

b) The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project does not include destruction of any existing housing.

c) The project would not displace any 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?				✓
Police Protection?				✓
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other public facilities?				✓

Discussion: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, and staff review of the project and 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 high fire hazard severity zone. However, no significant additional level of fire protection is necessary. Additional fire hydrants will be installed per the County Fire Safe Standards.

Police Protection:

The County has a total of 147sworn and 119 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff's deputies) for the County population of 68,300 (Calif. Dept. of Finance, Official State Estimates as of January 1, 2004) persons in the unincorporated area of the County. That is a ratio of one officer per 256 persons. The project will result in zero additional residences, with an additional population of zero (use 2.621 persons per household per Calif. Dept. of Finance Official State Estimates as of January 1, 2003). This is not a significant number to warrant any additional sworn or non-sworn peace officers.

Schools:

The resultant development from the project will be required to pay the amount allowable per square foot of construction to mitigate school impacts.

Parks:

The County does not have a neighborhood parks system.

Other public facilities:

None

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIV. RECREATION	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?				✓
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓

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

a) 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. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.

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. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – 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)?				✓
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highway?				✓
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				✓
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓

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

a) The project would not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The Department of Public Works has indicated that the project would not generate enough traffic to significantly reduce the volume to capacity ratio of adjacent roadways to a reduced level of service.

b) The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highway. There is no County congestion management agency, and no level-of-service established by such an agency.

c) The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. The project would result in the construction of single-family residences which would not affect air traffic patterns.

d) The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

e) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Primary and Emergency access to the project is provided by the following roadways: Cedro Way. The project has been reviewed by the Shasta County Fire Department which has determined that there is adequate emergency access.

f) The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. There is more than adequate parking available for on-site parking as required by Chapter 17.86 of the Shasta County Code.

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 1998 Shasta County Bikeway Plan, and with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

a) The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project will be served by the Community Service Area #8 wastewater treatment system which is in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to water quality.

b) The project would not 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. The project will be served by individual wells. Well log data from the vicinity indicates that there is sufficient groundwater to serve the project. The project will be served by the Community Service Area #8 wastewater treatment system. The CSA has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities.

c) The project would not 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. The project will be served by the existing storm water drainage facilities. No expansion of the facilities is necessary.

d) The project would 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. The project will be served by individual wells. Well log data from the vicinity indicates that there is sufficient groundwater to serve the project.

e) The project would 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. The project will be served by the Community Service Area #8 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 project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. 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. The project will not generate any solid waste other than common household waste. Recycling facilities are available in the major shopping areas available to the project site.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	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?				✓
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 the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				✓
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓

Discussion:

a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is no evidence to support a finding that project would 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.

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 no evidence to support a finding that the project would have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

PROJECT NUMBER Zone Amendment 05-009, General Plan Amendment 05-004, TATOM

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. Archeology Report, by Trudy Vaughan of Coyote and Fox Enterprises, March 2004

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. Shasta County Division of Environmental Health
2. Shasta County Fire Department
3. Shasta County Department of Public Works

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, 1991 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

3. 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.