

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	1
CHAPTER 1	7
INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE	7
1.2 LEAD AGENCY	8
1.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	8
CHAPTER 2.....	9
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	9
2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	9
2.2 Location	9
CHAPTER 3.....	14
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	14
I. AESTHETICS	16
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099	16
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	19
III. AIR QUALITY	22
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	28
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	35
VI. ENERGY	37
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	38
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	45
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	49
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	54
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	58
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES	59
XIII. NOISE	61
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING	63
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	64
XVI. RECREATION	66
XVII. TRANSPORTATION	67
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	70
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	73
XX. WILDFIRE	76
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	78
REFERENCES	80
FIGURES	84

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Date: October 21, 2020

Project Title: Conditional Use Permit 2020-002
Mission Livestock Feedlot

Lead Agency: Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services

225 North Tehama Street
Willows, California 95988

Contact Person: Greg Conant, Assistant Planner
(530) 934-6540
gconant@countyofglenn.net

Project Location: The project site is 6569 County Road 27, approximately 4-miles south of Orland; located on the south side of County Road 27, west of County Road M, north of County Road 30 and east of County Road 99W, within the unincorporated area of Glenn County, California. Section 15, Township 21 North, Range 3 West, MDBM. Based on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Orland 7.5-minute Quadrangle, the site coordinates are Latitude: 39.6740N, Longitude: 122.1900W. General site location is shown on Figure 1.

APN: 024-100-017 (273.07± acres)

Applicant: Douglas Freitas dba Mission Livestock
P.O. Box 933
Dixon, CA 95620

Landowner: Paul Violich Rev Trust/ Violich Farms Inc.
P.O. Box 875
Kentfield, CA 94914

Consultant: VESTRA Resources Inc. Attn: Wendy Johnston
5300 Aviation Drive
Redding, CA 96002

General Plan: “Intensive Agriculture”

Zoning: “AE-40” Exclusive Agriculture (36-acre minimum parcel size).

FINDINGS FOR MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

An Initial Study has been prepared by the Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency. Based on this study, it is determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. The following Findings are made based on the Initial Study to support a Mitigated Negative Declaration:

Finding 1 (Aesthetics)

The project will not have a significant impact on aesthetics. The adopted standards for lighting and construction will minimize impacts from future development. The project is compatible with existing uses in the area. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 2 (Agricultural and Forest Resources)

The project will not have a significant impact on agriculture or forest resources. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project site is zoned "AE-40" Exclusive Agriculture (Chapter 15.330 Glenn County Code). The project does not involve construction or conversion of forestland and no trees will be removed. Agricultural activities within the vicinity will not be adversely impacted by this project. No significant change in the current use of the land will result, therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 3 (Air Quality)

The project will not have a significant impact on air quality with mitigation measure incorporated. The project will not violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation. Additionally, the project will not adversely impact sensitive receptors nor would it create objectionable odors. Impacts are considered less than significant with the following mitigation measure incorporated.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall obtain an Authorization to Construct and Permit to Operate (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy of Authorization to Construct shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall submit a copy of a Dust Control Plan (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall submit a copy of an Odor Control Plan (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Finding 4 (Biological Resources)

The project will not have a significant impact on biological resources. There are no identified sensitive habitats or natural communities within the project site; therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on 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. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 5 (Cultural Resources)

The project will not have significant impact on cultural resources with mitigation measures incorporated. State laws are in place in case of accidental discoveries made. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

Mitigation Measure CR-1 (Cultural Resources)

If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- *If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.*
- *If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the lead federal agency, the lead CEQA agency, and applicable landowner. The agencies shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either:
 - 1) *is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or*
 - 2) *that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.**
- *If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill [AB] 2641). The archaeologist shall notify Glenn County Coroner (as per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for*

the Project (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

Finding 6 (Energy)

The project will not have a significant impact on energy. The project will comply with California Green Building Standards as well as California Energy Code. The project will not with conflict or obstruct a state or local plans for renewable or efficient energy.

Finding 7 (Geology and Soils)

The project will not have a significant impact on geology and soils because geologic hazards in the area are minimal and the building codes will require new construction to meet standards for soil conditions. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 8 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

The project will not have a significant impact on global climate change as a result of greenhouse gas emissions. The project is not in conflict with existing guidelines or standards. The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project will not create significant changes in GHG emissions. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)

Hazards and hazardous materials will not have a significant impact on the environment as a result of the proposed project. The project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan nor expose people to risk of loss, injury, or death. The project does not propose the use of hazardous materials either directly or indirectly. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measure incorporated.

Mitigation Measure HA-1 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)

Prior to Operation Commencement, the applicant shall provide Glenn County Planning Division a Hazardous Materials Business Plan approved by Glenn County Air Pollution Control District.

Finding 10 (Hydrology/Water Quality)

The project will not have a significant impact on hydrology and water quality because the project will not significantly alter the drainage pattern of the area. The project will not

significantly interfere with groundwater recharge in the area. The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The project will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 11 (Land Use and Planning)

The project will not have a significant impact on land use and planning because the project would not physically divide an established community. The project is consistent with the Glenn County General Plan land use designation of “Intensive Agriculture” as well as Title 15 of Glenn County Code. The project will not conflict with an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

Finding 12 (Mineral Resources)

The project will not have a significant impact on mineral resources; according to the California Department of Conservation Mineral Lands Classification Map, the property does not contain Concrete-Grade Mineral Aggregates. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 13 (Noise)

The project will not have a significant impact on people residing or working in the area from excessive noise levels. The proposed project will not substantially increase noise levels in the area or expose people in the area to excessive noise levels. Any future noise generating activities are required to meet the established standards prescribed by the County Code. The project site is not directly within an airport land use plan and not in the vicinity of a private airstrip which would expose people in the area to unacceptable noise levels. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 14 (Population and Housing)

The project will not have a significant impact on population and housing because the project will not displace people or housing. The project does not induce population growth. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 15 (Public Services)

The project will not have a significant impact on public services. The services of fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities are sufficient to accommodate the proposed project. Existing requirements for taxes and developmental impact fees are implemented to offset impacts.

Finding 16 (Recreation)

The project will not have a significant impact on recreation because it would not substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities nor does the project include such facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Finding 17 (Transportation)

The project will not have a significant impact on transportation/circulation because it will not significantly increase traffic volumes on existing roads. The project will not change air traffic patterns. There is adequate access to the project site. Public roads will provide

adequate emergency access to the project site. Alternative transportation plans will not be impacted. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources)

The project will not have a significant impact on Tribal Cultural Resources with mitigation measures incorporated. Native Tribes were sent project documentation; additionally, the Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System states that there are no prehistoric or historic resources in the project area. It is concluded this proposal will not have a significant impact with mitigation measures incorporated.

Mitigation Measure TCR -1 (Tribal Cultural Resources)

In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural (including Tribal) resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the applicant/operator shall consult with the County and a qualified archaeologist (as approved by the County) and corresponding tribal representative to assess the significance of the find per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The qualified archaeologist shall determine the nature of the find, evaluate its significance, and, if necessary, suggest preservation or mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation measures, based on recommendations listed in the archaeological survey report and tribal representative, will be determined by the Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources, unique archaeological resources, and/or tribal resources is carried out. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, tribal representative, and documented according to current professional standards.

Finding 19 (Utilities and Service Systems)

The project will not have a significant impact on utilities and service systems. The project will not require or result in new or expanded municipal facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Onsite water supplies and future development is required to meet local, state, federal and utility company standards. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 20 (Wildfire)

The project will not have a significant impact on wildfires. The project will not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project will not exacerbate wildfire risk, and no new infrastructure is being proposed. The site is relatively flat and there will be no change in drainage. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding 21 (Mandatory Findings of Significance)

There is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project may have a significant impact on the environment either cumulatively or individually. Impacts are considered less than significant.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This Initial Study has been prepared by the County of Glenn to evaluate the potential impacts on the environment that could result from the implementation of the proposed project and to identify, if necessary, any mitigation measures that will reduce, offset, minimize, avoid, or otherwise compensate for significant environmental impacts.

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), encoded in Sections 21000 *et seq.* of the Public Resources Code (PRC) with Guidelines for Implementation codified in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 *et seq.*

An initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration may be prepared [CEQA Guidelines §15064(f)(3)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. This document conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

Alternatively, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared if the Initial Study identifies a potentially significant effect for which the project's proponent, before public release of a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, has made or agrees to make project revisions that mitigate the effects [CEQA Guidelines §15064(f)(2)].

Approval of the proposed project requires discretionary action by the County. According to CEQA Guidelines, a discretionary action or project must be reviewed by the lead agency, to determine its potential effects on the environment. Prior to preparation of the Initial Study, a Request for Review, which included a copy of the application and project description, was sent out by the County of Glenn to responsible and trustee state agencies, and local agencies and organizations to identify issues to be addressed in the Initial Study. Comments received were considered during the preparation of the Initial Study.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), "the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose."

The lead agency for the proposed project is Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency. The contact person for the lead agency to whom all inquiries and comments on this environmental document should be addressed is:

Greg Conant, Assistant Planner
Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency
225 North Tehama Street, Willows, CA 95988
(530) 934-6540, gconant@countyofglenn.net

1.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, that the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a MND be adopted in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Initial Study has been prepared for Conditional Use Permit 2020-002 - Mission Livestock Feedlot. The project addresses an application for a Conditional Use Permit to convert the previous Greenwood Dairy facility, located at 6569 County Road 27 in Orland, to a beef cattle feedlot. The Greenwood Dairy was established in 2000; in December 2007 Conditional Use Permit 2007-002 was approved for the expansion of the Greenwood Dairy. In March 2009 a Minor Amendment for revisions of the site plans were approved. Conditional Use Permit 2007-002 approved a herd of 4,100 dairy cattle (Holstein); which equates to 5,567 Animal Units.

Conditional Use Permit 2020-002 proposes a feedlot with a beef cattle capacity of approximately 7,100, (4,260 Animal Unit) with a maximum capacity of 9,278 beef cattle. Cattle will arrive at the site at an average weight of 350 pounds and leave at a weight of approximately 950 pounds. Individual cattle will be onsite for approximately 150 days. The facility is proposed to operate seven days a week from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. No new structures are being proposed.

Mission Livestock is applying for coverage under Order R5-2017-0058 Waste Discharge Requirements General Orders for Confined Bovine Feeding Operations. Under this Order, the conversion of the dairy to a feedlot would be considered an “existing facility” as the current dairy was covered under individual waste discharge requirements (Order R5-2008-0122) and the operation had been approved and undergone CEQA review.

2.2 Location

The project site is 6569 County Road 27, approximately 4-miles south of Orland; located on the south side of County Road 27, west of County Road M, north of County Road 30 and east of County Road 99W, within the unincorporated area of Glenn County, California. Section 15, Township 21 North, Range 3 West, MDBM. Based on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Orland 7.5-minute Quadrangle, the site coordinates are Latitude: 39.6740N, Longitude: 122.1900W. (Figure 1 and 2). The project site comprises the following Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 024-100-017 (273.07± acres)

2.3 Summary

The former dairy facility and surrounding property were recently sold to Paul Violich Revocable Trust; Violich Farms, Inc.; and Alcatraz Farming, Inc. (see Figure 2). The previous cropland associated with the dairy has been planted to almonds. Mission Livestock will lease the former dairy facility as outlined on Figure 3. No land application of wastewater will occur. The onsite wastewater ponds will be used to collect and retain onsite stormwater from areas that contact manure. Roof runoff and other “non-contact” water will continue to be directed to a separate stormwater detention pond. The facility

includes six clay-lined retention ponds, three freestall barns, manure separator and drying area, medical barns, exercise pens, stormwater retention pond (non-contact), and numerous feed storage buildings.

The dairy expansion approved by Glenn County in 2007 addressed 5,567 Animal Units (AU) (4,100 Holstein cows and heifers). Mission Livestock proposes to house an average of approximately 7,100 head of beef cattle. The cattle would be comprised of mixed breeds. The calves would weigh approximately 350 to 500 pounds when arriving at the feedlot. Cattle would be at the feedlot for approximately 150 days. The weight of the cattle when leaving the feedlot will be approximately 950 pounds. The overall average weight of cattle at the feedlot is estimated to be 675 pounds. The desired average 7,100 head of beef cattle is estimated to be approximately 4,260 AU, below the currently permitted operating limit of 5,567 AU. The 5,567 AU would allow a maximum of 9,278 head at an average AU of 0.6. Although Mission Livestock does not anticipate housing this cattle volume, this would be the maximum allowed under the RWQCB order.

Manure is currently composted onsite and will continue to be composted onsite. In the future, manure will be combined with almond processing waste from the adjoining orchards, composted onsite, and returned to the adjacent orchards. Water from the ponds may be used to provide moisture to the compost. The composting operation meets the definition of “agricultural composting” under the current Order WQ 2015-0121-DWQ General Waste Discharge Requirements for Composting Operations and would be exempt from the requirements of the Order. If required to do so, the facility will limit the production of compost to no more than 25,000 cubic yards processed onsite at any given time to meet the requirements of the pending amendment to the Order dated October 31, 2019 (not yet adopted).

The feedlot facility will be staffed seven days a week from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Sunday, and will employ six full-time workers.

Dead animals will be immediately removed from corrals or barns and temporarily relocated to an isolated site away from both County Road 27 and Railroad Avenue, out of public view, until removal. During the summer months, lime will be applied to the area for sanitation and odor mitigation. Sacramento Rendering Company pick-up days are Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays. Mission Livestock will have a better percentage basis for mortality numbers at the feedlot following an operational period. The industry standard for feedlot mortality according to the agweb.com Cattle Network is about 2 percent.

The average manure generation will be approximately 21.5 pounds per head per day at 65 percent dry matter. With an average of 7,100 cattle at the feedlot facility, roughly 152,650 pounds per day of manure will be generated. Tons of manure per year is estimated at 27,858 tons. Barns will be scraped or vacuumed daily. The main storage area for manure is between the barns and ponds. Manure is currently composted in this area. Composting will continue under the new operation. Manure will be removed from the barns by a loader or vacuum. In the winter months, if sufficient volume in the detention ponds is available, some flushing may occur. Scraping or vacuum will be used during the

summer season. The plan is to pave the manure composting area. External pen areas will be scraped.

If the barns are flushed, the wastewater will run through the separator. The separator will remove the 20 to 30 percent of waste solids with a stationary screen, and the water will continue on into the ponds with solids redirected to composting piles. If necessary, some manure will be removed from the site.

No land application of wastewater will occur. The barn well and domestic well are separate from any wastewater connections and supply only fresh water to the existing barn and residence.

Solids will continue to be removed from the ponds with the existing separator. Ponds will be dry by mid-October each year to allow for pond cleaning as well as ensuring sufficient storage holding for incoming rainy seasons and stormwater runoff.

Mission Livestock will apply BMPs and good housekeeping as follows:

- Daily pest and vector control
- Odor control from proper manure and pond management
- Daily barn flushing, scraping, or vacuuming
- Pond agitation
- Careful management of internal composting temperatures
- Regular removal of compost offsite
- Follow recommended inspection schedules
- Follow current Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR)
- Follow careful health management procedures for cattle (vaccinating and worming schedule)
- Supply adequate nutrition, water, and shelter to cattle
- Ensure employees are properly trained in BMPs

The feedlot will use BMPs to ensure no stagnant or standing waters will be contributing to the breeding of mosquitoes. Manure removal, composting, fly tape, fly traps, and fly predators will be used as a means to control fly populations. Mission Livestock will utilize fly predators as a biological control, fly traps as a mechanical control, and efficiency of manure to compost management as a cultural control. Insecticides will be used as a last resort.

Truck traffic is expected to be consistent with the current baseline usage as a dairy. Likely truck trips for feed will decrease slightly.

Noise and lighting are not anticipated to change from baseline. Odors should be reduced as less flushing will occur.

2.4 Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is located at 6569 County Road 27 in Orland. The surrounding land use is agricultural, farmland security zone, or service commercial zoning. County Road 27 borders the property to the north, Southern Pacific Railroad line and private parcels border the property to the west, and the Fulton Reclamation and Recycling borders the property to the south. Irrigated croplands border the property to the northeast and east.

The baseline condition for review under CEQA is that of an operating dairy with 5,565 permitted AU. The AU under the proposed feedlot will be equal to or lower than the AU of the operating dairy.

Table 1 identifies the existing uses, General Plan designation and Zoning designations for the project site and neighboring properties. All surrounding parcels are zoned for Agriculture and designated Intensive Agriculture in the general plan.

	Existing Uses	General Plan	Zoning Designations
Project Site	Dairy	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40
North	Agriculture/Residential	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40
East	Agriculture	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40
South	Agriculture	Intensive Agriculture	FS-80
West	Agriculture/Water District	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40

Floodplain:

The feedlot is not located near any streams and is outside of any 100-year flood hazard zones. The site is located in an area of minimal flooding, Zone X. Flood potentials are derived from the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The FIRM Map, Community Panel No. 06021C0400D, dated August 5, 2010, is shown on Figure 4.

Aesthetics:

This facility is surrounded by farmland. Paul Violich Revocable Trust; Violich Farms, Inc.; and Alcatraz Farming, Inc., have purchased the facility. Violich Farms will complete planting almond orchards on the ground previously used for wastewater disposal in 2020. This facility has housed bovines since the late 1970s and there will be no change in aesthetics to the feedlot facility. The closest urban area is 2.5 miles from the facility to the north.

Topography:

Topography of the facility slopes gently to the southeast. The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 730 feet above sea level at the northwest corner of the property (the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 25) to approximately 660 feet above sea level at the southwest corner of the property near the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 28.

Soils:

The soils in the immediate vicinity of the feedlot facility, including the area of the wastewater ponds, are composed of Cortina very gravelly sandy loam. The Cortina series consists of excessively drained soils on recent gravelly alluvium from schistose, sedimentary, and metavolcanic rocks. These soils are characteristically gravelly or very gravelly and coarse textured or moderately coarse textured. They are shallow to moderately deep over channel sand and gravel. These soils typically have a light brownish-gray or grayish-brown surface layer that is slightly acid. The soil depth to sand and gravel is more than 36 inches. Permeability is very rapid and the available moisture-holding capacity is 3 to 5 inches. Cortina series soils generally occupy narrow areas that are small or medium in size. Cortina soils are of limited agricultural value due to low water retention capacities. In this area, the Cortina series overlays the Stony Creek alluvial fan. Site soils are summarized in additional detail in Appendix A.

Groundwater:

A monitoring well network was established under the individual WDRs (R5-2008-0122) associated with Greenwood Dairy. A number of these wells will be abandoned in spring 2020. Five monitoring wells will be retained and monitored. These are associated with the retention ponds and composting area. Depth to first groundwater is approximately 45 feet. Groundwater flow direction is to the southeast.

Hydrology:

There are no surface water bodies onsite.

Biology:

The site is currently a dairy and has operated as a dairy since 2001. The site is developed and disturbed. The CNDDDB was reviewed and results are included on Figure 5. Species that have been observed in the vicinity of the site are shown in Table 2.

DRAFT

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Listing	California Listing
Burrowing Owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	None	None
Crotch Bumble Bee	<i>Bombus crotchii</i>	None	Candidate Endangered
Swainson's Hawk	<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	None	Threatened
Tricolored Blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	None	Threatened
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp	<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	Threatened	None

CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment.

A significant impact is considered a substantial adverse effect, one that exceeds some critical and accepted threshold for negative environmental effects. CEQA defines a significant effect on the environment as "...a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse (i.e., negative) change in any of the physical conditions within the area directly or indirectly caused by the Project, including effects on land, air, water, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic "significance" (CEQA Guidelines, §15382). As recommended in the CEQA Guidelines, impacts are also identified as "potentially significant" prior to mitigation.

Mitigation Measures are measures to mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen impacts identified as significant or potentially significant. According to CEQA, the term "mitigation measures" refers to those items that are in addition to standard conditions, uniform codes, or project features that may also reduce potential impacts.

DRAFT

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, and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

DRAFT

Signature _____

Greg Conant, Assistant Planner

Date _____

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099

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

DRAFT

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. A scenic vista can be defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the public. There is no designated scenic vista on or adjacent to the proposal. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. There will be minimal change in operations. The project will have no impact on a scenic vista. No impact.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. Scenic resources are defined as those landscape patterns and features that are visually or aesthetically pleasing and that, therefore, contribute affirmatively to the definition of a distinct community or region. Scenic areas, open spaces, rural landscapes, vistas, country roads, and other factors interact to produce a net visual benefit upon individuals or communities. Those visual resources that uniquely contribute to that public benefit are scenic resources under CEQA.

The proposed project would not remove scenic resources such as buildings (historic or otherwise), rock outcroppings, or trees. There are no unique scenic resources or structures located at the project site. The roadways in Glenn County are not listed as Eligible or as Officially Designated Scenic Highways according to the California Department of Transportation.¹ The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. There will be minimal change in operations. The project will not change the existing visual character of the site and will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No impact.

c) Would the project in nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact. Visual character is descriptive and non-evaluative, which means it is based on defined attributes that are neither good nor bad in and of themselves. It is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. It is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity, and expectation of the viewers.

¹ California Department of Transportation. *Officially Designated State Scenic Highways*.
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm>.

See a) and b) above. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. There will be minimal change in operations. The project is consistent with the existing visual character of the site and will not conflict with any zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. No impact.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact. The proposal is not anticipated to produce glare, which may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, the glare at the project location would not substantially alter the existing characteristics of the area.

Installation of future lighting will be required to conform to the Glenn County Code. Glenn County Code §15.560.080 (Glare and Heat) states the following: *All exterior lighting accessory to any use shall be hooded, shielded or opaque. No unobstructed beam of light shall be directed beyond any exterior lot line.* The project does not include the installation or use of any new lighting sources or structures that will be a new source of glare. New exterior lighting will be required to be hooded to reduce glare and retain light to limited areas. Additionally, the light shall not be directed beyond the property lines. This site will not create substantial light or glare that will affect day or nighttime views in the area. No impact.

DRAFT

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 Model (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 timberland, are significant environmental 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:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	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 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), tracks and categories land with respect to agricultural resources. Farmland is classified according to its ability to support crops or livestock. Land is designated as one of the following and each has a specific definition: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Urban and Built-Up Land, and Other Land.

The FMMP maps for each county are generally updated every two years; the 2016 map for Glenn County is the latest published version. The designation of Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance covers the majority of the valley portion of Glenn County. The 2016 FMMP map designates a portion of the project site as 'Other Land', a portion as 'Urban and Built-Up Land', a portion as 'Farmland of Statewide Importance' and a portion as 'Prime Farmland'.

While Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance are located on the project site, those areas are not part of the project and will be unaltered from this proposal. The feedlot will lease only the dairy facility and not the portions of the site designated 'Farmland of Statewide Importance' or 'Prime Farmland'. The lease area consists of land designated 'Other Lands' and 'Urban and Built-Up Land'.

California Department of Conservation defines 'Other Lands' as *"Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land."*

California Department of Conservation defines 'Urban and Built-Up Land' as *"Urban and Built-Up land is occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures."*

The lease area is not designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The feedlot will lease only the dairy facility, no cropland. The project will not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impact.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. As the sight is zoned for Exclusive Agriculture the project site is not subject to an agricultural contract under the Williamson Act. It is concluded that there will be no impact on existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the project 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 51104(g))?

No Impact. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project site is not zoned for forestland or timberland nor is it adjacent to land that is zoned for forestland or timberland. The “FA” Foothill Agricultural/Forestry Zone and “TPZ” Timberland Preserve Zone (Chapters 15.320 and 15.450 of the Glenn County Code) are meant to protect timber and forest lands. Areas zoned “FA” and “TPZ” are located within the Mendocino National Forest in the western part of Glenn County. The project site is zoned Exclusive Agriculture. It is concluded that the project will have no impact.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Forest land is defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) as *land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.* This project will not result in the loss of forestland as the project site does not contain forestland. Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of this project.

e) Would the project 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 use?

No Impact. This project will not involve a change of agricultural-related uses on surrounding parcels. The proposal will not conflict with agriculture operations. There will be no changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of this project.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DRAFT

The Air Quality section addresses the impacts of the proposed project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. Examples of criteria pollutants (according to California Ambient Air Quality Standards) include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_x) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)².

Geographic areas are classified under the federal and California Clean Air Act (CCAA) as in either attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the Ambient Air Quality Standards have been achieved. The CCAA requires air districts which have been designated as a nonattainment area for California Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, or nitrogen dioxide to prepare and submit a plan for attaining and maintaining the standards. Glenn County is within the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area air district.

The California Clean Air Act of 1988 also requires that districts review their progress made toward attaining the CAAQS every three years. The 2018 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan is the latest Air Quality Attainment Plan that has been prepared for the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area.

The 2018 plan assesses the progress made in implementing the previous triennial update completed in 2015 and proposes modifications to the strategies necessary to attain the CAAQS by the earliest practicable date. The 2018 plan includes the following:

1. Assessment of progress towards achieving the control measure commitments in the previous Triennial Plan.
2. Summary of the last three years of ozone data to demonstrate improvement of air quality.
3. Comparison of the expected versus actual emission reductions for each measure committed to in the previous Triennial Plan.
4. Updated control measure commitments and growth rates of population, industry, and vehicle related emissions.

² Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area 2018 Triennial Air Quality Attainment PLAN
<http://airquality.org/SVBAPCC/Documents/2018%20Triennial%20Report.pdf>

a) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigations Incorporated. Air quality standards are set at both the federal and state levels. The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (GCAPCD) is responsible for the planning and maintenance/attainment of these standards at the local level. The GCAPCD sets operational rules and limitations for businesses that emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. The GCAPCD is supervised by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Under the federal Clean Air Act, local air quality districts must produce and implement plans for cleaning up any pollutant that exceeds federal standards.

Local air districts are not able to enact rules that restrict "mobile sources" including cars, trucks, locomotives, and other vehicles. Only "stationary sources" of air pollution fall under their control. Mobile sources are regulated by the California Air Resources Board.

With Mitigation Measures incorporated the proposal will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The Air Quality section of the Glenn County General Plan establishes mitigation measures designed to reduce particulate matter (PM) and ozone precursors in the ambient air as a result of emissions from sources that attract or generate motor vehicle activity.

Glenn County has been designated as an attainment area for ozone; additionally, there have been no exceedances of the maximum ozone values for 1- hour or 8-hour standard since 2010. The proposed conversion from Dairy Cattle to Beef Cattle is not anticipated to significantly increase Vehicle Miles Traveled nor is it anticipated to increase population both of which are major contributors to pollutants. The proposal will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Attainment Plan.

The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District was provided project documentation and submitted comments dated April 10, 2020. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and AQ-2 has been established based upon Air Pollution Control Districts comments. It is concluded there will be a less than significant impact with mitigation measures incorporated.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall obtain an Authorization to Construct and Permit to Operate (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy of Authorization to Construct shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Timing/Implementation:
Prior to Operation Commencement

Enforcement/Monitoring:
Glenn County Air Pollution Control District

Mitigation Measure AQ-2 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall submit a copy of a Dust Control Plan (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Timing/Implementation:
Prior to Operation Commencement

Enforcement/Monitoring:
Glenn County Air Pollution Control District

- b) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

See Section III a)

Each project with emissions falling under regulatory standards must individually comply with the GCAPCD regulations. When adopting the General Plan in 1993, the Glenn County Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations finding that the unavoidable impact to air quality could be overridden because any project would represent a cumulative impact and that the General Plan employed all feasible mitigations. In addition, each project would be required to utilize the best available control technology to mitigate impacts to air quality.

Glenn County has been designated as an attainment area for ozone; additionally, there have been no exceedances of the maximum ozone values for 1- hour or 8-hour standard since 2010. An “Attainment” area is defined as a geographic area that meets or exhibits values lower than the level of a criteria air pollutant allowed by the federal standards; a “Nonattainment” area is defined as a geographic area in which the level of a criteria air pollutant is higher than the level allowed by the federal standards.

There is not anticipated to be a significant increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a result of this project. Operations will continue as they have been conducted in the past. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition.

This project is not anticipated to significantly increase VMT or substantially increase population, both of which are major contributors to pollutants; additionally, Glenn County is designated as an Attainment Area it is concluded that the impact from the proposal is less than significant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Neither California statutes nor regulations define “sensitive receptors” but this term normally refers to locations where uses and/or activities result in increased exposure of persons more sensitive to the unhealthy effects of emissions (such as children and the elderly). Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, churches, recreation areas and residential areas.

The proposed project is located in an area zoned for agriculture uses. Land use within the vicinity of the project site is primarily agriculture uses. There are no schools, churches, hospitals, recreation areas, or other public facilities within the vicinity of the project site.

All uses at the site are still required to comply with applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations regarding contaminants and pollutants (Glenn County Code §15.560.040). These requirements include, but are not limited to, emissions of suspended particles, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, odors, toxic or obnoxious gases and fumes. As none of these impacts are expected to occur beyond lawful limits and due to the lack of sensitive receptors in the area, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigations Incorporated. Odors are generally labeled as a nuisance and not a health risk to a community. It is a violation for odor to cause a nuisance according to GCAPCD, which has jurisdiction over odor complaints and can issue Notices of Violation according to state and local nuisance regulations if warranted. "Nuisance" includes anything which is injurious to human health, indecent or offensive to the senses, interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, affects at the same time an entire community, neighborhood, household or any considerable number of persons although the extent of annoyance or damage inflicted upon an individual may be unequal, and which occurs as a result of the storage, removal, transport, processing or disposal of solid waste.

All land uses are required to comply with applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations regarding contaminants and pollutants (Glenn County Code §15.560.040). These requirements include, but are not limited to, emissions of suspended particles, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, odors, toxic or obnoxious gases and fumes. GCAPCD will regulate future uses that may generate objectionable odors through the enforcement of applicable law.

The project site and vicinity consists agriculture uses. It is anticipated that this project will not generate objectionable odors, which will affect a substantial number of people. Potential receptors in agricultural areas are subject to Glenn County's Right to Farm Ordinance and should expect inconveniences caused by odors associated with existing standard agricultural operations or practices. Homeowners must sign and acknowledge this ordinance prior to the construction of a home in or adjacent to an agricultural zone.

The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District was provided project documentation and submitted comments dated April 10, 2020. Mitigation Measure AQ-3 has been established based upon Air Pollution Control Districts comments

Mitigation Measure AQ-3 (Air Quality)

The applicant shall submit a copy of an Odor Control Plan (or exemption thereof) approved by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District. A fully executed copy shall be provided to the Planning Division prior to operation commencement.

Timing/Implementation
Prior to Operation commencement

Enforcement/Monitoring:
Glenn County Air Pollution Control District

DRAFT

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

Regulatory Background

Special-Status Species

Special-status species include those plants and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts afford protection to both listed and proposed species. In addition, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern, which are species that face extirpation in California if current population and habitat trends continue, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW special-status invertebrates are all considered special-status species. Although CDFW Species of Special Concern generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition to regulations for special-status species, most birds in the United States, including non-status species, are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Under this legislation, destroying active nests, eggs, and young is illegal. Plant species on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory (Inventory) with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species and must be considered under CEQA. Rank 3 and Rank 4 species are afforded little or no protection under CEQA.

Waters of the United States

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulates “Waters of the United States” under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Waters of the U.S. are defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) as waters susceptible to use in commerce, including interstate waters and wetlands, all other waters (intrastate waterbodies, including wetlands), and their tributaries (33 CFR 328.3). Potential wetland areas, according to the three criteria used to delineate wetlands as defined in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*³, are identified by the presence of (1) hydrophytic vegetation, (2) hydric soils, and (3) wetland hydrology. Areas that are inundated at a sufficient depth and for a sufficient duration to exclude growth of hydrophytic vegetation are subject to Section 404 jurisdiction as “other waters” and are often characterized by an ordinary high water mark. Other waters, for example, generally include lakes, rivers, and streams. The placement of fill material into Waters of the U.S generally requires an individual or nationwide permit from the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

³ Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Department of the Army, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631.

Waters of the State

The term “Waters of the State” is defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as “any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) protects all waters in its regulatory scope and has special responsibility for wetlands, riparian areas, and headwaters. These waterbodies have high resource value, are vulnerable to filling, and are not systematically protected by other programs. RWQCB jurisdiction includes “isolated” wetlands and waters that may not be regulated by the Corps under Section 404. Waters of the State are regulated by the RWQCB under the State Water Quality Certification Program, which regulates discharges of fill and dredged material under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Projects that require a Corps permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact Waters of the State, are required to comply with the terms of the Water Quality Certification determination. If a proposed project does not require a federal permit, but does involve dredge or fill activities that may result in a discharge to Waters of the State, the RWQCB has the option to regulate the dredge and fill activities under its state authority in the form of Waste Discharge Requirements.

Streams, Lakes, and Riparian Habitat

Streams and lakes, as habitat for fish and wildlife species, are subject to jurisdiction by CDFW under Sections 1600-1616 of California Fish and Game Code. Alterations to or work within or adjacent to streambeds or lakes generally require a 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. The term “stream”, which includes creeks and rivers, is defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as “a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life [including] watercourses having a surface or subsurface flow that supports or has supported riparian vegetation” (14 CCR 1.72). In addition, the term “stream” can include ephemeral streams, dry washes, watercourses with subsurface flows, canals, aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and other means of water conveyance if they support aquatic life, riparian vegetation, or stream-dependent terrestrial wildlife.⁴ “Riparian” is defined as “on, or pertaining to, the banks of a stream.” Riparian vegetation is defined as “vegetation which occurs in and/or adjacent to a stream and is dependent on, and occurs because of, the stream itself”.⁵ Removal of riparian vegetation also requires a Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW.

Site Conditions

This site is located approximately 4 miles south of the City of Orland. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. There will be minimal change in operations. The site is zoned for Exclusive Agriculture and is designated Intensive Agriculture in the Glenn County General Plan. Properties within the project site vicinity are primarily agriculture with agriculture related outbuildings and limited residences.

⁴ California Department of Fish and Game. 1994. *A Field Guide to Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements, Sections 1600-1607, California Fish and Game Code*. Environmental Services Division, Sacramento, CA.

⁵ California Department of Fish and Game. 1994. *A Field Guide to Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements, Sections 1600-1607, California Fish and Game Code*. Environmental Services Division, Sacramento, CA.

Topography of the facility slopes gently to the southeast. The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 730 feet above sea level at the northwest corner of the property (the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 25) to approximately 660 feet above sea level at the southwest corner of the property near the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 28.

- a) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

An updated search of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) database for the project site and California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was conducted for the project to address any impacts to special-status species. CNDDDB occurrences within a five-mile radius of the project site, as well as species listed by the IPAC were included in Table 2. CNDDDB occurrences within a one and five-mile radius of the project site were included on Figure 5.

Swainson's hawks forage in grasslands, irrigated meadows, and agricultural fields that support rodent populations, but nest in trees near these areas. There are no trees on the site of the dairy barns and ponds, but the few eucalyptus trees adjacent to Road 27 and at the intersection of Road 25 and Road M could provide suitable nesting habitat. No nests, however, were observed in these trees during the November 21, 2000, reconnaissance survey. These trees would not be removed or impacted by continual usage of the facility and therefore no impacts to potential Swainson's hawk nest sites are anticipated. The dairy facility portion of the property does not contain foraging habitat.

Burrowing owl burrows have been recorded within creek banks and drainage berms in areas east of the Orland Buttes and southwest of the town of Orland. The closest recorded burrowing owl site is located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the project site. No additional grading or earthwork is planned onsite that could eliminate California ground squirrel habitat and therefore potential burrows for the burrowing owl. The agricultural drainage ditches along Road M, the eastern portion of Road 27, and other ditches may also provide suitable habitat. These ditches remain under current uses and no modification of these structures is anticipated. Operation of the feedlot will not affect potential habitat for burrowing owl nesting.

The tricolored blackbird requires open water and freshwater marsh habitat near grassland or agricultural cropland foraging areas. Tricolored

blackbirds usually nest in dense cattails or tules and in thickets of willow, blackberry, wild rose, and tall vegetation. The species is highly colonial and the nesting area must be large enough to support a minimum colony of about 50 pairs. Nesting habitat for tricolored blackbird is not present within the improved portion of the project site containing the dairy facility. No impacts to tricolored blackbird nesting habitat or colonies are anticipated as a result of the feedlot facility.

No special status or endangered species have been documented within or within 1-mile vicinity of the project site. As previously discussed, the site has been significantly disturbed. As such, it is concluded that the project will have a less than significant impact on 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

b) Would the project 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Glenn County General Plan, riparian communities formerly occupied extensive stands within Glenn County; however, current riparian communities are principally located along the Sacramento River, Willow Creek, and Walker Creek.⁶ The project site is not located in the vicinity of any riparian community.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of any of the twelve important biological areas defined in Table 2-5 of Volume III of the General Plan. These important biological areas are primarily located within the riparian zones of the Sacramento River. The project site is also not located within an area of special biological importance as shown on Figure 3-14 of Volume I of the General Plan.

The project site does not include any surface water. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community located on the project site. The site does not encompass any riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat. It is concluded that there would be a less than significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

⁶ Quad Consultants. January 22, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume III, Environmental Setting Technical Paper*, Section 2.4.1, Vegetation.

- c) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Confined Animal Facilities Element of the Glenn County General Plan, wetlands comprise approximately 4,278 acres of Glenn County, and include marshes, ponds, fringes of small lakes, sloughs, and swamps. The largest wetland assemblages occur within the Sacramento River floodplain, including the managed wetlands of the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge. Wetlands may also be found in areas with suitable soil and hydrologic conditions.⁷

Since the 1970s, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have used the following definition for wetlands for regulatory purposes: *“Wetlands are areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.”*

According to the National Wetlands Inventory of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service⁸, no wetlands exist in the project sites footprint. According to the California Central Valley Wetlands and Riparian GIS data sets of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife⁹, the project site is not designated as a protected wetland site. Neither contains sufficient spring or summer runoff to provide fishery resources. Continued operation of the facility will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

⁷ Quad Knopf. May 2005. *Confined Animal Facilities Element of the Glenn County General Plan*, Section 2.4, Biological Resources.

⁸ United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *National Wetlands Inventory*: <http://www.fws.gov/nwi>.

⁹ California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2014. *California Central Valley Wetlands and Riparian GIS Data Sets*: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/wetlands/>.

- d) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Glenn County General Plan, there is a large expanse of deer range located in the western portion of the County next to the Mendocino National Forest.¹⁰ Major migration corridors are located in the western part of the County. Based on the project site's location in the eastern portion of the County, there will be a less than significant impact on migration corridors.

Glenn County is located within the Pacific Flyway; a migratory corridor for birds moving between their winter and summer ranges. Winter waterfowl habitat is located within and surrounding the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge, which is located in the southern part of the County. Many of these birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which prohibits killing, possessing, or trading in migratory birds except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the United States Secretary of the Interior. The project would have no impact on migratory waterfowl and other birds migrating through the region because the project does not include features, which would draw migratory fowl to the area.

Continued operation of the facility will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not create a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources because there are none within the area of the project. Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact.

- f) **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not create a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan because no plans have been adopted for this specific area. Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact.

¹⁰ Quad Consultants. January 22, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume III, Environmental Setting Technical Paper*, Section 2.4.2, Wildlife.

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 as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic period archeological sites; historical features, such as rock walls, cemeteries, water ditches and flumes, and architectural features. Cultural resources consist of any human-made site, object (i.e., artifact), or feature that defines and illuminates the past.

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**
- b) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**
- c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

a), b) and c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigations Incorporated The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. The majority of the project site is currently graded and there is no evidence to suggest the presence of any human remains or burial sites located on or near the project site. The project site contains no known paleontological resources or unique geologic sites.

Future development would be required to comply with the required procedures of conduct following the accidental discovery of human remains as mandated in the Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA).

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that if human remains are found during construction activities, all operations are to cease until the County coroner has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

The potential exists to possibly uncover previously unidentified resources; therefore, it is concluded that there is a less than significant impact with mitigation measure incorporated.

Mitigation Measure CR-1 (Cultural Resources)

If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.
- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the lead federal agency, the lead CEQA agency, and applicable landowner. The agencies shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either:
 - 3) is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or
 - 4) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
- If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill [AB] 2641). The archaeologist shall notify Glenn Butte County Coroner (as per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the Project (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

Timing/Implementation:
During Construction/Excavation Activities

Enforcement/Monitoring:
Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:		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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not include new or expanded sources of energy consumption onsite. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. The proposal will not result in a significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption. The project must comply with California Green Building Standards as well as California Energy Code. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

- b) **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

Less Than Significant Impact. This proposal will not conflict with any state or local renewable energy plan or efficiently. This proposal is required to conform with Glenn County Energy Element. Construction of this project would be required to comply with the updated Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations established by the Energy Commission regarding emergency conservation standards.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:		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:				
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 Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Geologic Setting

The soils in the immediate vicinity of the feedlot facility, including the area of the wastewater ponds, are composed of Cortina very gravelly sandy loam. The Cortina series consists of excessively drained soils on recent gravelly alluvium from schistose, sedimentary, and metavolcanic rocks. These soils are characteristically gravelly or very gravelly and coarse textured or moderately coarse textured. They are shallow to moderately deep over channel sand and gravel. These soils typically have a light brownish-gray or grayish-brown surface layer that is slightly acid. The soil depth to sand and gravel is more than 36 inches. Permeability is very rapid and the available moisture-holding capacity is 3 to 5 inches. Cortina series soils generally occupy narrow areas that are small or medium in size. Cortina soils are of limited agricultural value due to low water retention capacities. In this area, the Cortina series overlays the Stony Creek alluvial fan. Site soils are summarized in additional detail in Appendix A.

a) **Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

- 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 Publication 42.**
- ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Fault rupture occurs when an active fault displaces in two separate directions during an earthquake. Concern about the growing number of structures located on or near active and potentially active faults led the State of California to enact the Alquist-Priolo Geologic Hazard Zone Act of 1972. The Act was revised in 1975 and renamed the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act. Sudden surface rupture from severe earthquakes can cause extensive property damage, but even the slow movement known as “fault creep” can cause displacement that results in offset or disfiguring of curbs, streets, and buildings.

According to the Glenn County General Plan, Glenn County is in a generally inactive seismic area. There are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones within the County. During the past 100 years, the County has experienced only minor earthquakes within its boundaries and secondary impacts from earthquakes centered out of the area. Projections of future impacts are low to moderate.¹¹ Glenn County is in a Seismic Design Load “D” according to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). All construction in the County is required to meet the standard set by the UBC for this area.

¹¹ Quad Consultants. January 22, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume III, Environmental Setting Technical Paper*, Section 3.3.1, Seismicity.

According to the Glenn County General Plan, the highest historic intensity rating for an earthquake affecting Glenn County is VII as measured by the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale. The UBC establishes standards for structures to survive earthquakes of an intensity of VII with little or no damage. The UBC also classifies all of Glenn County as being within a Seismic Risk Zone 3. Seismic risk zones are based, in part, on the distribution of earthquakes and the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale rating of known earthquakes. A Seismic Risk Zone 3 requires that special precautions be taken, in accordance with the UBC, during construction to avoid or minimize earthquake damage.

The United States Geologic Survey (USGS) and California Geologic Survey (CGS) produced a Seismic Shaking Hazards in California map (revised April 2003), which depicts the peak ground acceleration (pga) percentage that has a 10% potential of occurring in the next fifty years.¹² Glenn County, as well as areas on the west side of the central valley, are rated as 10%–30% on a scale of 0%–100%. Additionally, no earthquake greater than a magnitude 5.5 has occurred in Glenn County in over 200 years.¹³

The seismic history of Glenn County shows the area to be generally stable. Glenn County's stability can be correlated with its location away from tectonic plate boundary convergence/divergence and its location away from major active faults with high slip rates. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, no new development is being proposed at this time, any future development shall comply with California Unified Building Code including section 1613 Earthquake Loads. Given this data, seismic related activities such as rupture of known earthquake faults and strong seismic ground shaking would have a less than significant impact on people and structures in the area of the project.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction is defined as the transformation of a granular material from a solid state into a liquefied state resulting from increased pore water pressure. Ground shaking resulting from an earthquake is capable of providing the mechanism for liquefaction.

Due to the lack of seismic activity in Glenn County, it is unlikely that liquefaction or other ground failure of this type would occur. Liquefaction generally occurs in low-lying areas with saturated soils and its effects are commonly observed near water bodies. Soils with a loose structure, such as sand, are more susceptible to liquefaction when saturated.

¹² United States Geological Survey and California Geologic Survey. *Seismic Shaking Hazards in California*. <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha/Pages/pgs.aspx>.

¹³ California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey. *Map 49, California Earthquakes, 1800-2000*. <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/quakes/Pages/index.aspx>.

Depending on the level of saturation, soils at the site may be subject to liquefaction during strong shaking in a seismic event. However, since 1800, there have been no recorded earthquakes in Glenn County above a magnitude 5.5. The Earthquake Shaking Potential for California map published by the California Geologic Survey in 2008 indicates that Glenn County is in an area that only will experience lower levels of ground shaking.¹⁴ Further, the California Geologic Survey does not list Glenn County as an area where seismic activity affects soil stability. It is concluded that there is a less than significant impact.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. Landslides include phenomena that involve the downslope displacement and movement of material, either triggered by static (gravity) or dynamic (earthquake) forces. Areas susceptible to landslides are typically characterized by steep, unstable slopes in weak soil or bedrock units. The highest potential for landslides exists in the western portion of the County. Figure 4-2 of Volume II of the General Plan depicts the project site as being in an area with the least potential for landslide.¹⁵ The topography of the site and surrounding area is generally flat; therefore, it is not susceptible to slope failures and landslides. Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Soil erosion occurs through either water or wind action. Erosion by water includes sheet, rill, ephemeral gully, classical gully, and stream bank erosion. The project site is generally flat. Severe erosion typically occurs on moderate slopes of sand and steep slopes of clay subjected to concentrated water runoff. Disruption of soils on the site is not expected to create significant soil erosion due to the flat topography on the site. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, any future construction at the site is required to conform to the Glenn County Code, which includes Glenn County Code Section 15.700 (Leveling of Land-Drainage Changes). The project would therefore not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. It is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact.

¹⁴ United States Geological Survey and California Geological Survey. 2008. *Earthquake Shaking Potential for California*. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/ms/Documents/MS48_revised.pdf.

¹⁵ Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues*, Public Safety Issue Paper, Figure 4-2.

- c) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. This proposal will have a less than significant impact on soil involving unstable soils that may result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Soils and the geology of the project site are generally stable because of the area's seismic stability and low relief (see Section VI. a) i) above).

On or Off-Site Landslide

Landslide potential in the County generally correlates with relief. Landslides are not a threat because the site is not located in an area with a great amount of relief. Figure 4-2 of Volume II of the General Plan shows that the project area is in an area of least landslide potential.¹⁶

Lateral Spreading

There is a low probability for lateral spreading to occur because of the area's seismic stability. All future construction is required to meet the standards set by the UBC, which will reduce impacts from lateral spreading.

Subsidence

Land subsidence is a gradual settling or sudden sinking of the Earth's surface owing to subsurface movement of earth materials. The principal causes of subsidence are aquifer-system compaction, drainage of organic soils, underground mining, hydrocompaction, natural compaction, sinkholes, and thawing permafrost.¹⁷

According to the Glenn County General Plan, potential subsidence areas occur in the eastern portion of the County where extensive groundwater withdrawals have occurred.¹⁸ Extraction of natural gas reservoirs located in these same areas can also contribute to local subsidence of the land surface.

¹⁶ Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues*, Public Safety Issue Paper, Figure 4-2.

¹⁷ U.S. Geological Survey. December 2000. *Land Subsidence in the United States*, USGS Fact Sheet -165-00. <http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/pubs/fs00165/>.

¹⁸ Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues*, Public Safety Issue Paper, Section 4.1.3, Subsidence.

Glenn County is being monitored for subsidence through 58 monitoring stations. There have been cases of Subsidence_within Glenn County; however, there have been no cases of subsidence at the project site or project vicinity¹⁹. The closes monitoring station is located approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the project site. All future construction is required to meet the standards set by the UBC, which will reduce impacts from possible subsidence. Farming intensity at the project site will not increase and will not have a significant impact on subsidence.

Liquefaction/Collapse

Liquefaction occurs when loosely packed sandy or silty materials saturated with water are shaken enough to lose strength and stiffness. Liquefied soils behave like a liquid and are responsible for damage during an earthquake, causing pipes to leak, roads and airport runways to buckle, and building foundations to be damaged. There is a low probability for liquefaction and ground collapse to occur because of the area's seismic stability. Future construction in compliance with the UBC will reduce impacts from liquefaction and collapse.

There is no record of any incidents of unstable geologic units in the project area. Based on the information provided above, it is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact.

- d) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils are those that shrink or swell with the change in moisture content. The volume of change is influenced by the quantity of moisture, by the kind and amount of clay in the soil, and by the original porosity of the soil. According to Figure 4-5 of Volume II of the Glenn County General Plan, most of Glenn County has high expansive soils.²⁰ Soils containing a high clay content often exhibit a generally high potential to expand when saturated, and contract when dried out. This shrink/swell movement can adversely affect building foundations, often causing them to crack or shift, with resulting damage to the buildings they support.

¹⁹ CA. Department of Water Resources. February 2015. Glenn County GPS Subsidence

²⁰ Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues*, Public Safety Issue Paper, Figure 4-5.

The project includes continued operation of an existing facility and now new development is being proposed. Additionally, there would be no substantial risks to life or property from this project because any future development will require compliance with the UBC to avoid potential unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. If any new development are proposed in the future the Glenn County Building Division will ensure that the foundations of any new structures are adequately designed for the shrink/swell characteristics of expansive soils and no significant impacts to life or property are expected. An engineer will be required to design the footings for future structures to address soil conditions. California Building Code compliance reduces potential impacts from expansive soils to a less than significant level.

- e) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is for continue operation of an existing facility, the project does not include the installation of a septic system. Compliance with Glenn County Environmental Health standards would ensure that any future septic systems are properly operating and any expansion of the system is designed with respect to on-site soil capabilities for the safe treatment and disposal of wastewater and the protection of groundwater quality. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- f) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site contains no known paleontological resources or unique geologic sites; therefore, it is concluded there will be a less than significant impact.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:		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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DRAFT

Legislative/Regulatory

The Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05 (EO), in June 2005, which established statewide reduction targets for greenhouse gases. The EO states that emissions shall be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, to 1990 levels by 2020, and by 2050 reduced to 80 percent of the 1990 levels. Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, 2006 (AB 32), was signed into law in September 2006. AB 32 finds that global warming poses a serious threat to the economic wellbeing, public health, natural resources, and the California environment. It establishes a state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which would be a 25 percent reduction from forecasted emission levels.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) was approved by the Governor of California in August 2007. SB 97 requires the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit guidelines to the Resources Agency for the feasible mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions, as required by CEQA. In April 2009, OPR submitted to the Secretary for Natural Resources its proposed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions, as required by Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007). The Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency) conducted formal rulemaking prior to certifying and adopting the amendments, as required by Senate Bill 97. The Resources Agency adopted the proposed amendments, and transmitted the amendments to the Office of Administrative Law on December 31, 2009. The Office of Administrative Law reviewed the Adopted Amendments and the Natural Resources Agency's rulemaking file. The Adopted Amendments were filed with the Secretary of State, and became effective March 18, 2010.

These CEQA Guidelines amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions in draft CEQA documents. The greenhouse gas guidelines fit within the existing CEQA framework by amending existing Guidelines to reference climate change.

Greenhouse gases (GHGs), as defined by the Health and Safety code, include but are not limited to water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), ozone (O₃), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) (Health and Safety Code §38500 et seq.). These gases all act as effective global insulators, reflecting back to earth visible light and infrared radiation.

GHGs are present in the atmosphere naturally, released by natural sources, or formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. In the last 200 years, substantial quantities of GHGs have been released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere, enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global warming. While manmade GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), some (like CFCs) are completely new to the atmosphere.

Natural sources of carbon dioxide (CO₂) include respiration (breathing) of animals and plants and evaporation from the oceans. Together, these natural sources release about 150 billion tons of CO₂ each year, far outweighing the seven billion tons of manmade emissions from fossil fuel burning, waste incineration, deforestation, and cement manufacture. Nevertheless, natural removal processes such as photosynthesis by land and ocean-dwelling plant species cannot keep pace with this extra input of manmade CO₂, and consequently the gas is building up in the atmosphere.

Methane (CH₄) is produced when organic matter decomposes in environments lacking sufficient oxygen. Natural sources include wetlands, termites, and oceans. Manmade sources include the mining and burning of fossil fuels, digestive processes in ruminant animals such as cattle, rice paddies, and the burying of waste in landfills. Total annual emissions of CH₄ are about 500 million tons, with manmade emissions accounting for the majority. The major removal process of atmospheric methane – chemical breakdown in the atmosphere – cannot keep pace with source emissions, and CH₄ concentrations in the atmosphere are increasing.²¹

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. A project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change on its own. A project participates in potential climate change by its incremental contribution (positive or negative) of GHG emissions that, when combined with the cumulative increase of all other natural and anthropogenic sources of GHGs, impact global climate change. Therefore, global climate change is a type of cumulative impact and a project's participation in this cumulative impact is through its incremental contribution of GHG emissions.

Energy efficiency standards have been updated, and new technology has allowed construction to be more energy efficient. Future construction would be required to comply with the updated Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations established by the Energy Commission regarding emergency conservation standards.

This part of the County is used primarily for agriculture and contains very limited residential use. Vehicle Miles Traveled are a major contributor to Greenhouse Gas Emissions; as the project is for the continued operation of an existing facility there is not anticipated to be a significant increase in Vehical Miles Traveled as a result of this proposal.

²¹ State of California. September 2006. *Assembly Bill 32 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf

The project includes continued operation of an existing facility; converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This conversion is considered a baseline condition. Conditional Use Permit 2007-002 approved a herd of 4,100 dairy cattle (Holstein); which equates to 5,567 Animal Units (AU). Conditional Use Permit 2020-002 proposes a feedlot with a beef cattle capacity of approximately 7,100, (4,260 Animal Unit). The total permitted Animal Units is anticipated to be decreased by 1,307 Animal Units from 5,567 Animal Units to 4,260 Animal Units.

As the proposal is not anticipated to significantly increase Vehicle Miles Traveled and the total permitted Animal Units is decreasing the proposal is not anticipated to significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. It is concluded there will be a less than significant impact.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

See Section VIII a) (above)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle; Animal Units will not be increased. This is considered a baseline condition. AB 32 is the State of California's primary GHG emissions regulation. The project would not conflict with the state's ability to achieve the reduction targets under AB 32. The project will not result in a change in greenhouse gas emissions or conflict with any adopted plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

IX. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The California Health and Safety Code defines a Hazardous Material as “any material that because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or the environment if released into the workplace or environment”. Thus, hazardous material is a broad term for all substances that may be hazardous (there is no single list) and includes hazardous substances and hazardous wastes. Substances that are flammable, corrosive, reactive oxidizers, radioactive, combustible, or toxic are considered hazardous. Examples include: oil, fuels, paints, thinners, cleaning solvents, compressed gasses (acetylene, carbon dioxide, oxygen, nitrogen, etc.), radioactive materials, and pesticides.

The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (GCAPCD) is the Administering Agency and the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Glenn County with responsibility for regulating hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, underground storage tank facilities, above ground storage tanks, and stationary sources handling regulated substances.

The project site is subject to Glenn County Code §15.560.070 for fire and explosion hazards. This section states: *All uses involving the use or storage of combustible, explosive, caustic or otherwise hazardous materials shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate fire-fighting and fire suppression equipment.*

The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during construction would be subject to and therefore conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 8 and Title 22.

The project does not include the routine transport or disposal of hazardous materials. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. The project has a less than significant impact related to the use hazardous materials onsite

- b) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigations Incorporate

Uses involving the storage and handling of hazardous materials are monitored by the Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (GCAPCD), which is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Glenn County.

According to the GCAPCD, businesses that handle hazardous materials are required by law to provide an immediate verbal report of any release or threatened release of hazardous materials. Local, state, and federal regulations for use and handling of hazardous materials will reduce impacts to the public and the environment. The project has the potential to release hazardous materials to the environment if a spill of fuel or equipment leaks were to occur onsite. Glenn County Air Pollution Control District replied to the Request for Review as shown in comments. A Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required for any facility that store hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 500 lbs or 200 cubic feet or facilities that generate any amount of hazardous waste. The mitigation measures HA-1 has been established based upon GCAPCD's requirement. It is concluded there will be a less than significant impact with Mitigation Measures incorporated.

Mitigation Measure HA-1 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)

Prior to Operation Commencement, the applicant shall provide Glenn County Planning Division a Hazardous Materials Business Plan approved by Glenn County Air Pollution Control District.

Timing/Implementation:

Prior to Operation Commencement

Enforcement/Monitoring:

Glenn County Air Pollution Control District

- c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No Impact. Project operations will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The project is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. Due to lack of hazardous emissions and no schools being located within one-quarter mile it is concluded that there will be No Impact as a result of this project.

- d) **Would the project 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?**

No Impact. The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code §65962.5. According to the database of cleanup sites provided through the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), there are no cleanup sites within the vicinity of the project.²² Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact.

- 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?**

No Impact. The project site is approximately 3.5-miles southwest of the Orland-Glenn County Airport (Haigh Field).²³ This airport is the closest public use airport in the vicinity of the project site. The project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area because it is located outside of the overflight zone. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no impact.

- f) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. All roads in the area would remain open. The project site has adequate access to County Roads through frontage of County Road 27. The project will not interfere with adjacent roadways that may be used for emergency response or evacuation. The project will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

Designated emergency evacuation routes in the event of flood or dam failure are listed in Section 3.7 of Volume II of the Glenn County General Plan.²⁴ The proposed project does not pose a unique or unusual use or activity that would impair the effective and efficient implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The project will not obstruct or compromise the safety of emergency response vehicles or aircraft and their ability to effectively respond in an emergency. It is concluded this project will have a less than significant impact.

²² California Department of Toxic Substance Control. *Envirostor: Cleanup Sites and Hazardous Waste Permitted Facilities*. <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.

²³ Glenn County Airport Land Use Commission. February 27, 1991. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan: Orland-Haigh Field Airport*. http://gcppwa.net/documents/Orland_Airport_Land_Use_Plan-1991.pdf.

²⁴ Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues*, Public Safety Issue Paper, Section 3.7, Emergency Response Plan.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project site is not within Cal Fire's State Responsibility Area. The site is within the Artois Fire Protection District; Artois Fire Protection District was provided application documentation, no comments were received. According to Figure 3-2 of Volume II of the Glenn County General Plan, the project site is not within a fire hazard severity zone. The most severe wildland fires occur in the western portion of the County within the Mendocino National Forest. It is concluded that there will be a Less than Significant Impact on the project from wildland fires.

DRAFT

X. 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i)	result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?**

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no surface waters located on the project site. Unlike the dairy operations, the feedlot operations will not generate additional wastewater from operations. All water that comes in contact with manure or cattle holding areas will be contained in the retention ponds onsite. Portions of the existing groundwater monitoring network will be retained to verify that groundwater is not being impacted by site activities. The wells will be sampled per the General Order. The project will not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. It is anticipated that the proposed project will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements set forth by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposal must meet the requirements in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board comments received April 30, 2020.

- b) **Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed operation of the feedlot is anticipated to use less water than the previous dairy operations. The project will not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

- 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:**

- i) **result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;**
- ii) **substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;**
- 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**

Less Than Significant Impact. Topography of the facility slopes gently to the southeast. The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 730 feet above sea level at the northwest corner of the property (the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 25) to approximately 660 feet above sea level at the southwest corner of the property near the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 28. No waterways exist on the project site. The project includes the continued operation of an existing facility, the converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. According to application documentation, the sites drainage will not be altered.

There will not be a significant increase in surface runoff, which would result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. No development is being proposed, any future development is required to conform to the Glenn County Code, which includes Glenn County Code Section 15.700 (Leveling of Land-Drainage Changes). As is the case under current land use designations and zoning, future development would be required to adhere to standard practices designed to prevent erosion and siltation, such as slope protection and dust control. Any future drainage changes shall meet the requirements of Chapter 15.650 of the County Code.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. This project will not impede or redirect flood flows. The project site is located within Flood Zone “X” according to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06021C0400D. Flood Zone “X” (unshaded) consists of areas of minimal risk outside the 1-percent and 0.2-percent annual chance floodplains. No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within this zone. As the project is not within a flood zone the project will not have a significant impact in impeding or redirecting flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less Than Significant Impact. A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. Seiches are potentially hazardous when the wave action created in lakes or swimming pools is strong enough to threaten life and property. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by major seismic events and mudflows are landslide events in which a mass of saturated soil flows downhill as a very thick liquid. There would be no impact on the project site from inundation by seiche or tsunami because the project area is not located near large bodies of water that would pose a seiche or tsunami hazard.

The project site is located within Flood Zone “X” according to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06021C0400D, dated August 5, 2010, issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flood Zone “X” (unshaded) consists of areas of minimal risk outside the 1-percent and 0.2-percent annual chance floodplains. No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within this zone. It is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact on release of pollutants due to the project not being in a flood zone.

e) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

Less than Significant Impact. The proposal will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The proposed project will not substantially degrade water quality. No construction is being proposed; any future construction activities resulting in a land disturbance of greater than one acre must be permitted by Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge as no significant increases in groundwater use are planned.

DRAFT

XI. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project is not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The project would not block a public street, trail, or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide a community. Upon development, the proposed uses would be fully integrated into their surrounding areas. It is concluded that there will be no impact as a result of this project.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The General Plan land use designation is “Intensive Agriculture” and the zoning designation is “AE-40” (Exclusive Agriculture (36-acre minimum parcel size)). This project is consistent with and will not conflict with the “AE-40” zoning designation (Glenn County Code Chapter 15.330). The proposed conversion from dairy cattle to beef cattle is a permitted uses only if a conditional use permit has first been secured (Glenn County Code Chapter 15.330.040.W). *Glenn County Code §15.330.040.X. Confined animal facility.* The project is consistent with the General Plan land use goals and policies. The proposal is in accordance with the previously adopted Glenn County Confined Animal Facility Element. It is concluded that no significant land use impacts will occur. It is concluded that there will be no impact on land use.

XII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The purpose of the Mineral Resources section is to identify and evaluate the potential for the project to adversely affect the availability of known mineral resources. The mineral resources of concern include metals, industrial minerals (e.g., aggregate, sand and gravel), oil and gas, and geothermal resources that would be of value to the region and residents of the State of California.

Notable mineral resources in Glenn County include natural gas and construction grade aggregate material. In addition, published reports indicate past attempts to exploit deposits of chromite, molybdenite and copper. Primary areas for gravel extraction occur along Stony Creek and the Sacramento River, although there are other pockets of gravel scattered throughout the County.

Several gas fields contribute to a significant quantity of natural gas production in Glenn County. Of these, the Malton-Black Butte field located on the border with Tehama County in eastern Glenn County, and the Willows-Beehive Bend field located in southeastern Glenn County account for nearly 80 percent of total gas production in the County. No oil or geothermal resources have been discovered in the County.

Mining in Glenn County was primarily related to the extraction of strategic minerals during World Wars I and II. The extraction of chrome and manganese essentially ended in the late 1940s with the loss of government demand and subsidies.²⁵

²⁵ Quad Consultants. January 22, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume III, Environmental Setting Technical Paper*, Section 2.5, Mineral and Energy Resources.

- a) **Would the project 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) **Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation, none of the project site is located within a Mineral Resource Zone, which are areas that have a high likelihood of containing significant aggregate deposits.²⁶ None of the project areas are located on active mine sites. There is no other evidence that any of the project areas have mineral resources that may add value to the region and residents of the state, or are important mineral resource recovery sites. Additionally, the proposal is for the conversion of Dairy Cattle to Beef Cattle; and does not propose new structures or activities on undisturbed ground. Therefore, no significant impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

DRAFT

²⁶ California Department of Conservation, Mineral Lands Classification,
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:		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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. No new construction is being proposed. If any future construction is proposed and approved, there may be periodic increases in noise during future construction activities. Construction-related noises between the hours of 7 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. are exempt from the local noise standards per Glenn County Code §15.560.100(F)(5). Construction-related noise levels at other times are regulated by Glenn County Code §15.560.100.

The Glenn County General Plan Noise Element provides a basis for local policies to control and abate environmental noise, and to protect the citizens of Glenn County from excessive noise exposure. The County also enforces its Noise Ordinance (Chapter 15.560.100) in the County Code. This ordinance contains noise level standards for residential and non-residential land uses. Section 6.10 of the Glenn County General Plan supplies noise/land use compatibility guidelines and noise level standards.

The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. The project will not result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. It is concluded there will be less than significant impact.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels??

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibrations. Vibrations are regulated by Glenn County Code §15.560.130, which states that no use shall generate ground vibrations which are perceptible without instruments beyond the lot line. Ground vibration caused by motor vehicles, aircraft, temporary construction work or agricultural equipment are exempt from the vibration performance standard as stated under Glenn County Code §15.560.130. No construction is being proposed; any future construction work in the future would not cause significant groundborne vibration. Since the duration of impact would be brief and would occur during less sensitive daytime hours (i.e., between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.), the impact from construction-related groundborne vibration and groundborne noise is considered less than significant.

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?

No Impact. There are no private airports or private airstrips located within the vicinity of the project site. According to topographic maps and aerial photos, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Additionally, the project site is located outside of airport land use planning boundaries and is approximately 3.5 miles southwest from the Orland Airport.²⁷ This airport is the closest public use airport to project site. The project site is outside of the noise contour based on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as defined in the Willows Glenn County Airport Master Plan. It is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact as a result of this project.

²⁷ Glenn County Airport Land Use Commission. June 30, 1990. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan Willows Glenn County Airport*. http://gcppwa.net/documents/Willows_Airport_Land_Use_Plan-1990.pdf

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:		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 (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Population impacts are often associated with substantial increases in population from a project. Housing impacts may result directly from the construction of new housing units or indirectly from changes in housing demand associated with new non-residential development, such as office, manufacturing, and industrial uses that increase employment in an area.

- a) **Would the project 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)?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly. In accordance with Glenn County General Plan §3.0.2 (Intensive Agriculture), the proposed project will not violate the population density standard of 12 persons per square mile (640 acres). New businesses and/or the extension of public roads that may lead to significant population growth are considered less than significant. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly. Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact on population growth.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. The proposal would not displace existing housing or people within the area of the project. Construction of replacement housing would not be necessary with this proposal. Therefore, it is concluded that there will be no impact.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
i)	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v)	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?

See Section XIX a)

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is within Artois Fire Protection District. Artois Fire Protection District were provided application documentation, no comments were received. Response time is not anticipated to be affected by the proposed project. Compliance with state laws will reduce impacts from fire. Therefore, it is concluded that the impact from the proposal is less than significant.

ii) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Law enforcement for unincorporated portions of Glenn County, including the project site, is provided by the Glenn County Sheriff's Department. There is a sheriff's office located in the City of Willows and substations located in the City of Orland and Hamilton City. The California Highway Patrol is responsible for patrolling all interstate and state highways. Transportation routes to the project site are adequate for law enforcement to reach the area in the event of an emergency. The project site has adequate access to County Road 27 through frontage. Response time would not be affected by the proposed project. This project is not anticipated to require the staffing of additional peace officers or the purchase of additional equipment to support law enforcement activities. The project will not generate substantial additional population in the area and therefore would not require additional police surveillance over existing conditions. Based on this information, it is concluded that the project would have a less than significant impact on police protection.

iii) Schools?

The project will not result in an increase in demand on the public schools system. The project site is located within the Orland Unified School District. It is concluded that there is no impact from the project.

iv) Parks?

No Impact. The County provides for maintenance and upkeep of the existing parks within the unincorporated area. The County has no park facilities within the area of the project. The proposed project would have no impact on the County's ability to maintain its parks and no new substantial demands on the current facilities would be generated by this proposal.

v) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed project may have incremental increases on demands for other public services and facilities; however, this would be a less than significant impact. The project will not generate substantial additional population to the area and therefore will not have a need for public facilities such as libraries, postal service, hospitals, etc. Public agencies have reviewed this proposal for impacts to public services and facilities and a potentially significant impact has not been identified for this proposed project. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no impact to other public facilities.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 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?**

No Impact The project will have no impact on recreation. No new demand will be generated for the use of the existing area parks. The project does not include recreation facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

- 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?**

No Impact.) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. See a).

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:		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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DRAFT

Glenn County Roads Overview:

The major north-south road is Interstate 5 (I-5), which provides major connection between Glenn County and major cities to the north, such as Red Bluff and Redding, and to the south to cities such as Sacramento. East of I-5, State Routes 32 and 162 are the major east-west roads. Route 32 provides a connection through Orland to Chico, the closest of the major urban areas of California to Glenn County residents. To the south State Route 162 provides a similar connection to Oroville. The next major east-west road to the south is Highway 20, which provides a connection to the Yuba City- Marysville area. Highway 45 is the only major north-south road east of I-5. It serves adjoining land uses as well as providing a connection between State Routes 32, 162, and 20.

State Route 162 is the only state route west of I-5. The route originally began at Highway 101 in Mendocino County and continued into Glenn County, but a 70-mile break currently exists (34 miles of which is in Mendocino County and 36 miles in Glenn County). The intermediate mileage is a seasonal road owned and maintained by Mendocino and Glenn Counties. This travel corridor is the only east-west route between I-5 and Highway 101 between State Routes 20 and 36, a distance of approximately 75 miles.

The jurisdictions responsible for public roads within Glenn County include the County of Glenn, the incorporated cities of Orland and Willows, the State of California, and the U.S. Forest Service.

- a) **Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. Project traffic (employee trips and truck trips) will remain consistent or less than the previous dairy operation. The project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in traffic from current or past operations. The project will not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)

§ 15064.3 Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts

(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts

(1) Land Use Projects. *“Vehicles miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transportation stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant impact”.*

Less Than Significant Impact. Section 15064.3 was recently added to the CEQA Guidelines and states that “vehicle miles traveled” (VMT) is the preferred method for evaluating transportation impacts. This project includes continued operation of an existing facility. The project will not result in a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled by project-related traffic. It is concluded there will not be a significant increase in VMT as a result of this proposal; therefore; there will be a less than significant impact.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not substantially increase traffic hazards due to geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The project does not include potentially hazardous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. County Road 27 will provide adequate ingress and egress to the proposed facility.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access because access road to County Road 27 through frontage. Emergency services agencies have been contacted and have no objections to the proposal. It is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact on emergency access with mitigation measures incorporated.

VIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AB 52 was enacted on July 1, 2015 and establishes that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (Public Resources Code Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and meets either of the following criteria:

- 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

- 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 these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California cities, counties, and tribes regarding tribal cultural resources. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

a) **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) **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**
- ii) **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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

i) and ii) Less than significant with Mitigations Incorporated. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition.

Pursuant to AB 52, project notifications have been mailed by Glenn County to all tribes that have requested notice of projects proposed within the County to invite consultation and avoid potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. No comments were received from native tribes. It is concluded the proposal will have a less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated.

Discovery of Cultural Resources

In accordance with State and Federal Laws if any potentially prehistoric, protohistoric, and/or historic cultural resources are accidentally encountered during future excavation of the site, all work shall cease in the area of the find pending an examination of the site and materials by a qualified archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure TCR -1 (Tribal Cultural Resources)

In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural (including Tribal) resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the applicant/operator shall consult with the County and a qualified archaeologist (as approved by the County) and corresponding tribal representative to assess the significance of the find per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The qualified archaeologist shall determine the nature of the find, evaluate its significance, and, if necessary, suggest preservation or mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation measures, based on recommendations listed in the archaeological survey report and tribal representative, will be determined by the Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources, unique archaeological resources, and/or tribal resources is carried out. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, tribal representative, and documented according to current professional standards.

Timing/Implementation:

During Construction/Excavation Activities

Enforcement/Monitoring:

Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services Agency

DRAFT

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:		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, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. There is no municipal wastewater treatment facility proposed with this project. The project will not require or result in new or expanded municipal facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The proposal will rely on individual sewage disposal systems for wastewater treatment.

The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; therefore, no significant environmental damage would result from the construction of such facilities. The project will not require significant alterations to existing electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. It is concluded there will be a less than significant impact as a result of this project.

- b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. The operation of a feedlot will use less water than the operation of a dairy. There is sufficient water supply to serve the project.

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. All stormwater that contacts cattle holding areas will be continued onsite. Ponds have sufficient capacity to hold all water generated onsite. The project will not result in the increased generation of wastewater requiring treatment.

- d) **Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Manure will continue to be composted onsite. This is a baseline condition. The manure will be combined with almond processing waste from the adjoining orchards, composted onsite, and returned to the adjacent orchards. Water from the ponds may be used to provide moisture to the compost. The composting operation meets the definition of “agricultural composting” under the current Order WQ 2015-0121-DWQ General Waste Discharge Requirements for Composting Operations and would be exempt from the requirements of the Order. Based upon Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board comments dated April 30, 2020, the proposal will be limited to 25,000 cubic yards of composting storage at any given time as well as no more than 5,000 cubic yards of compost final product can be given or sold annually, as seen in Condition of Approval XX.

Small quantities of solid waste generated by the project are transported to Glenn County landfill. In 2019 Glenn County closed the landfill is currently utilizing a transfer station. At this time, waste disposal is not anticipated to be a significant issue. The cumulative impacts on the landfill will be minimal and will be offset in the future from increased requirements for sorting, recycling, diversion, and increases in disposal costs.

- e) **Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact. In compliance with guidelines set forth by AB 939 (California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989), the County of Glenn has adopted a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) to define goals and objectives for waste reduction, recycling, and diversion. The SRRE defines guidelines to implement these goals and objectives through seven main programs, consisting of Source Reduction, Recycling, Composting, Special Waste Materials, Public Education, Policy Incentives, and Facility Recovery. The proposed project will be required to comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste disposal. As a result, there would be no impact on solid waste regulations.

XX. WILDFIRE

		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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan. All roads in the area would remain open. The project site is located on private property with adequate access to county roads. The project site has adequate access to County Road 27. The project will not interfere with adjacent roadways that may be used for emergency response or evacuation. The project will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The proposed project does not pose a unique or unusual use or activity that would impair the effective and efficient implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. According to Figure 3-2 of Volume II of the Glenn County General Plan, the project site is not located within a fire hazard severity zone or within Cal Fire’s State Responsibility Zone. The most severe wildland fires occur in the western portion of the County within the Mendocino National Forest. The project will not obstruct or compromise the safety of emergency response vehicles or aircraft and their ability to effectively respond in an emergency. Therefore, it is concluded that there is a less than significant impact.

- b) **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Topography of the facility slopes gently to the southeast. The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 730 feet above sea level at the northwest corner of the property (the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 25) to approximately 660 feet above sea level at the southwest corner of the property near the intersection of Highway 99W and County Road 28. The project site has no features that would exacerbate wildfire risk including slope or prevailing winds; therefore, it is concluded there will be a less than significant impact.

- c) **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

This project would not require the installation or maintenance of additional infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk impacts to the environment. The project does not include new infrastructure or maintenance that may exacerbate fire risks or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Artois Fire Department was contacted regarding this proposal and no comments were received. It is concluded there will be no impact.

- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not include the construction of any additional structures. Workers will not be exposed to downslope or downstream flood or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes

XXI. 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 self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DRAFT

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

Less Than Significant Impact. All impacts associated with the project have been fully identified in this document. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility, simply converting from dairy cattle to beef cattle. This is considered a baseline condition. The project does not have an impact as such to degrade any quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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.

- 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)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. There are currently no known aspects of the project that might result in cumulative impacts to the project site or surrounding areas. The project includes continued operation of an existing facility and will not result in any impacts over current baseline. The project does not have any cumulatively considerable effects on any past, present, or future projects.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create significant hazards or health safety concerns. Aspects of this project, which have the potential to have an effect on human beings or the environment, have been discussed in this document. The impacts of the project have been concluded to be less than significant. The project as proposed will not have substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. It is concluded that there will be a less than significant impact.

REFERENCES

In addition to the resources listed below, Initial Study analysis may also be based on on-site field observations, discussions with the affected agencies, analyses of adopted plans and policies, review of existing studies, and specialized environmental studies. Most resource materials are on file in the office of the Glenn County Planning & Community Development Services, 225 North Tehama Street, Willows, CA 95988, Phone (530) 934-6540.

Applicant:

Douglas Freitas dba Mission Livestock
P.O. Box 933
Dixon, CA 95620

Landowner:

Paul Violich Rev Trust/ Violich Farms Inc.
P.O. Box 875
Kentfield, CA 94914

Consultant:

VESTRA Resources Inc. Attn: Wendy Johnston
5300 Aviation Drive
Redding, CA 96002

Records of, or consultation with the following:

Artois Fire Protection District
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
California Department of Food and Agriculture
California Department of Water Resources
Glenn County Agricultural Commissioner
Glenn County Air Pollution Control District/Certified Unified Program Agency
Glenn County Environmental Health Department
Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency, Building Inspection Division
Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency, Engineering & Surveying Division
Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency, Solid Waste Division
Glenn County Sheriff's Office
Grindstone Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki
Kanawha Fire Protection District
State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Drinking Water
Southern Pacific Railroad
Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
Orland Artois Water District
Orland School District

California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey. *Map 49, California Earthquakes, 1800-2000.*

<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/quakes/Pages/index.aspx>.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.*

<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Index.aspx>.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources. 2001. *Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Fields in California.*

California Department of Conservation. 1997. *Mined Land Classification Map for Concrete-Grade Aggregate Resources Central Glenn County.*

California Department of Fish and Game. 1994. *A Field Guide to Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements, Sections 1600-1607, California Fish and Game Code.* Environmental Services Division, Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2014. *California Central Valley Wetlands and Riparian GIS Data Sets:* <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/wetlands/>.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. *California Natural Diversity Database.* <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB>

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsible Areas (SRA, Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP).* http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/glenn/fhszs_map.11.jpg.

California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General. *Global Warming.* <http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/index.php>

California Department of Toxic Substance Control. *Envirostor: Cleanup Sites and Hazardous Waste Permitted Facilities.* <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.

California Department of Transportation. *Officially Designated State Scenic Highways.* <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm>.

California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board. *Climate Change Program.* <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cc.htm>

California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board. June 2011. *2011 State Area Designations.* <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual.* Department of the Army, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for Glenn County, as revised to date.

Glenn County Airport Land Use Commission. February 27, 1991. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan: Orland-Haigh Field Airport.*

http://gcppwa.net/documents/Orland_Airport_Land_Use_Plan-1991.pdf.

Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency. Glenn County Geographic Information System.

Institute of Transportation Engineers. 1997. *Trip General Manual.*

Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume I, Policy Plan.*

Quad Consultants. June 15, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume II, Issues, Public Safety Issue Paper.*

Quad Consultants. January 22, 1993. *Glenn County General Plan, Volume III, Environmental Setting Technical Paper.*

Quad Knopf. May 2005. *Confined Animal Facilities Element of the Glenn County General Plan.*

State of California. September 2006. *Assembly Bill 32 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf

Title 15 (Unified Development Code) of the Glenn County Code, as revised to date.

http://www.countyofglenn.net/govt/county_code/?cc_t_id=17

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Farm Service Agency. 2014. Aerial Photography Field Office, National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP).

<http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/apfoapp?area=home&subject=prog&topic=nai>

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service. Soil Survey Geographic (SURGO) Database.

<http://soils.usda.gov/survey/geography/ssurgo/>

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service. 1968. Soil Survey of Glenn County, California.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *National Wetlands Inventory.*

<http://www.fws.gov/nwi>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Indoor Water use in the United States.*

<http://www.epa.gov/WaterSense/pubs/indoor.html>

United States Geological Survey. December 2000. *Land Subsidence in the United States*, USGS Fact Sheet -165-00. <http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/pubs/fs00165/>.

United States Geological Survey and California Geological Survey. 2008. *Earthquake Shaking Potential for California*.
http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/ms/Documents/MS48_revised.pdf.

United States Geological Survey and California Geologic Survey. *Seismic Shaking Hazards in California*. <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha/Pages/pga.aspx>.

DRAFT

FIGURES

- Figure 1. Topographic Map
- Figure 2. Assessor's Map
- Figure 3. Plot Plan
- Figure 4. Aerial Photograph of Site

DRAFT