

CITY OF REDDING

777 CYPRESS AVENUE, REDDING, CA 96001

P.O. Box 496071, REDDING, CA 96049-6071

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Permit No. Use Permit Application UP-2021-00190
State Clearinghouse No. _____

SUBJECT

Use Permit Application UP-2021-00190 by Al Naticchioni.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Use Permit Application UP-2021-00190 to allow the construction of approximately 400 feet of sewer line, to support future development of 499 Twin View Boulevard, to encroach within the 100-year floodplain and floodway of Boulder Creek. The sewer line is approximately 400 feet in length and is proposed within the Twin View Boulevard public right-of-way.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area consists of approximately 3 acres consisting of the property and a portion of the Twin View Boulevard right-of-way along the street frontage of the project parcel and the northerly adjacent parcel addressed as 501 Twin View Boulevard. The project area consists of a relatively level upper terrace on which a proposed office building will be constructed and a lower terrace on the south side of Boulder Creek. To the north of Boulder Creek, the site rises evenly to its northern terminus. The project area ranges in elevation from 620 feet to 640 feet above sea level. A mobile home park is developed immediately south of the project area, an RV park is developed immediately northeast of the project area, and Twin View Boulevard is immediately northwest of the project area. Approximately 80 percent of the project area is encumbered by the 100-year floodplain of Boulder Creek that traverses its northern boundary. The project area consists primarily of disturbed annual grassland and patches of oak/pine woodland on the upper terrace, oak/pine woodland on the slope between the upper and lower terraces, annual grassland and ceanothus scrub on the lower terrace, and annual grassland and oak/pine woodland north of Boulder Creek. In addition to Boulder Creek, aquatic features on or adjacent to the site include a drainage channel that flows in a northeasterly direction parallel to Twin View Boulevard. A created seasonal wetland is present immediately west of the sewer manhole at the northern project area boundary.

FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

The City of Redding conducted an Initial Study (attached), which determined that the proposed project could have significant environmental effects. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation measures identified below. The project, as revised and as agreed to by the applicant, avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects identified,

and the preparation of an environmental impact report will not be required. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the City, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment. If there are substantial changes that alter the character or impacts of the proposed project, another environmental impact determination will be necessary.

The project includes measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts from indirect construction activity to nesting birds during the nesting season.

Prior to approval of the project, the lead agency may conclude, at a public hearing, that certain mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are infeasible or undesirable. In accordance with CEQA Section 15074.1, the lead agency may delete those mitigation measures and substitute other measures which it determines are equivalent or more effective. The lead agency would adopt written findings that the new measure is equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it, in itself, would not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment.

1. **Based on the whole record (including the Initial Study and any supporting documentation) and the mitigation measures incorporated into the project, the City of Redding has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant.**
2. **The Mitigated Negative Declaration, with its supporting documentation, fully incorporated herein, reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency, which is the City of Redding.**

DOCUMENTATION

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above determination.

MITIGATION MEASURE

Mitigation Bio-1. If construction activities will occur during the nesting season for migratory birds (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey seven days before construction activities begin. If nesting birds are found, CDFW will be notified and consulted. An appropriate buffer, as determined by CDFW and the qualified biologist, will be placed around the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities cease for a period of greater than seven days, additional preconstruction surveys will be required.

PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

- State Clearinghouse (if necessary)
- Shasta County Clerk
- U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Redding
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Redding
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Redding
- California Native Plant Society, Shasta County
- Shasta Environmental Alliance
- All property owners within 300 feet of the property boundary

PUBLIC REVIEW

- (x) Draft document referred for comments April 21, 2021.
- () No comments were received during the public review period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration findings or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public review period. The letters and responses follow (see Response to Comments, attached).

Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Initial Study, documentation materials, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Development Services Department, City of Redding, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001 and online on the Planning/Projects page of the Development Services website at: www.cityofredding.org. Contact: Planning Manager, Lily Toy, (530) 225-4022.



Lily Toy, Planning Manager


4/21/2021

Date

Date of Final Report

Attachments:

- A. Location map
- B. Initial Study
- C. Mitigation Monitoring Program



	GIS DIVISION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT	LOCATION MAP UP-2021-00190 AL NATICCHIONI 499 TWIN VIEW BOULEVARD AP# 116-040-003	MTG. DATE:
	DATE PRODUCED: APRIL 21, 2021		ITEM:
			ATTACHMENT:

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

References and Documentation

Naticchioni Twin View Boulevard Sewer Floodplain/Floodway
Encroachment Project
Use Permit UP-2021-00190

Prepared by:
CITY OF REDDING
Development Services Department
Planning Division
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, California 96001

April 21, 2021

CITY OF REDDING ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Naticchioni Twin View Boulevard Sewer Floodplain/Flooway Encroachment Project
2. **Lead agency name and address:**

CITY OF REDDING
Development Services Department
Planning Division
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, CA 96001
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Planning Manager, Lily Toy, (530) 245-7231
4. **Project Location:** The project area consists of a portion of 499 Twin View Boulevard, located approximately 1,500 feet north of Lake Boulevard, as well as a portion of Twin View Boulevard public right-of-way immediately adjacent to 499 and 501 Twin View Boulevard.
5. **Applicant's Name and Address:**

Al Naticchioni
20 Hilltop Drive, Suite A
Redding, CA 96003
- Representative's Name and Address:**

The Land Designers
1975 Placer Street, Suite A
Redding, CA 96001
6. **General Plan Designation:** Heavy Commercial and Greenway
7. **Zoning:** "HC-FP" Heavy Commercial with Floodplain Combining District
8. **Description of Project:** To allow the construction of approximately 400 feet of sewer line, to support future development of 499 Twin View Boulevard, to encroach within the 100-year floodplain and floodway of Boulder Creek. The sewer line is approximately 400 feet in length and is proposed within the Twin View Boulevard public right-of-way.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project area consists of approximately 3 acres consisting of the property, 499 Twin View Boulevard, and a portion of the Twin View Boulevard right-of-way along the street frontage of the project parcel and the northerly adjacent parcel addressed as 501 Twin View Boulevard. The project site consists of a relatively level upper terrace on which a proposed office building will be constructed and a lower terrace on the south side of Boulder Creek. To the north of Boulder Creek, the site rises evenly to its northern terminus. The project site ranges in elevation from 620 feet to 640 feet above sea level. A mobile home park is developed immediately south of the site, an RV park is developed immediately northeast of the site, and Twin View Boulevard is immediately northwest of the site. Approximately 80 percent of the project site is encumbered by the 100-year floodplain of Boulder Creek that traverses its northern boundary. The project site consists primarily of disturbed annual grassland and patches of oak/pine woodland on the upper terrace, oak/pine woodland on the slope between the upper and lower terraces, annual grassland and ceanothus scrub on the lower terrace, and annual grassland and oak/pine woodland north of Boulder Creek. In addition to Boulder Creek, aquatic features on or adjacent to the site include a drainage channel that flows in a northeasterly direction parallel to Twin View Boulevard. A created seasonal wetland is present immediately west of the sewer manhole at the northern site boundary.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and/or US Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers.

11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?** A letter notice of this project was sent to the California Native American tribes that have requested notification: Redding Rancheria and Wintu Tribe of Northern California, on April 16, 2021. No request for consultation has been received as of yet.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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 or Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Energy
	Geology / Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population / Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities / Service Systems		Wildfire		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 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 Development Services Department, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Planning Manager, Lily Toy at (530) 245-7231.



Lily Toy
Development Services Department

4/21/2021

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

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

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

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

Prior environmental evaluations applicable to all or part of the project site:

- *City of Redding General Plan, 2000*
- *City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH #1998072103*

List of attachments/references:

Attachment A – Location Map

Attachment B – Project Site Plan

Attachment C – Project Sewer Exhibit

Attachment D – Biological Screening, prepared by Enplan, dated June 9, 2020 (on file in the Development Services Department, Planning Division)

Attachment E – Flood Encroachment Impact Letter, prepared by Realm Engineering, dated February 19, 2021 (on file in the Development Services Department, Planning Division)

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES:

Biological Resources

M Bio-1. If construction activities will occur during the nesting season for migratory birds (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey seven days before construction activities begin. If nesting birds are found, CDFW will be notified and consulted. An appropriate buffer, as determined by CDFW and the qualified biologist, will be placed around the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities cease for a period greater than seven days, additional preconstruction surveys will be required.

I. AESTHETICS: <i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>	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?				x
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				x
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? <i>(Public views are those that area experienced from publicly accessible vantage point).</i> If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				x
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				x

Discussion:

- a) The project must comply with the height standards of the City's Zoning Ordinance. The project would be consistent in height with buildings on adjacent properties and would not obstruct any documented scenic vistas. The proposed project would not represent a significant change to the overall scenic quality of the area.
- b) The project site is not located adjacent to a state-designated scenic highway.
- c) The project will be compatible with the existing visual character of the property and its surroundings.
- d) The project would generate light that is customary for development and comply with the Zoning Ordinance light standards. There would not be an adverse effect on day or nighttime views in the area.

Documentation:

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

Mitigation:

None necessary.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: <i>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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i>	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?				x
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				x
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 5110(g))?				x
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				x
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?				x

Discussion:

- a-e) The project site does not contain designated farmland, forest land, or timberlands. The project site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes, nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production. The site is not located within an area of Prime Farmland as identified by the California Department of Conservation's Important Farmland Series Mapping and Monitoring Program and is not under Williamson Act contract. The project would not convert or rezone any farmland to non-agricultural use, or any forest land to non-forest use.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000
City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.4: Agricultural Lands
California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, Soil Survey of Shasta County Area.

Mitigation:

None necessary.

III. AIR QUALITY: <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>	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?				x
b) 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			x	

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			x	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				x

Discussion:

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

The City Air Quality Element of the *General Plan* establishes emission-reduction goals of 20 to 25 percent, depending on the projected level of unmitigated emissions for a project. Mitigation thresholds are established for the important regional/local pollutants, including: Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), which are ozone precursors, and Inhalable Particulate Matter, 10 Micron (PM₁₀). The mitigation thresholds for these pollutants are tiered at two levels as follows:

Level "A"	Level "B"
25 pounds per day of NOx	137 pounds per day of NOx
25 pounds per day of ROG	137 pounds per day of ROG
80 pounds per day of PM ₁₀	137 pounds per day of PM ₁₀

If a project has unmitigated emissions less than the Level "A" threshold, then it is viewed as a minor project (from an air quality perspective) and only application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) is required to try to achieve at least a 20 percent reduction in emissions, or the best reduction feasible otherwise. Land uses that generate unmitigated emissions above Level "A" require application of appropriate Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMMs), in addition to the SMMs, in order to achieve a net emission reduction of 20 percent or more. If, after applying SMMs and BAMMs, a use still exceeds the Level "B" threshold, then a minimum of 25 percent of the unmitigated emissions exceeding 137 pounds per day must be offset by reducing emissions from existing sources of pollution; otherwise, an Environmental Impact Report is required.

Under policy of the Air Quality Element, a project has the potential to impact air quality primarily in two ways: (1) the project would generate vehicle trip emissions (with NOx, ROG, and PM₁₀) that contribute cumulatively to local and regional air quality conditions; and (2) fugitive dust (particulate/PM₁₀) emissions are possible during construction activities. As a utility project for a future small office building the project does not have the potential to generate significant emission concentrations of other pollutants subject to state and federal ambient air quality standards. The project was not of a size or significance that would warrant Level "B" conditions, therefore standard conditions will be applied and reduce potential air quality impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) is required in order to strive toward the *General Plan* policy of a 20 percent reduction in emissions to address small-scale cumulative effects. SMMs applicable to this project address primarily short-term impacts related to construction and are standard development regulations promulgated in the City Grading Ordinance and California Building Code identified below. Application of the SMMs and the application of Best Available Mitigation Measures for NOx emissions as outlined below would reduce the project's potential air quality impacts to a level less than significant.

1. Nontoxic soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
2. All grading operations shall be suspended when winds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 miles per hour.

3. Temporary traffic control shall be provided as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
4. Construction activities that could affect traffic flow shall be scheduled in off-peak hours.
5. Active construction areas, haul roads, etc., shall be watered at least twice daily or more as needed to limit dust.
6. Exposed stockpiles of soil and other backfill material shall either be covered, watered, or have soil binders added to inhibit dust and wind erosion.
7. All truck hauling solid and other loose material shall be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.
8. All public roadways used by the project contractor shall be maintained free from dust, dirt, and debris caused by construction activities. Streets shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil materials are carried onto adjacent public paved roads. Wheel washers shall be used where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or trucks and any equipment shall be washed off leaving the site with each trip.
9. Alternatives to open burning of cleared vegetative material on the project site shall be used unless otherwise deemed infeasible by the City Planning Division. Suitable alternatives include, but are not limited to, on-site chipping and mulching and/or hauling to a biomass fuel site.

d) Potential impacts to neighboring homes (sensitive receptors) from fugitive dust caused during construction are mitigated by application of the SMMs discussed above.

e) The project does not involve land use that could generate objectionable odors affecting substantial number of people.

Documentation:

Shasta County APCD Air Quality Maintenance Plan and Implementing Measures

City of Redding General Plan, Air Quality Element

City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH #1998072103, Chapter 8.6, Air Quality,

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the *City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, as adopted by the Redding City Council on October 3, 2000, by Resolution 2000-166

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 9.7, Natural Resources and Air Quality

California Air Resources Board. 2017. Area designations maps/state and national. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm> (accessed on April 15, 2021).

Mitigation:

None necessary.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> : <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				x
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		x		

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

Discussion:

a-d) A biological report was prepared by Enplan, dated June 9, 2020. The study contains the following determinations:

- Project implementation would not adversely affect sensitive terrestrial natural communities.
- Boulder Creek, the diverted stream/drainage, and the seasonal wetland present immediately west of the sewer manhole at the northern site terminus are expected to qualify as “Waters of the State” and/or “Waters of the United States.” Project implementation could adversely affect Waters of the State or United States. If avoidance of these waters is not feasible, then permits from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and/or US Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, may be required. Compliance with the permit conditions would ensure that work would not adversely affect waters.
- No special-status plant species would be directly or indirectly affected by project implementation.
- No special-status animal species other than rearing salmonids are likely to be utilize the study area. Because the sewer line would be installed under Boulder Creek using trenchless techniques and because Best Management Practices for erosion control and spill prevention would be implemented, no adverse effects on special-status animals are expected.
- Essential fish habitat is present in Boulder Creek and designated critical habitat for winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon is present downstream in Churn Creek and the Sacramento River. However, these habitats would not be adversely affected by project implementation because the sewer line would be installed under Boulder Creek using trenchless techniques and because Best Management Practices for erosion control and spill prevention would be implemented.
- Migratory birds could potentially nest in and adjacent to the work areas and could be directly or indirectly affected by project implementation. Implementation of the following standard construction measure would ensure that nesting birds are appropriately protected.

e) The natural oak/pine woodland on-site supports interior live oaks, blue oaks, gray pines, poison oak, toyon, chaparral honeysuckle, and Himalayan blackberry. The project has a moderate potential to support nesting birds. Tree removal is not proposed with the installation of this sewer line project. Indirect effects such as increased noise levels and increased human activity could lead to nest abandonment by adults. Most birds expected to occur on the site nest between February 1 and August 31. If work must occur during the nesting season, a nesting survey should be conducted in advance of any construction. If active nests are present, a buffer zone should be established around the nest to ensure that nesting birds are not directly or indirectly affected. Implementation of standard construction practices would preclude disturbance to nesting migratory birds. To minimize impacts from construction, mitigation is provided below to encourage construction activity to be conducted outside the main nesting period of February 1 to August 31, and requiring a nest survey and appropriate nest-avoidance measures, if any work must occur during the nesting season.

f) No habitat conservation plans or other similar plans have been adopted for the project site or project area. No impact would occur in this regard.

Documentation:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife: Natural Diversity Data Base
City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000
City of Redding Municipal Code, Chapter 18.45, Tree Management Ordinance
City of Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH #1998072103
 Biological Screening, by Enplan, dated June 9, 2020.

Mitigation:

M Bio-1. If construction activities will occur during the nesting season for migratory birds (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey seven days before construction activities begin. If nesting birds are found, CDFW will be notified and consulted. An appropriate buffer, as determined by CDFW and the qualified biologist, will be placed around the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities cease for a period greater than seven days, additional preconstruction surveys will be required.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:</u> <i>Would the project:</i>	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 Section 15064.5?				x
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				x
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				x

Discussion:

a-c) Based upon archaeological reports, records searches, and information contained in the *General Plan* EIR pertinent to the vicinity of the subject property, it has been determined that the project site is not in an area of archaeological or cultural sensitivity. No impacts in this area are anticipated.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998
City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH #1998072103

Mitigation:

None necessary.

<u>VI. Energy:</u> <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			x	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				x

Discussion:

- a) The project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Direct energy use would involve the short-term use of energy for construction activities. Project construction would primarily consume diesel and gasoline through operation of construction equipment, material deliveries, and debris hauling. Construction is estimated to result in a short-term consumption of energy, representing a small demand on local and regional fuel supplies that would be easily accommodated and would be temporary.
- b) The project will not conflict with any State or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Air Quality Element, 2000
California Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, 2011
Regional Transportation Plan for Shasta County, 2015

Mitigation:

None necessary.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 				x
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				x
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?				x
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				x
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?				x
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				x

Discussion:

- a, c, d) There are no Alquist-Priolo earthquake faults designated in the Redding area of Shasta County. There are no other documented earthquake faults in the immediate vicinity that pose a significant risk, and the site is located in an area

designated in the Health and Safety Element of the *General Plan* as having a low ground-shaking potential. The project is not located on or near any documented landslide hazard areas, and there is no evidence of ground slippage or subsidence occurring naturally on the site. The type of soils and underlying geology is identified as having no potential for liquefaction. No portion of the site falls within the 100-year floodplain of the Sacramento River or any creek.

- b) The project site contains two primary soil classifications: Red Bluff gravelly loam (RcB) and Honcut gravelly loam (He). These classifications consist of well drained soils formed mainly in alluvium subject to periods of offloading in short periods during the winter. They are characterized as having rapid to moderate permeability with slow runoff. Erosion potential is slight to none. The sewer line within the floodplain area will be installed by excavating a trench and laying the pipe in the trench. A manhole will be installed at the end of the new line. The floodway area of Boulder Creek will be bored under the channel so as not to disturb the creek bed. Once installation of the sewer line is complete, all ground surfaces within the floodplain will be returned to their original ground elevation and reseeded with grasses to prevent erosion control. Excess soil will be removed from the floodplain area and spread on the private property not within the 100-year floodplain and applicable erosion control measures necessary to prevent erosion control.

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

- ◆ *City of Redding Grading Ordinance.* This ordinance requires the application of “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (Redding Municipal Code Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, E). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final project improvement plans and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts.
- ◆ *California Regional Water Quality Board “Construction Activity Storm Water Permit.”* This permit somewhat overlaps the City’s Grading Ordinance provision by applying state standards for erosion-control measures during construction of the project.
- ◆ *California Regional Water Quality Control Board “Project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).”* This plan emphasizes stormwater best management practices and is required as part of the Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the SWPPP are to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants that affect the quality of stormwater discharges and to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharges.
- ◆ *California Department of Fish and Wildlife “1600 Agreement.”* This notification is required for any work within a defined streambed and will be applicable to impacts to Boulder Creek.
- ◆ *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit.* A new Nationwide Permit will be required from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to address impacts to jurisdictional waters.

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

- e) The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal. No impact has been identified.
- f) No unique geologic features, fossil-bearing strata, or paleontological sites are known to exist on the project site.

Documentation:

City of Redding Health and Safety Element, figures 4-1 (Ground Shaking Potential) and 4.2 (Liquefaction Potential)

City of Redding General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, 1998

City of Redding Grading Ordinance, RMC Chapter 16.12

City of Redding Standard Specifications, Grading Practices

City of Redding Standard Development Conditions for Discretionary Approvals

Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974

Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42

State Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Regulations related to Construction Activity Storm Water Permits and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans

Mitigation:

None necessary.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				x
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				x

Discussion:

- a) In 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing that it is the State of California's goal to reduce statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emission levels. Subsequently, in 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill AS 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act. In part, AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations to achieve a reduction in the State's GHG emissions to year 1990 levels by year 2020.

California Senate Bill SB97 established that an individual project's effect on GHG emission levels and global warming must be assessed under CEQA. SB97 further directed that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop guidelines for the assessment of a project's GHG emissions. Those guidelines for GHG emissions were subsequently included as amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. The guidelines did not establish thresholds of significance and there are currently no state, regional, county, or city guidelines or thresholds with which to direct project-level CEQA review. As a result, the City of Redding has utilized the best available information to develop a threshold until a specific quantitative threshold is adopted by the state or regional air district.

As the Lead Agency, the City has opted to utilize a quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold using a methodology recommended by the California Air Pollution Officers (CAPCOA) and accepted by the California Air Resources Board. According to CAPCOA's *Threshold 2.3, CARB Reporting Threshold*, 10,000 metric tons of carbon-dioxide equivalents per year (mtCO₂eq/yr) is recommended as a quantitative non-zero threshold. According to the CAPCOA, this threshold would be equivalent to 550 dwelling units, 400,000 square feet of office use, 120,000 square feet of retail, or 70,000 square feet of supermarket use. This approach is estimated to capture over half the future residential and commercial development projects and is designed to support the goals of AB 32 and not hinder it.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies four primary constituents that are most representative of the GHG emissions. They are:

- **Carbon Dioxide (CO₂):** Emitted primarily through the burning of fossil fuels. Other sources include the burning of solid waste and wood and/or wood products and cement manufacturing.
- **Methane (CH₄):** Emissions occur during the production and transport of fuels, such as coal and natural gas. Additional emissions are generated by livestock and agricultural land uses, as well as the decomposition of solid waste.
- **Nitrous Oxide (N₂O):** The principal emitters include agricultural and industrial land uses and fossil fuel and waste combustion.
- **Fluorinated Gases:** These can be emitted during some industrial activities. Also, many of these gases are substitutes for ozone-depleting substances, such as CFC's, which have been used historically as refrigerants. Collectively, these gases are often referred to as "high global-warming potential" gases.

The primary generators of GHG emissions in the United States are electricity generation and transportation. The EPA estimates that nearly 85 percent of the nation's GHG emissions are comprised of carbon dioxide (CO₂). The majority of CO₂ is generated by petroleum consumption associated with transportation and coal consumption associated with electricity generation. The remaining emissions are predominately the result of natural-gas consumption associated with a variety of uses.

With regard to the project, the predominant associated GHG is CO₂ generated by motor-vehicle travel to and from the site. To a substantially lesser degree, the project will result in CH₄ emissions associated with use of electric power generated by the Redding Electric Utility (REU), though it should be noted that REU distributes power from a variety of sources, including hydroelectric, wind, and natural gas.

Given the scope and nature of the proposed project compared to that of similar projects, emissions from the project would be significantly below the thresholds put forth by CARB, as well as the City's air-quality thresholds. Therefore, the project would not contribute significantly to GHG emissions in the air basin. Additionally, the City and State's construction standards and BMPs, including Air Quality SSM 1 through 9 (listed in Section III, Air Quality, above), will be used during construction to further limit any potential contribution to negative impacts from GHG emissions. The project's direct or indirect impact on measurable GHGs in the Redding area would be less than significant.

On a larger scale, the City of Redding's General Plan acknowledges that land use decisions have an impact on climate and air quality. Land use decisions that result in low or very low density on the periphery of the community increase the amount of vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), which increases vehicle emissions. In response to this impact, the City's *General Plan* includes a number of goals and policies in the Community Development and Design Element, Transportation Element, and Housing Element that promote a compact urban form and encourage infill development, advocate higher housing density, and ensure connectivity to citywide bikeways and pedestrian plans. The goal of these policies is to reduce VMT, which also reduces emissions and reduces a wide variety of air quality impacts. Since automobiles are considered a major source of GHG emission, each vehicle trip reduced also reduces GHG emissions.

- b) The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policies, or regulations adopted to reduce GHG emission. As noted, in "a" above, the project is in conformance with the City's air quality policies and thresholds, and with state guidelines and regulations, and Standard Mitigation Measures listed in Section III Air Quality, above. The proposed project would have no impact on any plans, policies, or regulations related to GHG emissions.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, 2000

CPCOA website, July 19, 2010

California Office of the Attorney General, "The California Environmental Quality Act Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level," updated January 6, 2010.

Mitigation:

None necessary.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: <i>Would the project:</i>	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?				x
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?				x
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				x
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?				x
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				x

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?				x

Discussion:

- a-d) The nature of the project as a utility project does not present a significant risk related to hazardous materials or emissions. There are no documented hazardous material sites located on or near the project.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There would be no impact on public safety.
- f) The project does not involve a use or activity that could interfere with emergency-response or emergency-evacuation plans for the area.
- g) The project site does not have a wildland fire-hazard potential. The site has been disturbed in the past and is surrounded primarily by developed residential and commercial lots.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Health and Safety Element, 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: <i>Would the project:</i>	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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				x
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				x
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				x
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				x
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				x
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				x
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?				x

X. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				x
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				x

Discussion:

- a) Since the project is proposing to expand the City sanitary sewer service, the project would not involve any permitted discharges of waste material into ground or surface waters. Construction and operation of the project would not violate any water quality standards established by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in its Basin Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins. Water pollution best management practices are required and will be incorporated into the improvement plans for the project. The City's construction standards require that all projects prepare an erosion and sediment control plan (ESCP) prior to construction to address water pollution control. The ESCP will ensure that water quality standards are not substantially affected by the project during construction.
- b) The project would utilize City water service for domestic uses and fire protection. The proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies.
- c) The project is subject to standard requirements defined under Section VII., *Geology and Soils*, and mitigation measures under Section IV., *Biological Resources*, above that minimize the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The final improvement plans for the project must also incorporate specific design measures intended to limit pollutant discharges in stormwater from urban improvements as established under the State's National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) general permit, which the City is now obligated to follow in accordance with State Water Quality Control Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ. Feasible Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be incorporated in the final design of the project's storm-drain system, as approved by the City Engineer, based on the BMPs listed in the latest edition of the California Storm Water Quality Association Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook.
- d) Approximately 80 percent of the project site is located within the Boulder Creek 100-year floodplain boundary by both FEMA and the City of Redding Master Storm Drain Study (Montgomery Watson). However, any disturbance in the floodplain through the trenching for the sewer line will be restored to the original ground elevation. The floodway area of Boulder Creek will be bored under the channel so as not to disturb the creek bed. Excess soil will be removed from the floodplain area and spread on the private property not within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, there will not be any impact to the floodplain nor floodway. A letter has been submitted by Realm Engineering, dated February 19, 2021 confirming the project will not have any impact.
- e) The project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10, Health and Safety Element, 1998
Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations, FIRM map 06089C1551G], dated March 17, 2011
City of Redding Storm Drain Master Plan, Montgomery-Watson Engineers 1993
Floodplain and Floodway Impact Letter, prepared by Realm Engineering, dated February 19, 2021

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XI. <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?				x

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				x

Discussion:

- a) The project does not have the potential to physically divide an established community.
- b) The project is compatible with the applicable policies and regulations of the City General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and is not in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Community Development Element, 2000
City of Redding General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 2000, SCH #1998072103
City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: <i>Would the project:</i>	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?				x
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?				x

Discussion:

- a-b) The project site is not identified in the General Plan as having any known mineral-resource value or as being located within any "Critical Mineral Resource Overlay" area.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XIII. NOISE: <i>Would the project result in:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				x
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				x

XIII. NOISE: <i>Would the project result in:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?				x

Discussion:

- a-b) Due to the nature of the project as a utility project, it would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels and would not result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

During the construction of the proposed project, there will be a temporary increase in noise in the project vicinity above existing ambient noise levels. The most noticeable construction noise will be related to grading, utility excavation, and land-clearing activity. The City's Grading Ordinance (RMC Chapter 16.12.120.H) limits grading-permit-authorized activities to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. No operations are allowed on Sunday. Since heavy construction work associated with the project is limited in scope and by existing regulation, the anticipated noise impact to neighboring residents is considered less than significant.

- c) The proposed project site is not located within any of the noise contours of Redding Municipal Airport and is located approximately 7 miles from the Redding Airport and approximately 3 miles from the Benton Airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Noise Element, 2000
City of Redding Grading Ordinance Redding Municipal Code, Section 16.12.120
City of Redding General Plan, Transportation Element, 2000
City of Redding Zoning Ordinance Redding Municipal Code, Section 18.40.100
City of Redding Municipal Airport Area Plan

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (<i>for example, by proposing new homes and businesses</i>) or indirectly (<i>for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure</i>)?				x
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				x

Discussion:

- a-b) The nature of the project as a utility project would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing, and therefore, would not necessitate construction of replacement housing. No impacts to population and housing will result from the project.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Housing Element, 2014

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: <i>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:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?				X
Police Protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

Discussion:

Fire and Police Protection:

The City would provide police and fire protection to the project from existing facilities and under existing service levels. The size of the project would not mandate the need for additional police or fire facilities.

Since this is a utility project, this project is not subject to the citywide fire facilities-impact fee.

Schools:

Since this project is a utility project, the project will not contribute to the total student enrollment in any school district and is not subject to the school-facility impact (in-lieu) fee.

Parks:

Since this project is a utility project, the project will not cause a physical deterioration of an existing park facility or cause an adverse physical impact associated with a new park facility and is not subject to the citywide park and recreation-facilities impact.

Other public facilities:

See discussion under Item XIX (Utilities and Service Systems) below.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Public Facilities Element, 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XVI. 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?				X
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?				X

Discussion:

- a) The project is a utility project a commercially zoned area. It will not cause a physical deterioration of an existing recreation facility or cause an adverse physical impact associated with a new recreation facility.
- b) The project does not propose any recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of facilities. There would not be any potentially significant impacts to recreation associated with the project.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Natural Resources Element, 2000

City of Redding General Plan, Recreation Element, 2000

City of Redding General Plan, Public Facilities Element, 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				x
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b)?				x
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				x
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				x

Discussion:

- a-c) Since this is a utility project, the project will not generate any traffic and therefore will not have any impacts. The project would not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. The project will not conflict with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3(b).
- d) Access to the site is provided by way of Twin View Boulevard. The Redding Fire Marshal has deemed this to be adequate access for emergency access and fire protection.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Transportation Element, 2000

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

City of Redding Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan, 2018

City of Redding Traffic Impact Fee Program

City of Redding Active Transportation Plan, 2018

Redding Area Bus Authority System Map and Route Guide, October 2000

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				x
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				x

Discussion:

a-b) The City of Redding provided outreach to the California Native American tribes that have requested notification, Redding Rancheria and the Wintu Tribe of Northern California, on April 16, 2021. No request for consultation was initiated or received as of the writing of this document.

Documentation:

Letters sent to Redding Rancheria and the Wintu Tribe of Northern California, dated April 16, 2021.

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				x
c) 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?				x
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				x
e) Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				x

Discussion:

- a) The proposed development does not generate the need for relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.
- b) Potable water is available from the City to serve the project with adequate pressure and flows for fire suppression. The demands of the project can be accommodated within the City's existing water resources. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple day years.
- c) The project will utilize the City's sanitary sewer system to dispose of wastewater. Adequate sewer capacity and wastewater treatment is available in the City's existing system.
- d) The project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.
- e) The project will comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The City regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials from households, including those created by the project.

Documentation:

City of Redding General Plan, Public Facilities Elements, 2000

City of Redding Water and Sewer Atlas

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XX. WILDFIRE: <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation Plan?				x
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose projects occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?				x
c) Require installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				x
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				x

Discussion:

- a) The project site is not located within the Very High Fire Severity Zone and is not adjacent to areas with significant fuel loads. The project, however, would not impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- b-d) Because the project site is flat without any slope and no vegetation, nor is it surrounded by any significant vegetated area or slopes, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that could exacerbate wildfire risks, or expose people or structures to downstream flooding or landslides. No impacts associated with wildfire are anticipated.

Documentation:

CalFire, Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, Shasta County, 2008

Mitigation:

None necessary.

XXI. <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 substantially 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, substantially 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?			x	
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)?				x
c) Does the project have potential environmental effects which may cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				x

Discussion:

Based on the analysis undertaken as part of this Initial Study, the following findings can be made:


- a) The project has the potential to degrade wildlife habitat in general due to erosion and sedimentation resulting from grading and construction of project infrastructure. However, the project conditions as identified under *Hydrology/Water Quality* have been established to reduce potential impacts to a level less than significant.
- b) As discussed in Item III, the project will contribute to regionwide cumulative air quality impacts. However, under policy of the *General Plan*, application of Standard Mitigation Measures (SMMs) will eliminate the potential for air quality impacts from this project.
- c) As discussed herein, the project does not have characteristics which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Documentation:


See all Sections above.

Mitigation:


M Bio-1. If construction activities will occur during the nesting season for migratory birds (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey seven days before construction activities begin. If nesting birds are found, CDFW will be notified and consulted. An appropriate buffer, as determined by CDFW and the qualified biologist, will be placed around the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities cease for a period greater than seven days, additional preconstruction surveys will be required.




	GIS DIVISION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT	LOCATION MAP UP-2021-00190 AL NATICCHIONI 499 TWIN VIEW BOULEVARD AP# 116-040-003	MTG. DATE:
	DATE PRODUCED: APRIL 21, 2021		ITEM:
			ATTACHMENT:



PROFILE - A
HORIZONTAL SCALE: 1"=50'
VERTICAL SCALE: 1"=10'



OVERALL SITE GRAPHIC SCALE
(IN FEET)
1 inch = 30 ft



PROFILE - B
HORIZONTAL SCALE: 1"=50'
VERTICAL SCALE: 1"=10'

- LEGEND:**
- 1530 CONTOUR ELEVATION
 - FENCE
 - ASPHALT
 - GRAVEL
 - EARTH
 - (E) POWER POLE
 - (E) WATER VALVE
 - APN ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER
 - APPROX APPROXIMATE
 - DWY DRIVEWAY
 - (E) EXISTING
 - (P) PROPOSED
 - RD ROAD
 - SF SQUARE FEET
- NOTES:**
1. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 1'

- CONSTRUCTION NOTES**
- ① INSTALL INSIDE DROP PER CITY OF REDDING STANDARDS - PAGE 362.00
 - ② DIRECTIONAL DRILLING APPROXIMATELY 77 LF OF 8" ABS

Revisions:

REALM ENGINEERING
CIVIL ENGINEERING, SURVEYING & PLANNING
1767 MARKET STREET SUITE C
REDDING, CA. 96001
530-526-7493

PLANS PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
JASON B. VINE
No. 67800
EXPIRATION DATE 06/30/21
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

02-03-21

SEWER EXHIBIT 1

AL: AUTOCAD
TWIN VIEW BLVD.
REDDING, CA
SHASTA COUNTY - APN: 116-040-003

PLOTTED BY:
DATE PLOTTED:
02/03/21
SCALE OF DRAWING:
SEE PLAN
JOB NUMBER:
CADD FILE:
SHEET:

2

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

NATICCHIONI TWIN VIEW BOULEVARD SEWER PROJECT USE PERMIT APPLICATION UP-2021-00190

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM CONTENTS

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) for the Use Permit Application UP-2021-00190, a request by Al Naticchioni to allow the construction of approximately 400 feet of sewer line, to support future development of 499 Twin View Boulevard, to encroach within the 100-year floodplain and floodway of Boulder Creek. The sewer line is approximately 400 feet in length and is proposed within the Twin View Boulevard public right-of-way. The MMP includes a brief discussion of the legal basis for and the purpose of the program, discussion, and direction regarding complaints about noncompliance, a key to understanding the monitoring matrix, and the monitoring matrix itself.

LEGAL BASIS OF AND PURPOSE FOR THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs whenever certifying an environmental impact report (EIR) or a mitigated negative declaration. This requirement facilitates implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

The MMP contained herein is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA as they relate to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Naticchioni Twin View Boulevard Sewer Project. It is intended to be used by City of Redding (City) staff, participating agencies, project contractors, and mitigation monitoring personnel during implementation of the project.

Mitigation is defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15370 as a measure that does any of the following:

- Avoids impacts altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizes impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- Rectifies impacts by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the impacted environment.
- Reduces or eliminates impacts over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the project.
- Compensates for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

The intent of the MMP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of adopted mitigation measures and permit conditions. The MMP will provide for monitoring of construction activities as necessary, on-site identification and resolution of environmental problems, and proper reporting to City staff.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING TABLE

The Mitigation Monitoring Table identifies the mitigation measures proposed for the Naticchioni Twin View Boulevard Sewer Project. These mitigation measures are reproduced from the Initial Study and conditions of approval for the project. The tables have the following columns:

Mitigation Measure: Lists the mitigation measures identified within the Initial Study for a specific impact, along with the number for each measure as enumerated in the Initial Study.

Timing: Identifies at what point in time, review process, or phase the mitigation measure will be completed.

Agency/Department Consultation: References the City department or any other public agency with which coordination is required to satisfy the identified mitigation measure.

Verification: Spaces to be initialed and dated by the individual designated to verify adherence to a specific mitigation measure.

NONCOMPLIANCE COMPLAINTS

Any person or agency may file a complaint asserting noncompliance with the mitigation measures associated with the project. The complaint shall be directed to the City in written form, providing specific information on the asserted violation. The City shall conduct an investigation and determine the validity of the complaint. If noncompliance with a mitigation measure has occurred, the City shall take appropriate action to remedy any violation. The complainant shall receive written confirmation indicating the results of the investigation or the final action corresponding to the particular noncompliance issue.

**MITIGATION MONITORING TABLE
NATICCHIONI TWIN VIEW BOULEVARD SEWER PROJECT
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measure	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date and Initials)
<i>Biological Resources</i>			
<p><i>Mitigation Bio-1.</i> If construction activities will occur during the nesting season for migratory birds (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey seven days before construction activities begin. If nesting birds are found, CDFW will be notified and consulted. An appropriate buffer, as determined by CDFW and the qualified biologist, will be placed around the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities cease for a period greater than seven days, additional preconstruction surveys will be required.</p>	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Engineering Division and Planning Division	