CEQA APPENDIX G:
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

NOTE: The following is a sample form and may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

1. Project title: **UP/RZ/GPA/IS#22-009, THOMPSON FAMILY TRUST, 70 SPACE RV PARK**
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Susanville. 66 N. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130.

3. Contact person and phone number: Kelly Mumper, City Planner (530)252-5104
4. Project location: 300 Bella Way, Susanville, CA 96130.
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Perry Thompson 26810 Pittville Totten Road, McArthur, CA 95056

6. General plan designation: Light Industrial-Business Park 7. Zoning: Commercial-Light Industrial.
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

UP/RZ/GPA/IS#22-009, THOMPSON FAMILY TRUST, 70 SPACE RV PARK. The applicant is proposing a 70 space RV Park on a 10.19-acre parcel that is currently zoned C-M (Commercial Light Industrial Zoning District) with a General Plan designation of *"Light Industry or Business Park"* pursuant to the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010.* Approximately 1.28 acres of the subject parcel is zoned O-S (Open Space) and while still a part of the project is not proposed to be rezoned because the land use classification is already acceptable for an RV Park with a Use Permit. The bulk of the project proposal requires a rezone and general plan amendment application which if approved would rezone the subject parcel from C-M to C-2 (General Commercial Shopping Center District) with a General Plan designation of *General Commercial/ Shopping Center.* The subject parcel has an Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 116-470-018-000 and is located on Bella Way approximately 950 feet northwest of the intersection of Skyline Road and Johnsonville Road in Susanville CA.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: Surrounding land uses include a mixture of commercial light industrial and general commercial/shopping center zoning districts. The subject parcel is bordered by the Jensen Slough to on the western portion of the parcel and adjacent to Western Nevada Supply Company to the south and JW Wood Company to the west. Current settings also include an undeveloped 13 Acre parcel to the southeast, an undeveloped 32 Acre parcel to the north (Lassen County jurisdiction), and an undeveloped 30 Acre parcel to the west.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Encroachment Permit for Skyline Road access through the Lassen County Public Works Department.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? **Yes**

    Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

■ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Kelly Mumgaard, City Planner
Signature

6/9/2023
Date

Kelly Mumgaard, City Planner
Signature

6/9/2023
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

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

Responses to questions A-D

a) The most significant views in the project vicinity focus on streetscapes along major arterials such as Johnstonville Road and Skyline Road. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact to scenic vistas as the project location is not identified within the *City of Susanville General Plan, 1990-2010,* local ordinance, or specific plan, as a scenic vista. Project implementation would replace existing views of the site (undeveloped-native vegetation) with approximately two single story structures and up to 70 Recreational Vehicles depending on seasonal usage.

b) The proposed project is located within a half mile of California State Highway 36 which has not been identified by the California Department of Transportation as eligible, nor has the City of Susanville applied for Scenic Highway Approval and subsequently no Corridor Protection Program has been adopted by the City of Susanville. In addition, the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010*, does not have a policy to acquire or pursue scenic designation. There are no trees, outcroppings, historic buildings, or other scenic resources that would be applicable to a Corridor Protection Program. The Caltrans website was consulted to determine this analysis. In addition, The project is not located within a scenic highway corridor and there will be no impacts.

c) The existing visual character of the project site and its surroundings are dominated by mid-rise commercial and light industrial buildings presenting a mixture of architectural styles. The area is further defined by industrial and heavy industrial uses located within Lassen County's jurisdiction, paved roadways, parking lots, and structures which are accessory to the aforementioned land use designations. Approximately 1.26 Acres of the southwestern portion of the project site is zoned Open Space and shall remain as such as part of this proposal. Proposed project uses on said acreage fall under ministerial actions by the local agency and therefore will not be discussed in detail. Said area encompasses a portion of Jensen Slough, which is a man-made irrigation canal which over the decades, has established riparian corridor type vegetation. This area is to remain undisturbed as part of the project scope and to be enjoyed as such by potential patrons or temporary residents of the proposed RV Park. During the construction phase, views across the project site from surrounding areas would be temporarily disrupted. Graded or to be graded surfaces, construction debris, construction equipment, and truck traffic would be visible. There are no unique or scenic visual resources on the project site or in its vicinity. Long term operations would permanently alter the appearance of the site by replacing the undeveloped land with a 70 space recreational vehicle park.

Based on the context of the surrounding uses, the proposed development would be visually compatible with existing uses. The potential impacts are less than significant.

d) Lighting associated with the bathroom facility and office building would be that of typical office buildings. Any outdoor lighting would be downward facing and shielding as required pursuant to the City of Susanville Municipal Code Chapter 17 17.96.050. Outdoor lighting associated with the recreational vehicle spaces would also be downward facing, cut off, and subject to the aforementioned city ordinance in order to avoid spillover onto adjacent properties. Building materials and colors would be non-reflective to minimize impacts to glare. A glow effect could become significant if city lighting ordinance is not adhered to but impacts are considered to be less than significant should conditions be placed and followed.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	■
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))?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Responses to A-E

a) According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the site has been mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance and falls within the land classification of "Prime farmland if irrigated". The project site is only 10.19 acres and surrounded by Light Industrial and Commercial uses which makes the site not suitable for agricultural production. In addition, the subject parcel was already evaluated by a pervious EIR (State Clearing House Number 89050810) *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010*, for a more intense zoning district than what the project proposes General Commercial Shopping Center District vs Commercial/Light Industrial). Therefore, while the subject parcel does have viable soils for farmland, a previous EIR determined that impacts are considered to be less than significant, and that this general area would not be zoned for Agricultural uses within the scope of the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010.* No impacts.

b) The project site is located within the C-M (Commercial Light Industrial Zoning District) and agricultural uses are not permitted within this zone. There is no Williamson Act contract that affects the project site according to the Lassen County Assessor's Office and Planning Department. No impacts.

c) The project site is located within the C-M (Commercial Light Industrial Zoning District) and proposes residential and commercial uses and therefore is not in conflict with forest or timberland zoning. No impacts.

d) The proposed project site is located within the C-M (Commercial Light Industrial Zoning District) and proposes residential and commercial uses. There are no forests lands within this area so the loss of forest or conversion of forest land to non-forest use would not occur. No impacts.

e) The project site is not located in close proximity to forest land or farmland as shown on the maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation and based on a field reconnaissance. The project would not involve the disruption or damage of the existing environment that would result in the loss of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because its location is not in the vicinity of farmland and forest land. In addition, the project site was already evaluated by a previous EIR which determined that impacts are less than significant, and that this general area would not be zoned for Agricultural uses within the scope of the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010.* Agricultural uses that are within the vicinity of the proposed project are under Lassen County jurisdiction and buffered by Skyline Road. No impacts.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

Air Quality: Responses to A-E

a) The project is located in The Lassen County Air Pollution Control District which is a Local Air District governing the Lassen County Region. Lassen County is located in Northeastern California and is part of the Northeastern Plateau Air Basin. The Air Quality Management District which has been identified by the California Air Resources Board and Environmental Protection Agency as being in an Attainment area for Ozone, Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10), and Fine Suspended Particulate Matter (PM2.5) The applicable air quality plan is the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. The project was evaluated for consistency with the Federal and State Standards based on the following criteria:

1. The first criteria is if the project air pollutant emissions with respect to the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards will not increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, delay their timely attainment, or interfere with the interim emission reductions specified in the Plan. Based on the air quality report prepared for the project which used the Urban Emissions Model, the air pollution emissions do not exceed the Federal or State Ambient Air Quality Standards. Therefore, the project meets the first criteria for compliance with the established Federal and State standards.
2. The second criteria is compliance with the control measures of the federal and state standards. The Plan contains a number of land use and transportation control measures that are intended to reduce air pollutant emissions. The project will comply with control measures identified in the Plan in addition to all of the District's applicable rules and regulations. Therefore, the project complies with the second criteria and impacts are less than significant.
3. In addition, the project site was already evaluated under a previous EIR which determined impacts associated with Commercial/Light Industrial Uses related to air quality are less than significant. *City of Susanville General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 1990-2010.* (SCH#89050810).

The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations,or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards at the state or federal level. As determined by the California Emissions Estimator Model, the project will not exceed state or federal significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long term operation. Accordingly, the Project's air pollutant emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of the State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards. As such, the Project would be

consistent with the Lassen County Air Pollution Control District's adopted State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards and thresholds and no mitigation is required.

b) The project would generate air pollutants from construction activities (e.g. fugitive exhaust and equipment exhaust) and in the long term from project operation and area sources (e.g. vehicles emissions, landscaping activities, etc.) The pollutants that would be generated by the project include Particulate Matter (both PM10 and PM2.5), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and precursors of Ozone (oxides of nitrogen [NOx] and Volatile Organic Compounds [VOC], all of which are Nonattainment criteria pollutants in the Air Pollution Control District.

Based on the air quality analysis prepared for the project, air pollution emissions are projected to be below both Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Construction Impacts

Impacts from short-term construction are a result of site grading and construction from the bathroom facilities, managers office, recreational vehicle pads, parking areas, and related improvements. Construction related emissions were modeled using the California Air Resources Board approved CalEEMod computer program as recommended by the District.

The following table shows the construction related equipment and duration followed by air pollution emissions analysis based on the air quality report prepared for the project.

Phase	Days	Equipment
Site Rough Grading Preparation	5	Cat 140H Grader, Cat 615 Scraper, Hamm 84" Roller, and Water Truck.
Site Utilities	10	Komatsu 228 Excavator, Bobcat 337 Mini Excavator, Case Backhoe, and Water Truck.
Site Concrete	15	Backhoe, and concrete crew
Fine Grading Site Work	5	Cat 140H Grader, Cat 615 Scraper, Hamm 84" Roller, and Water Truck.
Site Paving	2	Paver, 2 Cat Rollers, and John Deer Skip Loader.
Landscaping and Site	7	Backhoe, Dump Truck,

Clean Up		and landscaping crew.
	Total Days: 45	

Air pollution emissions generated during all phases of construction are projected to be less than the district's, and States Construction Emission Thresholds. No mitigation is required.

Long-Term Operations Impacts

Impacts from long-term operations are primarily a result from recreational vehicle trips generated by the project and the use of natural gas by said recreational vehicles during the winter months for heating and cooking and the summer months for cooking. Natural gas will also be utilized to an extent in the proposed structures on site. Long-term impacts also include the use of maintenance equipment for weed abatement.

Based on the report generated for the Project using the California Emissions Estimator Model, construction related emissions would not exceed State or Federal emissions standards. In addition, the Projects long term operational impacts would not exceed State or Federal emissions standards. Lastly, the proposed Project would not generate or contribute to what is known as a CO hotspot which typically are associated with idling vehicles at extremely busy intersections which encounter 100,000 vehicle trips per day. There are no intersections within the vicinity of the Project site which exceed the 100,000-vehicle trip per day threshold typically associated with a CO hotspot. Therefore, Project-related vehicular emissions would not create a CO Hot Spot and would not substantially contribute to an existing or project Co Hot Spot. Based on the analysis above and the California Emissions Estimator Model Report generated for the project, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

c) The project is located in The Lassen County Air Pollution Control District which is a Local Air District governing the Lassen County Region. Lassen County is located in Northeastern California and is part of the Northeastern Plateau Air Basin. The Air Quality Management District which has been identified by the California Air Resources Board and Environmental Protection Agency as being in an Attainment area for Ozone, Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10), and Fine Suspended Particulate Matter (PM2.5) The applicable air quality plan is the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. As indicated by the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis, near-term construction activities and long-term operational activities would not

exceed any of the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants (including ozone precursors). As such, impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

d) Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. To the north, the Project is bordered by undeveloped vacant land. Western Nevada Plumbing Supply borders the Project site to the south. Skyline Road East and agricultural lands border the Project to the east. J.W. Wood Plumbing and irrigation company and the United States Postal Service Office are located to the west. None of the aforementioned land uses are considered to be sensitive receptors. As indicated by the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis, the Project would not exceed any of the Air Quality Management Districts adopted State or Federal thresholds of significance during near-term construction or long-term operation. In addition, the Project would not create a CO Hot Spot. Accordingly, Project-related localized emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction or long-term operation, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) During construction, there is a potential for the generation of objectionable odors in the form of diesel exhaust and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings, paint, and parking lot striping in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. However, these emissions will rapidly dissipate and be diluted by the atmosphere downwind of the site. The Project site is located within a half mile of a Wastewater Treatment Facility known as Susanville Sanitation Wastewater Treatment Facility. However, the Project does not propose any uses that technically categorize the project as a sensitive receptor (residential development) because it does not propose development that would constitute permanent residency scenarios. Recreational Vehicle Parks are not considered residential subdivisions, nor are they considered mobile home parks. In this case, the proposed project is solely proposing Recreational Vehicle accommodations and no mobile homes, or any type of permanent residency is proposed. Therefore, impacts to Recreational Vehicle enthusiasts or patrons utilizing the proposed Recreational Vehicle Park would only be subjected to short term objectional odors and therefore impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

*** The full annual California Emissions Estimator Model report is available for review as an attachment to this initial study. ***

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:
Would the project:

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

Answers to Questions A through F:

As discussed in the Land Use and Planning Section of this Initial Study, The Project is not located within an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. In addition, the project has not been identified to be apart of a tree preservation policy or ordinance. However, comments received during the early consultation process from the Department of Fish and Wildlife shall require specific mitigation for nesting birds, irrigation ditches, lighting, trenching, and native vegetation. The Department of

US Fish and Wildlife s comments have been summarized below as Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

Nesting Birds

Habitat suitable for nesting birds and raptors appear to occur within and adjacent to the proposed Project area. During construction, nesting migratory birds and raptors, if present, could be directly or indirectly impacted by land modification or vegetation removal activities. Direct impacts could include mortality, resulting from the operation of heavy equipment in an area containing an active nest with eggs or chicks. Indirect effects could include nest abandonment by adults in response to noise levels above ambient, human encroachment, or a reduction in food availability to young birds due to changes in feeding behavior by adults. Special status species known to nest within 1 mile of the project area include greater sandhill crane (*Antigone canadensis tabida*, state threatened) and bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*, state threatened). To avoid impacts to nesting birds and/or raptors protected under FGC sections 3503 and 3503.5 and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, one of the following should be implemented:

a. Vegetation removal and other ground-disturbance activities associated with construction should occur between September 1 and January 31, when birds are not nesting; or

b. If vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities occur during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify active nests in and adjacent to the Project area, no more than 7 days prior to the commencement of construction activities.

Surveys should begin prior to sunrise and continue until the entire Project area and adjacent suitable nesting habitat has been sufficiently surveyed for nests. The survey should consider acoustic impacts and line-of sight disturbances occurring as a result of the Project to determine a sufficient survey radius to maximize observations of nesting birds. A nesting bird survey report should be prepared and at a minimum, the report should include a description of the area surveyed, date and time of the survey, ambient conditions, bird species observed, a description of any active nests observed, any evidence of breeding behaviors (e.g., courtship, carrying nest materials or food, etc.), and a description of any outstanding conditions that may have impacted the survey results (e.g., weather conditions, excess noise, the presence of predators, etc.).

If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer should be established around the nest by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to comply with FGC sections 3503 and 3503.5 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Compliance measures may include, but are not limited to, exclusion buffers, sound-attenuation measures, seasonal work closures based on the known biology and life history of the species identified in the survey, as well as ongoing monitoring by biologists.

The nesting bird survey report should be submitted to the Department upon completion via email to R1CEQARedding@wildlife.ca.gov. The survey should be conducted no more than one week prior to the initiation of construction. If construction activities are delayed or suspended for more than one week after the pre-construction nesting bird survey, the site should be resurveyed.

Irrigation Ditches

Based on the Departments analysis of aerial mapping, the parcel has been altered and modified for agricultural purposes over the last decade. Jenson Slough runs along the northwestern parcel boundary and flows into Brockman Slough, which runs along the southern parcel boundary, where the sloughs intercept and flow into the Susan River. The Department recommends including a more detailed narrative about the surface connectivity of these irrigation ditches with direct connectivity to the Susan River, to determine if the Project activities are subject to Fish and Game Code section 1602. These irrigation ditches may provide, and be utilized, as suitable habitat for wildlife in the Susanville area, such as the Lahontan Mountain Sucker (*Catostomus lahontan,* state species of special concern*)*. Land modification associated with construction activities may result in direct and/or indirect impacts to ditch habitat and/or the water quality within them.

The Project review package includes the use of bioswales. It appears the proposed Project will increase impervious surfaces therefore, the Department concurs with, and encourages, the implementation of bioswales to allow stormwater to percolate in the ground and prevent potential water quality impacts throughout the irrigation ditches mentioned above.

Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement

Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires any person, state or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify CDFW prior to beginning any activity that may do one or more of the following:

1. substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream or lake; or
2. substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of

any river, stream, or lake; or
3. deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake.

To obtain information about the 1600 Notification process, please access the Department's website at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA.

Lighting
The Department recognizes the adverse effects that artificial lighting has on birds and other nocturnal species. The effects are numerous and include impacts to singing and foraging behavior, reproductive behavior, navigation, and altered migration patterns. To minimize adverse effects of artificial light on wildlife, the Department recommends that lighting fixtures associated with the Project be downward facing, fully shielded, designed and installed to minimize photo-pollution and spillover of light onto adjacent wildlife habitat.

Trenching
If trenching will be included in Project activities, any open trench should be covered securely prior to stopping work each day and/or a wildlife exit ramp should be provided in the trench to prevent wildlife entrapment. If pipes are left out onsite, they should be inspected for wildlife prior to burying, capping, moving, or filling. The Department recommends a mitigation measure be developed and included in the final environmental document or project approval.

Native Vegetation in Landscaping
The Department recommends utilizing vegetation native to the local area in landscaping whenever possible. Benefits of utilizing native vegetation in landscaping include providing resources for native wildlife such as hummingbirds and beneficial pollinators, conserving water, reducing pesticide use, and reducing landscaping maintenance. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) website (https://www.cnps.org) includes a variety of useful information and tools to help determine which native species occur in a particular area, information on care and maintenance of native species, and contacts for purchasing native plants or seeds. The CNPS tool Calscape (https://calscape.org/) generates a list of native plants that grow in an area based on a specific address, and can be used to develop a planting palate for landscaping plans. A search of Calscape returned a wide variety of plants native to the Project site and surrounding landscapes. For more information regarding the importance of using native species in landscaping, please see the CNPS Guidelines for Landscaping to Protect Native Vegetation from Genetic Degradation at:
https://www.cnps.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/04/landscaping.pdf.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, project applicants, contractors, and engineers can collaborate on the best time frames for construction and if needed, provide the proper mitigation pertaining to the Department of US Fish and Wildlife's requirements depending on when the project construction begins. Impacts are reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	■	☐
Tribal Cultural Resources: 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:				
e) 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				
f) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

Responses to questions A-D:
a) As part of the Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment for the project, the Project area was surveyed to identify potentially significant cultural resources. Based on the survey, The API was 100% surveyed in all areas except those with standing water or very deep mud where survey was not possible. The resources recorded in the API (Figure 7) include two isolated artifacts (Appendix A). Overall, the survey area was highly disturbed by seasonal flooding and mowing/ploughing of the parcel. The artifacts are both in heavily disturbed areas.

Two isolated artifacts were recorded within the API, none of which were diagnostic artifacts (Table 3). Both of these artifacts were pre-contact era stone tools: a fragment of groundstone and two small pieces of lithic debitage. SRV-i01 consists of a single piece of fire cracked groundstone from an unknown artifact. From the shape and angle, it was possibly a mano fragment (Figure 8). SRV-i02 consisted of two fragments of fine-grained volcanic rock, likely basalt. One of the fragments was a flake fragment while the other was shatter. Both flakes were found within a meter of each other, and no other artifacts were found (Figure 9).

The isolated resources are not associated with an event or person important in local prehistory or history under criteria 1 and 2. The isolates are not an outstanding or unusual representation of a type, period, or method of construction and do not retain architectural or engineering features under Criterion 3. Given the isolated nature of these resources and the thorough documentation of morphological and functional data at the inventory level, the data potential inherent in the isolates have been exhausted and they do not meet Criterion 4. The isolates do not retain integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. Given their portable and isolated nature and their location in a mowed and ploughed field, their setting and location has likely been altered, as has the integrity of feeling and association. Therefore, the two isolates are not eligible for inclusion in the CRHR and are not considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Therefore, implementation of the Project would not affect historical resources and no mitigation measures will be required.

b) A records search was requested from the California Historical Resource Inventory Center. As part of the Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment for the project, NST Engineering hired PAR Environmental Services, Inc. in 2023 to conduct a cultural resources inventory of a future 70-space RV park in the City of Susanville in Lassen County, California. Although a portion of two prior surveys intersected the project API, no existing sites were within the project area and adjacent sites were not visited during this fieldwork. The survey identified two new isolated artifacts. The two isolates do not meet criteria 1, 2, 3, or 4, of the CRHR and are not historical resources for the purposes of

CEQA. No protective measures are recommended at this time for these isolated flake debitage.

While an archaeological survey is designed to detect resources with surface manifestations, there is always a potential for unidentified subsurface deposits. Because the current project proposes to replace poles using digging only to its previous depth, there is a low potential to encounter *in situ* archaeological deposits. If archaeological deposits or artifacts (e.g.,beads, stone or bone tools, or human remains) are noted, work should stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the find.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.6 (f) requires the lead agency for a project to ensure that provisions are made for accidentally discovered resources. These requirements include preserving the find until an archaeologist can evaluate the discovery, providing for the immediate evaluation of the find by an archaeologist, and contingency planning for the time and funding to mitigate project effects upon such accidental discoveries. Therefore, the project shall be conditioned as such if upon accidental discovery of an archaeological deposit, it shall be required that work be halted within 100 ft. (30 m) of the discovery until a professional archaeologist has evaluated the find.

Based on the results from the survey done for the project and previous surveys in years past, there is a low probability that a subsurface cultural deposit exists within the immediate project boundaries. To ensure that impacts to cultural resources are reduced to less than significant levels the aforementioned condition shall be a condition of approval of the Use Permit, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) According to the Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment prepared for the project, a review of the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System, review of the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010*, the Project site is not located in an area that is considered likely to have paleontological resources present. Fossils of plants, animals, or other organisms of paleontological significance have not been discovered at the Project site, nor has the site been identified as an area where such discoveries are likely. The geologic conditions on the Project site typically do not represent favorable conditions for the discovery of paleontological resources. The Project does propose grading of the site but will not involve any deep excavation work that could un-earth or disturb a significant geologic or paleontological resource. The Project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources or geologic features. In addition, no paleontological resources were discovered during the field survey. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

d) The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. Based on the Records Search obtained from the California Historical Research Inventory Center, there is a low probability of archaeological resources to be present on the site and no further study is recommended.

In the event that human remains are discovered during the Project grading or other ground disturbing activities, The Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of the Public Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq., and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e). California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and deposition has been made by the Coroner.

If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted and the Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately notify the most likely descendants of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendants shall then make recommendations within 48 hours and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in the Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Mandatory compliance with these requirements would ensure that the potential impacts associated with accidental discovery of human remains would be less than significant.

e and f) As part of the Early Consultation process for the Project proposal, SB 18 consultation was performed by the lead agency. All the currently listed/registered tribes were contacted and only one tribe responded and their comments were “no comments at this time.”

As part of the Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment for the project, the Project area was surveyed to identify potentially significant cultural resources. Based on the survey, The API was 100% surveyed in all areas except those with standing water or very deep mud where survey was not possible. The resources recorded in the API (Figure 7) include two isolated artifacts (Appendix A). Overall, the survey area was highly disturbed by seasonal flooding and mowing/ploughing of the parcel. The artifacts are both in heavily disturbed areas.

Two isolated artifacts were recorded within the API, none of which were diagnostic artifacts (Table 3). Both of these artifacts were pre-contact era stone tools: a fragment of groundstone and two small pieces of lithic debitage. SRV-i01 consists of a single piece of fire cracked groundstone from an unknown artifact. From the shape and angle, it was possibly a mano

fragment (Figure 8). SRV-i02 consisted of two fragments of fine-grained volcanic rock, likely basalt. One of the fragments was a flake fragment while the other was shatter. Both flakes were found within a meter of each other, and no other artifacts were found (Figure 9).

The isolated resources are not associated with an event or person important in local prehistory or history under criteria 1 and 2. The isolates are not an outstanding or unusual representation of a type, period, or method of construction and do not retain architectural or engineering features under Criterion 3. Given the isolated nature of these resources and the thorough documentation of morphological and functional data at the inventory level, the data potential inherent in the isolates have been exhausted and they do not meet Criterion 4. The isolates do not retain integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. Given their portable and isolated nature and their location in a mowed and ploughed field, their setting and location has likely been altered, as has the integrity of feeling and association. Therefore, the two isolates are not eligible for inclusion in the CRHR and are not considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Based on SB 18 consultation, and the Cultural Resources Report prepared for the Project, the project will not 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. In addition, the Project is not 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 of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	■
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, 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?	☐	■	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	■	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	■	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	■	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	■	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			

Responses to A-E

According to the California Division of Mines and Geology, Susanville is located in the Honey Lake Fault Zone. The Division's fault-mapping investigations completed during summer 1988 indicate four quaternary faults and three pre-quaternary faults that run through or near the city. Figure 9-3 (p. 182) of the General Plan shows the locations of these faults. According to the Plan, quaternary faults are less than 1.8 million years old and are classified as "potentially active", while pre-quaternary faults are more than 1.8 million years old and are classified as "inactive" unless a detailed study concludes there is a potential for activity.

No faults classified as "active" (displacement within the. last 11,000 years) or "historic" (displacement within the last 200 years) are located within the city's sphere of influence.

Policies and programs included in the General Plan are intended to minimize Susanville's risk f ram seismic activity by ensuring that new development is located away f ram sites with high exposure to hazard and that it is constructed according to high safety standards. Specifically, the first policy that addresses seismic hazards calls for the city to be consistent with the Uniform Building Code in adopting acceptable seismic safety standards for buildings and requiring all (except historic) buildings to be brought up to the same standard. The second policy calls for the city to prohibit placement of critical facilities and high-occupancy structures directly on known fault lines or unstable slopes prone to ground failure during an earthquake.

Action programs for seismic safety direct the city to enforce safety standards for design of new and existing structures, giving priority to identification of existing critical public facilities and high-occupancy structures that present unacceptable levels of risk; to record information on potential geologic hazards with parcel or subdivision maps; and to increase public awareness or seismic hazards and educate the community· on procedures that can help to minimize injury and property loss before, during and after an earthquake.

i) Alquist-Priolo Zone: Based on the “Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007”, published by the State of California Conservation Department and the geologic report prepared for the project, the site is not located within an identified Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) Seismic Ground Shaking: Seismic ground shaking is influenced by the proximity of the site to an earthquake fault, the intensity of the seismic event, and the underlying soil composition. The geologic report prepared for the project indicates that the estimated peak horizontal ground acceleration at the site location has a 2 in 100 probability of exceedance in 50 years which is considered a lower hazard level. Given that the site is not located in an earthquake fault zone and the general soil composition in the area, the risk from ground shaking is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction: According to the geologic report prepared for the project, the soil conditions are not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction. Impacts from liquefaction are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

iv) Landslides: According to the geologic report prepared for the project and the California Geological Survey Seismic Hazard Zonation Program, the site is not located within a designated area where previous occurrence of landslide movement, or local topographical, geological, geotechnical and subsurface water conditions indicate a potential for landslides. Impacts from landslides are less than significant.

In addition, the site is almost flat with a slope of less than 2% and is not in the vicinity of slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. No mitigation measures are required.

Current General Plan Policies are directed toward controlling soil erosion and slope instability through regulation of development and other activities that could disturb the surface of the land. They call for the identification of existing erosion problems on public and private lands, and preparation and implementation of an erosion control program to remedy those problems; provision by developers of adequate drainage and erosion control during construction; and prohibition of off-road motor vehicles in areas where destruction of topsoil or valuable habitat could result. Further, they direct the city to require, prior to development, soil and geologic investigations in areas prone to slope instability, including geologic data for all development in hillside areas with slopes greater than 30 percent; to require soils analysis and erosion mitigation prior to issuing use permits for all development proposed on sites prone to erosion; to prohibit development - including any land alteration, grading for roads and structural development - in areas designated as having development constraints because of slope instability or other geologic concerns, until mitigating measures are taken to limit potential damage to acceptable levels of risk; and to require mitigation to avoid slope instability following development.
The action programs for soils and slopes direct the city to refer all applications for development in Susanville, where grading is necessary or the potential for soil erosion exists, to the Soil Conservation Service for comment; to develop a "grading and erosion control ordinance, and institute fines for violating that ordinance; to develop a Hazards Map that would show slopes greater than 30 percent, erosive soils, floodways and flood plains; to create development standards for stabilizing slopes following development (including replanting and use of drought-resistive plants in certain areas); to create development standards that allow only less intensive development (minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet) in high hazard areas; and to enforce Chapter 70 of the Uniform Building Code to prevent erosion and sedimentation.

b) The site is currently vacant with vegetation consisting primarily of ruderal and native vegetation. There are no trees located on the parcel. Development of the site will remove a portion of the native vegetation but will also keep some of the native vegetation intact where surfaces will not be disturbed and the proximity of the proposed bio-swales and storm water run off detention basins. In the short term, construction activities associated with the proposed buildings and recreational

vehicle pads may result in wind and water driven soil erosion and loss of top soil due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed. The applicant will be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board which in this case is Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (District 6 – South Lake Tahoe Office). And submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to be administered throughout project construction. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will incorporate Best Management Practices to ensure that potential water quality impacts during construction from soil erosion would be reduced to less than significant levels.

In the long term, previously undisturbed soil will be replaced with approximately two structures totaling 5,150 square feet, 228,320 square feet of paved surface, and new landscaping will encompass approximately 194,570 square feet which is roughly 45.5% of the project site. These improvements and aforementioned requirements and or conditions will not contribute to the conditions that result in on-site soil erosion. Based on the site plan delineating storm water run off and bio swale detention, off-site runoff will not contribute to factors that will impact soil erosion and loss of topsoil to other properties. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

The following analysis is based on the geologic report prepared for the project and the hazard maps contained in the City's adopted Hazard Mitigation Plan which has been adopted into the Safety Element of the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010*.

c) Liquefaction or Collapse: The soil conditions at the site are not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction. Impacts from liquefaction are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Landslide: The site is not located within a designated area where previous occurrence of landslide movement, or local topographic, geographic, geotechnical and subsurface water conditions indicate potential for landslides. In addition, the project site is virtually flat with 2% slopes or less and is not in the vicinity of slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. Impacts from landslides are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Lateral Spreading: As discussed in the response to landslides, the site is not located in an identified landslide hazard area, is virtually flat (2% slopes or less), and is not in the vicinity of slopes that would be susceptible to landslides. Impacts from lateral spreading are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Subsidence: The soil conditions at the site (Blickenstaff sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes consist of 97.6% of the project site) and (Humboldt silty clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded consists of 2.4% of the project site) are not considered to be susceptible to subsidence when slopes do not exceed 2%. Impacts from subsidence are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

d) The Preliminary Soil Investigation Report prepared for the project indicated that soils encountered at the site were generally dense, alternating layers of sandy loam, and gravelly sandy loam. The report indicated that expansive soils are not encountered so

there is no evidence that expansive soils exist on the property. Therefore, no known anticipated impacts will occur as a result of the implementation of the project. No mitigation measures are required.

e) No septic system or leach field is being proposed with the project. The project is located within the vicinity of the City of Susanville Sanitary District and will utilize said waste disposal system to dispose of a daily projected sewage load of approximately 7,515 gallons per day. These figures are formulated based on a fully built out and or rented Recreational Vehicle Park (70 Spaces Occupied). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant as there are no underground septic or alternate waste disposal systems proposed that would negatively impact the existing soils. No mitigation measures are required.

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

Responses to A and B:

a) The Project consists of 70 Recreational Vehicles spaces, a bathroom and management office facility. The City of Susanville has not adopted a numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions. Based on the California Emissions Estimator Model Report prepared for the project, the construction phase for the project would emit 35 metric tons of CO2 and the operational phase for the Project would emit 65 metric tons of CO2 per year. Based on the City of Susanville's Air District Attainment status and not having a numerical threshold established for greenhouse gas emissions, construction and operational based emissions would not have a significant impact and no mitigation measures are required.

b) The Project consists of 70 Recreational Vehicles spaces, a bathroom and management office facility. For the purposes of this analysis, the Project was evaluated against the following applicable plans, policies, and regulations:

1) *AB-32 Climate Change Scoping Plan.*
2) *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010.*
3) *Lassen Air Pollution Control District Website.*
4) *California Emissions Estimator Model Report* which was prepared by the City of Susanville City Planner on 5/23/23.

AB-32 Climate Change Scoping Plan:

The Climate Change Scoping Plan identifies emission reduction measures to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals set forth as part of the Plan. Thus, the Projects that are consistent with or don't interfere with the implementation of the measures contained in the Plan are consistent with Plan's mandate to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The Project is proposing the following measures consistent with the Plan:

- All installed appliances will comply with California Code of Regulations Title 20 (Appliance Energy Efficient Standards).
- The Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the California Building Code Title 24 requirements.
- While not codified in the City Municipal Code, the applicant intends to use Water Efficient Landscaping Requirements.

City General Plan 1990-2010

The City General Plan encourages A variety of energy conservation opportunities are available in the City of Susanville for housing construction and rehabilitation. These can be categorized as: green rating systems; new construction programs; rehabilitation programs; and local programs and partnerships. The resources available in each of these categories are described below. For new construction, additions and some remodeling jobs, Title 24 of the California Administrative Code sets forth mandatory energy standards for new development and requires the adoption of an "energy budget." The housing industry must meet these standards and the City is responsible for enforcing the energy conservation regulations through the building permit process. In addition, the Green Rating System can be used results in construction which exceeds Title 24 requirements.

Additionally, the local electric utility company Lassen Municipal Utility District (LMUD) has some energy efficiency programs. LMUD is a publicly-owned utility created by voters in 1986. It provides electrical service to approximately 10,500 customers in Lassen County. The service area extends across south central Lassen County, including the City of Susanville, Eagle Lake and Westwood. LMUD has implemented Public Benefit Programs, which mainly consist of energy crisis assistance for low income ratepayers and community projects such as grants for upgrading lighting, insulation, windows and other conservation measures.

The following are programs offered:

- Energy Conservation Assistance Program: ECAP - provides rate assistance, with an emphasis on energy conservation, to low-income LMUD customers.
- Residential Energy Efficiency Rebates - provides rebates to LMUD customers on a variety of EnergyStar Appliances, energy efficient Marathon electric water heaters and energy efficient air source and ground source heat pumps.
- SmartBuilt Home Program - provides incentives to home owners or contractors to build energy efficient homes or to retro-fit existing homes.

The Lassen Municipal Utility District also plans to offer commercial lighting rebates, energy audits for small business customers and the SmartBuilt Manufactured Home Program.

The City of Susanville does not currently impose any stricter energy conservation standards than required by Title 24. At present, there are no other applicable local or regional plans, policies, or regulation (e.g. Climate Action Plan) pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions that apply to the Project.

Based on the California Emissions Estimator Model report prepared for the Project and the above-described Performance Standards to ensure compliance with AB 32, The City General Plan, and Title 24, the Project will not exceed any local, state, or federal greenhouse gas emission thresholds. Therefore, impacts are less than significant and no further mitigation is required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	■
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	■	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	■
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	■	☐

Responses to A-H:

a) The project proposal involves a 70 space Recreational Vehicle Park which will be supported by Susanville Sanitary District to properly transport and treat the solid waste produced from the park users. The project proposal does not meet any of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) definitions of being a hazardous waste generator nor does the project proposal involve any routine transport, use, or disposal of EPA defined hazardous waste generators or materials. Therefore, the project does not require consultation by the Certified Uniform Program Agency and no Hazardous Materials Business Plan is needed. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) The project consists of a 70 unit recreational vehicle park. Upon occupancy of the park project, site maintenance and landscaping will require ordinary types of hazardous materials such as pesticides and herbicides, but none of these will be stored on site in large quantities. During construction there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient quantity to pose a hazard to people and the environment. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 below is recommended to reduce impacts to less than significant:

HAZ-1: All spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities will be remediated in compliance with acceptable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminated release. The

contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure will be incorporated into the project's storm water retention plan.

In addition, the project's soil report does not contain serpentines or ultramafic rocks and therefore, the potential for release of naturally occurring asbestos during construction activities is considered low to non-existent.

After construction and occupancy of the park there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient quantity to pose a hazard to people and the environment. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 below is recommended to reduce impacts to less than significant:

HAZ-2: All spills or leakage of petroleum products after construction activities will be remediated in compliance with acceptable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminated release. The contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure will be incorporated into the project's storm water retention plan.

c) The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and therefore no further discussion is required. No mitigation measures are required.

d) Research of the California Environmental Protection Agency's website determined that the project site is not located on any of the lists which constitute the Cortese List. Furthermore, the project site did not appear in the EnviroStor database, Water Board GeoTracker database, list of solid waste disposal sites per the Water Control Board, list of active cease and desist orders clean up and abatement orders from the Water Board, nor did the project site appear on the Department of Toxic Substances Control hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Health and Safety Code 25187.5. Therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) The project site is located approximately 3.14 miles northwest of the Susanville Municipal Airport. According to the City of Susanville Airport Land Use Plan, March 1987, the site is not located within the area of influence for the airport. Therefore, there will be no safety hazard for people residing or working within the area of influence for the Plan. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

f) A review of City and County records and a review of the surrounding area within a 2-mile radius show that there are no personal use airports or private airstrips operating in the projects vicinity. The project proposal is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip

and therefore there are no impacts. No mitigation is required.

g) Access to the project site is proposed from Bella Way and Skyline Road both of which are fully developed two lane roadways. Pursuant to the Lassen County Hazard Mitigation Plan, which was adopted in 2018, the project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route or is located adjacent to an existing emergency route. During construction Bella Way and Skyline Road will remain open. During long term operation activities, adequate access for emergency vehicles via Bellay Way and Skyline Road will be available. Furthermore, the project will not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

h) The project site is surrounded by a mix of urban uses and agriculture to the east of Skyline road. According to the City of Susanville Fire hazard Overlay District Map, the project site is not located in a Fire Hazard District. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention, Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map, the project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Therefore, the project will not be exposed to risks from wildfires, impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures will be required.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	■
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	■
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	■	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	■
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	■
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	■	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	■

Responses to questions A-J:

a) **Construction Impacts:** Construction of the Project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and the installation of landscaping, which would result in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City, the Project would be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit is required for all Projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area.

In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board' Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and the Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction-related activities, including grading. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would specify the Best Management Practices that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property.

The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan includes the following Best Management Practices: Bioswales will be located at the northern and southern portions of the Project site to prevent storm water run-off from leaving the Project site. Commercially available catch basin inserts shall be installed where applicable on Bella Way and Skyline Road to protect from any additional sediment run off.

Operational Impacts:

Storm water pollutants commonly associated with the land uses proposed by the Project (i.e., residential, open space, and park) include sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds, bacteria and viruses, o.il and grease, pesticides, and metals. Pursuant to the requirements of the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, a Water Quality Management Plan is required for managing the quality of storm water or urban runoff that flows from a developed site after construction is completed and the facilities or structures are occupied and/or operational. The Water Quality Management Plan describes the Best Management Practices that will be implemented and maintained throughout the life of a project to prevent and minimize water pollution that can be caused by storm water or urban runoff.

To meet NPDES requirements, the proposed storm drain system is designed to route first flush runoff (85th percentile) to one of six depressed grassy sediment basins, two bioswales, and a large sediment basin which is adjacent to Skyline Road. These detention practices have been sized to treat the entire Project's first flush volumes and contains filtration mechanisms designed to capture the range of pollutants anticipated to be present in the developed site runoff.

Furthermore, the Project would be required to implement its Water Quality Management Plan, pursuant to the requirements of the City's NPDES permit The Project's Water Quality Management Plan identifies structural controls (including infiltration basins} and operational controls (including educational materials for property owners, "good housekeeping" practices such as litter control and regular sweeping of driveways and parking areas, maintaining and marking inlets, etc.) to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. Mandatory compliance with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and the Water Quality Management Plan would ensure that the Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during both construction and long-term operation. Therefore, water quality impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) The Project would be served with potable water by the Community Services District. Domestic water supplies from this service provider (City of Susanville) are reliant on groundwater from the Cady Springs Groundwater Basin as a primary source. The Community Services District has adequate water supplies to serve the project.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site to approximately 53.3% of the site area or

approximately 228,320 square feet, which would reduce the amount of direct infiltration through runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the area of the Cady Springs Basin that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

Therefore, the Project's demand for domestic water service would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. Impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures will be required.

c) There are no stream courses or other established natural surface drainages within the Project site. However, a man-made drainage/irrigation canal called Jensen Slough borders the northern and western boundaries of the subject parcel. Development of the Project will create approximately 228,320 square feet of impervious surface and increase the amount of surface runoff. Any drainage that could impact the subject parcel from the north or west is buffered by the Jensen Slough. Given the gradual slope of the parcel 2% or less, potential drainage impacts from adjoining parcels to the south is limited and the southernly adjoining parcel is already developed with current on-site drainage systems to prevent off-site flows to the subject parcel. Any drainage impacts from a parcel adjoining to the east of the Project are buffed by Skyline Road.

The on-site flows or impervious surface runoff will be intercepted by one of six of the proposed depressed grassy basins, one of two bio-swales, or by the sediment basin, as depicted by the project applicant's drainage site plan dated September 27, 2022. In addition, the drainage system is designed to control the flow rate of on-site runoff so as not to exceed the pre-development condition so that the drainage pattern of the area will not be altered. In addition, the on-site storm drain system is required to comply with the mandatory requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System to control erosion and siltation. Therefore, either on-site or off-site erosion and siltation will not be substantial. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) There are no natural streams or rivers on-site. However, the Jensen Slough, which is an irrigation ditch that eventually reconnects to the Susan River, is a natural river which is off-site. The Jensen Slough rejoins the Susan River approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the Project site. A net increase in runoff flow rates and volumes is anticipated due to the increase in impervious surfaces as a result of

developing the site with 70 Recreational Vehicle asphalt or concrete pads and related improvements. The on-site storm drain facilities are designed to mitigate the 228,320 square feet of proposed impervious surfaces to infiltrate 24-hour events and 10-year storm events. The depressed grassy basins (6), bioswales (2), and sediment basin are all designed to accommodate both small and large storm events. As such, alterations to the existing drainage pattern of the Project site and area will not substantially contribute to flooding on-site or off-site. Project-related impacts are considered less than significant and mitigation measures are not required.

e) As noted in the preceding response to item 4.9(d), all of the developed site runoff would be discharged on-site into depressed grassy basins (6), bioswales (2), and sediment basin are all designed to accommodate both small and large storm events. The added runoff from the site would be largely contained within the Projects proposed drainage and infiltration plan and the projects impact would be less than significant.

Additionally, with strict adherence to the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Water Quality Management Plan as discussed above under question 4.9(a), the Project would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

f) There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in the responses to Issues 4.9(a), 4.9(c), and 4.9(e). Therefore, the Project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality and impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures required.

g) According to the National Flood Insurance Program, the Project site is partially located in Map Index Panel No. 060351942D, Map Revised September 3, 2010, and partially located in Map Index Panel No. 06035C1975D, Map Revised September 3, 2010, and both are not identified as being within a 100-year flood hazard area. In addition, the Project site is not within a flood hazard area shown on the City's Flood Hazard Area Map which is basically derived from FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer. Additionally, the Project consists of 70 Recreational Vehicle spaces with no permanent residential components. The Project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone and therefore there are no impacts and no mitigation measures required.

h) The project involves the construction of a 900 square foot restroom facility and a 4,250 square foot office and services building. As mentioned in the previous question, the Project site has not been identified as being within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore,

neither of the proposed buildings would impede any potential flood waters because the Project site is partially located in Map Index Panel No. 060351942D, Map Revised September 3, 2010, and partially located in Map Index Panel No. 06035C1975D, Map Revised September 3, 2010, and both are not identified as being within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

i) The Project site is not located within a "Flood Hazard" area or a "Dam Inundation" area nor is it in a flood hazard area as shown on National Insurance Program Maps. Approximately 1 mile northwest of the Project site is Barry Reservoir. Barry Reservoir has an earthen dam and spillway. If the Reservoir fills to capacity, the water utilizes the spill way and alternate drainage that currently bypasses the Project site entirely. If the earthen dam fails, existing geography, topography, and drainage would substantially if not entirely divert and or absorb any inundation from such a rare flooding event. Therefore, the Project would not be at significant risk of flooding, including flooding as a result from the failure of a levee or dam. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

j) The Pacific Ocean is located approximately 190 miles west of the Project site; consequently, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Project. In addition, there are no steep hillsides within a mile radius of the Project site that are subject to mudflows. The nearest large body of water is located approximately a mile northwest of the project, which is the Barry Reservoir. Due to the distance and small size of the reservoir's depth and surface area, the Project site would not be subject to a seiche and would have no impacts on the Project. No mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	■	☐
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	■	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			

Answers to Questions A-C:

a) The Project is the development of a 70-space recreational vehicle park. The Project is located in the southeastern area of the City of Susanville. The project site is bordered by Skyline Road to the east and Johnstonville Road to the south. This area is characterized by a mixture of light to heavy industrial and commercial uses with some areas still being utilized for small farming operations. There is a pedestrian and bike path that also borders the Project site concurrent with Skyline Road to the east. The Project will connect to existing roadways and pedestrian paths and will not create any physical barriers that would divide the neighborhood. No impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

b) The General Plan Land Use Designation for the project is currently assigned Light Industry/Business Park. Respectively, the Project site is currently zoned C-M (Commercial/Light Industrial Zoning District). Recreational vehicle parks are not an allowed use in said district, a Rezone of the Project site to C-2 (General Commercial/Shopping Center District) is required with the proposal. Recreational vehicle parks are an allowed use by first securing a Use Permit in the C-2 district. Subsequently, a General Plan Amendment from Light Industry/Business Park to General Commercial is also required. In addition, in the year 2000, the City of Susanville elected to adopt a local ordinance which allows SOPAs or

Special Occupancy Parks in the C-2 zoning district. Otherwise, a Rezone and General Pan Amendment to Mobile Home Park would be required. By adopting said ordinance in the year 2000, the City of Susanville remains in compliance with the Housing and Community Development Departments requirements for Special Occupancy Parks that do not include mobile homes, and or exclusive recreational vehicle parks. Requiring this specific process allows the City of Susanville to remain in compliance with the City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010, and the Housing and Community Development Departments permit processing requirements with both the state and the local jurisdictional authority.

Furthermore, the Project would not conflict with any goal, policy, or ordinance pertaining to the City of Susanville's General Plan or Zoning Ordinances. As discussed throughout this initial study checklist, in all instances where significant impacts have been identified, mitigation is provided to reduce each impact to a less than significant level. Lastly, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects including, without limitation, the City General Plan, County Regional Transportation Plan, or the Lassen County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) The Project is not located within an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. However, comments received during the early consultation process from the Department of Fish and Wildlife shall require specific mitigation for nesting birds, irrigation ditches, lighting, trenching, and native vegetation. The Department of US Fish and Wildlife s comments have been summarized below as Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

Nesting Birds

Habitat suitable for nesting birds and raptors appear to occur within and adjacent to the proposed Project area. During construction, nesting migratory birds and raptors, if present, could be directly or indirectly impacted by land modification or vegetation removal activities. Direct impacts could include mortality, resulting from the operation of heavy equipment in an area

containing an active nest with eggs or chicks. Indirect effects could include nest abandonment by adults in response to noise levels above ambient, human encroachment, or a reduction in food availability to young birds due to changes in feeding behavior by adults. Special status species known to nest within 1 mile of the project area include greater sandhill crane (*Antigone canadensis tabida*, state threatened) and bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*, state threatened). To avoid impacts to nesting birds and/or raptors protected under FGC sections 3503 and 3503.5 and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, one of the following should be implemented:

a. Vegetation removal and other ground-disturbance activities associated with construction should occur between September 1 and January 31, when birds are not nesting; or

b. If vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities occur during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify active nests in and adjacent to the Project area, no more than 7 days prior to the commencement of construction activities.

Surveys should begin prior to sunrise and continue until the entire Project area and adjacent suitable nesting habitat has been sufficiently surveyed for nests. The survey should consider acoustic impacts and line-of sight disturbances occurring as a result of the Project to determine a sufficient survey radius to maximize observations of nesting birds. A nesting bird survey report should be prepared and at a minimum, the report should include a description of the area surveyed, date and time of the survey, ambient conditions, bird species observed, a description of any active nests observed, any evidence of breeding behaviors (e.g., courtship, carrying nest materials or food, etc.), and a description of any outstanding conditions that may have impacted the survey results (e.g., weather conditions, excess noise, the presence of predators, etc.).

If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer should be established around the nest by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to comply with FGC sections 3503 and 3503.5 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Compliance measures may include, but are not limited to, exclusion buffers, sound-attenuation measures, seasonal work closures based on the known biology and life history of the species identified in the survey, as well as ongoing monitoring by biologists.

The nesting bird survey report should be submitted to the Department upon

completion via email to R1CEQARedding@wildlife.ca.gov. The survey should be conducted no more than one week prior to the initiation of construction. If construction activities are delayed or suspended for more than one week after the pre-construction nesting bird survey, the site should be resurveyed.

Irrigation Ditches

Based on the Departments analysis of aerial mapping, the parcel has been altered and modified for agricultural purposes over the last decade. Jenson Slough runs along the northwestern parcel boundary and flows into Brockman Slough, which runs along the southern parcel boundary, where the sloughs intercept and flow into the Susan River. The Department recommends including a more detailed narrative about the surface connectivity of these irrigation ditches with direct connectivity to the Susan River, to determine if the Project activities are subject to Fish and Game Code section 1602. These irrigation ditches may provide, and be utilized, as suitable habitat for wildlife in the Susanville area, such as the Lahontan Mountain Sucker (*Catostomus lahontan,* state species of special concern). Land modification associated with construction activities may result in direct and/or indirect impacts to ditch habitat and/or the water quality within them.

The Project review package includes the use of bioswales. It appears the proposed Project will increase impervious surfaces therefore, the Department concurs with, and encourages, the implementation of bioswales to allow stormwater to percolate in the ground and prevent potential water quality impacts throughout the irrigation ditches mentioned above.

Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement

Fish and Game Code section 1602 requires any person, state or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify CDFW prior to beginning any activity that may do one or more of the following:

1. substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream or lake; or
2. substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or
3. deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake.

To obtain information about the 1600 Notification process, please access the Department's website at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA.

Lighting

The Department recognizes the adverse effects that artificial lighting has on birds and other nocturnal species. The effects are numerous and include impacts to singing and foraging behavior, reproductive behavior, navigation,

and altered migration patterns. To minimize adverse effects of artificial light on wildlife, the Department recommends that lighting fixtures associated with the Project be downward facing, fully shielded, designed and installed to minimize photo-pollution and spillover of light onto adjacent wildlife habitat.

Trenching

If trenching will be included in Project activities, any open trench should be covered securely prior to stopping work each day and/or a wildlife exit ramp should be provided in the trench to prevent wildlife entrapment. If pipes are left out onsite, they should be inspected for wildlife prior to burying, capping, moving, or filling. The Department recommends a mitigation measure be developed and included in the final environmental document or project approval.

Native Vegetation in Landscaping

The Department recommends utilizing vegetation native to the local area in landscaping whenever possible. Benefits of utilizing native vegetation in landscaping include providing resources for native wildlife such as hummingbirds and beneficial pollinators, conserving water, reducing pesticide use, and reducing landscaping maintenance. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) website (https://www.cnps.org) includes a variety of useful information and tools to help determine which native species occur in a particular area, information on care and maintenance of native species, and contacts for purchasing native plants or seeds. The CNPS tool Calscape (https://calscape.org/) generates a list of native plants that grow in an area based on a specific address, and can be used to develop a planting palate for landscaping plans. A search of Calscape returned a wide variety of plants native to the Project site and surrounding landscapes. For more information regarding the importance of using native species in landscaping, please see the CNPS Guidelines for Landscaping to Protect Native Vegetation from Genetic Degradation at:
https://www.cnps.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/04/landscaping.pdf.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, project applicants, contractors, and engineers can collaborate on the best time frames for construction and if needed, provide the proper mitigation pertaining to the Department of US Fish and Wildlife's requirements depending on when the project construction begins. Impacts are reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	☐	☐	☐	☐
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

Answers to Questions A and B:

a) According to maps prepared by the California Geological Survey's Aggregate Availability Map, the Project is located within Mineral Resource Zone-1 (Areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence). In addition, according to the California Geological Survey Aggregate Availability Map, the Project site is not within the vicinity of a site being used for aggregate production. The nearest aggregate production site is located in Lassen County's jurisdiction. The Gold Run Pit is approximately 3.5 miles southwest of the Project site and is owned and operated by Lassen County for removal of decomposed granite aggregate. IN addition, there are approximately six more mines located 5 miles east or further from the Project site. There are no other known mining sites for any type of mineral production in the vicinity of the Project site based on information and maps from the California Geological Survey. Therefore, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) As noted in the response to Question 4.10(a), the Project is located within Mineral Resource Zone-1 (Areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence). In addition, according to the California Geological Survey Aggregate Availability Map, the Project site is not within the vicinity of a site being used for aggregate production. The nearest aggregate production site

is located in Lassen County's jurisdiction. The Gold Run Pit is approximately 3.5 miles southwest of the Project site and is owned and operated by Lassen County for removal of decomposed granite aggregate. Therefore, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of availability of a local mineral resource recovery site. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	■
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	■
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	■	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	■	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	■

Responses to Questions A-F:

Impact analysis for Short-Term Construction Noise

a) The City's noise ordinance includes a provision that exempts construction activities from any maximum noise level standard, provided that construction activities occur between the hours of 7 AM and 9 PM and that noise exceeding thresholds that would exceed a single event lasting for more than two hours beyond thresholds. The Project is required to follow the City's noise ordinance so implementation of the Project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards adopted by the City.

Regardless of the Project's consistency with the City's noise ordinance as described above, construction activities on the project site, especially those involving heavy equipment, would initially create intermittent, short-term noise increases in the vicinity of the Project site, representing a temporary effect on ambient noise levels during the estimated construction period. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, graders, bulldozers, concrete mixers, and portable generators, can reach high levels of noise. The projected noise levels used for analysis assume the worst-case noise environments with all construction equipment operating simultaneously, at full power, at the same location on the Project site. In reality, noise levels fluctuate day to day and throughout the day, as it is highly unlikely that all pieces of construction equipment would simultaneously operate at the same time and location.

The initial phase of construction would involve mass grading of the site, along with site development activities. This includes the construction of 70 recreational vehicle parking pads, internal roadways, which both involve fine grading, trenching, and paving activities. Following site preparation activities, the project will include the construction of two buildings. A 900 square foot bathroom facility, and a 4,250 square foot commercial office building with bathrooms and laundry facilities. Mass grading of the site is expected to produce the highest construction noise levels because of the use of graders, dozers, excavators, scrapers, and trucks. Unmitigated noise levels could reach a maximum of up to 85.0 dBA at fifty (50) feet from the noise source. Although construction noise is exempt from the requirements of the City's noise ordinance, the following Mitigation Measure is required to reduce the construction related impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction Noise. A site analysis confirms that there will be occupied residences within one half (1/2) mile of the proposed Project at the time of construction. Prior to grading and building permit issuance, the City shall verify that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City staff or its designee for compliance. These notes shall also be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

A) Whenever a construction site is within one half (1/2) mile of an occupied residence or residences, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 9 PM to 7 AM at any time.
B) All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacture's standards.
C) The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest to the project site during all project construction.
D) No music or electronically reinforced speech from construction workers shall be audible at noise sensitive properties.

Impact Analysis for Noise Generated by the Project (Answer to Question "a" continued)

The primary source of noise generated by the Project will be from vehicle and recreational vehicle traffic generated by the temporary and or intermittent residency of the recreational vehicle park to the nearby residential uses. The Project would generate an estimated additional 11 trips per day, totaling 770 trips per year, and approximately 5 truck trips per day totaling 60 annual truck trips. Project noise levels during operation are projected to be that of or below CNEL standards found within a residential neighborhood. It is very unlikely that the project exceeds the states generally accepted exterior noise standards to sensitive receptors of 65 dBA CNEL. In addition, the Project is subject to the City's noise ordinance which would regulate the project noise levels during construction. Based on the above analysis, impacts associated with off-site transportation-related noise generated by the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required for noise generated by the project during operation.

Impact Analysis for Noise Exposure to the Project (Answer to Question "a" continued)

Exterior Noise Exposure

The background ambient noise levels in the Project study area consists of primarily transportation related noise associated with Skyline Road and Johnstonville Road. The project is not considered a sensitive receptor because although a recreational vehicle park is similar to a residential use, it is not considered a permanent type of residential development. Impacts to the Project would be less significant due to the fact that the City of Susanville has yet to adopt Community Noise Level Equivalence standards in addition to the *City of Susanville General Plan 1990-2010.* Current noise levels which were surveyed by the City Planner on April 24th and April 26th, 2023 from the Skyline Road right of way, show that average noise levels from traffic reach 78.9 dBA at the property line of the subject Project. This average is based on cumulative average noise levels surveyed ranging from car, truck, and freight traffic noise.

Although the Project exterior noise exposure is roughly 13.92 decibels above the acceptable exterior noise level for a residential subdivision (65 CNEL dBA) the projects proposed zoning and adjacent zoning districts are not Residential Zoning and therefore do not enjoy the same noise accommodations and or standards found in said districts. Based on the noise survey and anylysis above, the Project would not require any noise mitigation measures for exterior noise and impacts are considered to be less than significant. However, it is recommended that the applicant consider a noise barrier wall for the eastern property line bordered by Skyline road so that patrons and or residents using the recreational vehicle park can enjoy what the State of California considers as acceptable interior and exterior noise standards to sensitive receptors. In addition, due to the Parcel location, configuration, and proposed locations for Recreational Vehicle pads, it is anticipated that only 10 out of the 70 proposed Recreational Vehicle spaces would be potentially impacted by the average noise levels from traffic on Skyline Road.

Interior Noise Exposure:

With an average exterior noise level of 78.92 dBA, it is logical to assume that interior noise levels for Recreational Vehicle Residents would be at 65 dBA or below at any given time during the Projects operation. In addition as mentioned above and due to the lack of established local thresholds for community noise, the Project would have less than significant impacts on interior noise levels and no mitigation measures are required.

The Noise Study is reflected below:

Noise Impact Study for the Thompson Family Trust 70 Space RV Park

The following report was prepared and administered by the City Planner to assess the potential impacts of traffic noise from Skyline Road on the proposed project. A total of (4) noise surveys were conducted by the City Planner at multiple locations that adjoin the proposed project site. The City Planner used a General DSM402SD Sound Level Meter Device to conduct all surveys.
Please review the Survey Location Map provided for reference when consulting the data tables

Survey Location #1 April 24, 2023. 7:20 AM	Weather Conditions: Sunny- 42 Degrees	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA Average
Car		70.5	72.5	75.2	75	70.2	72.68 dBA
Light Truck		75.1	72.8	71.8	76.5	82	75.64 dBA
Freight		83	85	98	92	96	90.8 dBA

Survey Location #2 April 24, 2023. 8:04 AM	Weather Conditions: Sunny- 44 Degrees	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA Average
Car		70	71	70.3	74.4	73.1	71.76 dBA
Light Truck		76.1	75.2	71.6	80	78.4	76.26 dBA
Freight		82	89	93	85	87	87.2 dBA

Survey Location #1 April 26, 2023. 2:30 PM	Weather Conditions: Sunny- 44 Degrees	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA Average
Car		72	74	71	68	73	71.6 dBA
Light Truck		75	73.6	75.4	76	75	75 dBA
Freight		79.6	96	89.1	93.6	95.7	90.8 dBA

Survey Location #2 April 26, 2023. 3:30 PM	Weather Conditions: Sunny- 44 Degrees	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA	dBA Average
Car		72.4	73.3	72	73.5	75	73.25 dBA
Light Truck		76	75	76	74	77	75.6 dBA
Freight		80	83.2	95.1	80.3	94.4	86.6 dBA

(b)

Under existing conditions there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise that affect the Project site such as a railroad. However, Skyline Road East is a freight traffic connector to U.S. State Highway 139 but is not designated as a truck route. The majority of truck route traffic is relieved by U.S. Highway, 395, 36, and 44 which does not come within the proximity of the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not expose future on-site recreational vehicle residents to substantial or long-term ground-borne vibration or noise. In addition, given the Project is for a recreational vehicle park, structural concerns that would apply to a site built residential subdivision wouldn't apply or be of concern in this particular case.

The Project would not generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise, except, potentially during the construction phase from the use of heavy construction equipment. According to the Department of Transportation's Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual, ground-borne vibration from heavy construction equipment does not create vibration amplitudes that could cause structural damage, when measured at a distance of 10 feet. The nearest off-site structures are located 70 feet and 300 feet from the nearest point of construction activities and would not be exposed to substantial ground-borne vibration due to the operation of heavy construction equipment on the Project site.

Furthermore, the project is not expected to employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction

activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne vibrations and noises during construction. As such, impacts from ground-borne vibration and noise during near-term construction would be less than significant.

There are no conditions associated with the long-term operation of the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of on-site or off-site residents or recreational park patrons to excessive ground-borne vibrations or noise. The proposed Project would develop the parcel into a 70 space recreational vehicle park that would not include nor require equipment, facilities, or activities that would generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise.

Based on the above analysis, operation of the Project would not expose on-site or off-site sensitive receptors to substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. Impacts are evaluated as less than significant and no mitigation is required.

(c)
The project is a 70 space recreational vehicle park located on a 10 acre parcel. The site is located near the intersection of Skyline Road and Johnstonville Road. Adjacent to the project site are numerous commercial and industrial uses such as Western Nevada Plumbing Supply, J.W. Wood, the Lassen Rural Transit Agency Bus Yard, and a U.S. Post Office. Although the ambient noise levels will increase, the Noise Study prepared for the Project determined that the ambient noise levels will not substantially increase above the existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project because the Project is located to two major arterial roadways, and multiple commercial and industrial developments adjacent to the project site have already elevated the ambient noise levels in the area. As such, ambient noise impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required.

(d)
As discussed above under Question 4.11(a), the only potential for the Project to create substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels is during the initial phase of construction. The analysis presented under Question 4.11(a) concluded that although construction noise is exempt from the City's Noise Ordinance, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 above is required to reduce construction related noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

(e)
The project site is located approximately 3.14 miles northwest of the Susanville Municipal Airport. According to the City of Susanville Airport Land Use Plan, March 1987, the site is not located within the area of influence for the airport. Therefore, there will be no safety hazard for people residing or working within the area of influence for the Plan. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

(f)

A review of City and County records and a review of the surrounding area within a 2-mile radius show that there are no personal use airports or private airstrips operating in the Projects vicinity. The Project proposal is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore there are no impacts. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	■
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	■
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	■
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	■

Answers to Population and Housing A-C:

4.12(a)
The Project is a 70 space recreational vehicle park located on an infill development area of ten acres that has all utilities and services available. Even though the Project site does not consist of permanent housing, the Project is roughly 7 recreational units per acre. Although the Project will induce minor population growth, the growth is not above the General Plan buildout projections of the Projects proposed zoning district of 20 dwelling units per acre, nor does the project propose permanent housing.

The Susanville Sanitary District Sewage Treatment Plant is directly north of the project site to serve for solid and liquid human waste disposal. The City of Susanville has expressed that all other utilities such as water and natural gas are available to the site and no major infrastructure upgrades are needed.

Minor road improvements such as driveway aprons and connections will be needed on Bella Way and Skyline Road. In addition, the analysis section on Public Services of this Initial Study Checklist demonstrates that the impacts on public services are less than significant so the public services providers ability to provide services will not be reduced. As such, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

4.12(b)
The Project is a 70 space recreational vehicle park. The Project is to be constructed on a vacant ten acre parcel and therefore it will not displace any existing housing. No impacts.

4.12(c)
The Project is a 70 space recreational vehicle park. The Project is to be constructed on a vacant ten acre parcel and therefore it will not displace any people. No impacts.

XV. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	■
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	■

Responses to Questions A and B:

(a)
The nearest park to the Project site is Skyline Park that contains a remote-control car track, disc golf course, paved walking path, and bike pump track. It was designed with the recreational needs of the neighborhood and for recreational tourism in which the Project site is located. As such, the Project would not substantially increase the use of Skyline Park and would not require modifications to existing parks or the need for new park facilities. In fact, the pedestrian path located along the Skyline Road corridor connects directly with Skyline Park approximately 1 mile northwest. Impacts to park and recreation facilities are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

(b)
The Project does not propose any recreation facilities. The Project site adjoins Skyline Road which has an existing paved bike and pedestrian path which eventually connects to Skyline Park approximately 1 mile northwest. The Project site is also located within a 2 mile radius of the Susanville Ranch Park which has over 30 miles of hiking, biking, and equestrian trails which are open to the general public. Patron of the Project once in use will have these park amenities available to them. Due to the fact the project does not propose the construction of any new recreation facilities and that the Project intends to utilize existing facilities, the Project will not require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	☐			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	■	☐

Responses to Questions A through F:

a) The Project site is currently vacant. The Project would develop a 70-space recreational vehicle park adjacent to Skyline Road approximately one quarter mile from the intersection of Johnstonville Road and Skyline Road.

Transit Analysis

The Project area is currently served by the Lassen Transit Service Agency (LTSA), a public transit agency serving the City. Early consultation correspondence with Lassen County and the LTSA will not require the need for a new bus stop location. In fact, the Project site is located approximately one half mile from the nearest bus stop. Generally speaking the close proximity of the existing bus stop and the small scale of the type of development didn't trigger any thresholds of any City or County adopted Transportation Plans or Policies and is in compliance with the City's Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Roadway Analysis

Skyline Road is a fully improved two way roadway that serves as a major arterial connector to U.S. Highway 139 toare required to accommodate traffic flow the north and U.S. Highway's 395 and 36 to the southeast and west. Skyline Road will not be widened and no additional flow lanes are required to accommodate traffic generated by the Project. In addition, there is a four foot vegitiative strip bordered by a 5 foot wide paved pedestrian and bicycle path within the Skyline Road right-of-way. Typical encroachment permits were a requirements from the Lassen County Public Works Department for the proposed driveway connection from the Project site onto Skyline Road. The improvements are consistent with the City's Circulation Element Map.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Path Analysis

There is a Class 1 Bikeway within the right-of-way on Skyline Road which is completely separated from the lane of motorist travel by a four foot vegetative strip and minimal areas for crossflow by motorists. The Project site adjoins the aforementioned right-of-way and patrons utilizing the Project will be encouraged to use this available amenity. The Project will utilize the same Class 1 Bikeway for pedestrian travel. This Class 1 Bikeway was apart of the Lassen County Bikeway Master Plans goal to provide bicycle and pedestrian access and ways of travel once Skyline Road was completed.

Based on the above analysis, the Project will not result in any conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy for the addressing of safety or performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian trails. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

b) For the purposes of this analysis, the method known as "Trip based vehicle miles traveled (VMT)" was used. The Project consists of 70 recreational vehicle spaces. For the purposes of this Project, trip based VMT will be evaluated using the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip generation rate for residential units of 9.52 trips per unit. Based on the most recent Institute of Traffic Engineers trip generation rate of 9.52 trips per unit, the Project would generate 666.4 daily trips. Granted this average may be liberal considering the above average is based on an average single family home occupancy of 3.88 persons per unit. It is very unlikely that the Projects impacts would reach the average mentioned with the primary use being a recreational vehicle park.
The VMT per capita for the Metropolitan Planning Organization with jurisdiction over the Project area is XX.X As such, the Project will have less than a significant impact on VMT.

c) The Project will construct the following safety improvements consistent with City standards as part of the standard conditions of approval to ensure no substantially unsafe conditions will be created for users of the public right-of-way.:

- Install pedestrian/bicycle crossing warning signs at each side of the proposed driveway entrance/exit to warn pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists of the potential for cross traffic due to the Class 1 Bike lane being connected to the Projects proposed Skyline Road access.
- Install vehicle crossing warning signs at the north and south sides of the Class 1 Bike lane at the Skyline driveway entrance to inform pedestrians and bicyclists of the potential for vehicle and recreational vehicular traffic.

Based on the above analysis, the Project would not result in substantially unsafe conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, or other users of public rights-of-way. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required aside from the standard conditions required above.

d) The Traffic Analysis prepared for the Project concluded that potential impacts to area roadways impacted by the Project are less than significant because the existing roadways (Bella Way) and Skyline Road are already designed to accommodate the Projects projected traffic impacts which would not create any potential spill back on Skyline Road or Bella Way during peak operation hours. Accordingly, adverse impacts to vehicle progression along affected roadways during peak hours would not occur for current or built out conditions. As such, the Project does not require the affected roadways to increase physical capacity, nor would any additional travel lanes or new roadways would be required to serve the Project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) The Project site and surrounding roadway network, including the onsite proposed circulation and roadway related to the recreational vehicle park do not have any conditions that would restrict emergency vehicle access to the Project site such as insufficient width of roadways or inadequate roadway surfaces that cannot support the weight of larger emergency vehicles.

The Project's ingress/egress and on-site circulation are required to meet the City Fire Department and City Police Department standards, which ensure new development provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. In addition, Bella Way will remain open during construction. The Project plans have been reviewed by the Fire and Police Departments to ensure that adequate emergency vehicle access is provided.

f) As discussed in question response (a), the Project will not result in any conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy for the addressing of safety or performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian trails. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Answers to Questions A-G:
a) The Project site would develop 70 Recreational Vehicles spaces, a bathroom, and a management office on a currently vacant parcel. None of the proposed uses would generate atypical wastewater such as industrial or agricultural affluent. All wastewater generated by the Project is expected to be domestic sewage which will be served and treated by the Susanville Sanitary District Sewage Treatment Plant. The City is required to adhere to the requirements of the Regional Wastewater Ordinance established by the applicable water agency which requires pre-treatment regulations to prevent the introduction of pollutants into the regional sewerage system. Any surface runoff from the Project is addressed in the responses to Questions 4.9(a), (c), (e), and (f) of this Initial Study Checklist.

In addition, The Susanville Sanitary District's (SSD) existing sewage collection system is divided into two separate and individual subsystems with 8-inch to 18-inch lines. The original wastewater treatment plant was constructed in 1951 adjacent to the Lassen County Fairgrounds southeast of Susanville. Treatment now consists of a head works with a fine screen and grit removal, two oxidation ditches, a secondary clarifier, an aerobic digester, and a sludge holding tank for sludge thickening. Further treatment takes place in 35 acres of facultative stabilization ponds for dechlorination.

Final effluent is discharged through a wetland. The effluent is discharged to an irrigation canal ultimately reaching the Susan River. The current average daily flow is 1.2 MGD with a maximum design capacity of 3.3 MGD. Susanville's wastewater capacity is adequate to accommodate its regional housing needs throughout the planning period.

Based on the analysis and information provided above, the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board are not anticipated to be exceeded because the current sewage collection system operated by the Susanville Sanitary District has more than adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project.

b) The Project would construct an on-site network of water and sewer pipes that would connect to City and Sanitary District existing lines. The installation of water and sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and immediate subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are considered to be apart of the Projects construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where significant impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required because the Project would be adequately served by existing sewage disposal infrastructure.

c) On-site runoff will be directed to either one of six depressed grassy water detention basins, one of two large bioswales, or the large sediment basin proposed near the eastern portion of the Project parcel that adjoins Skyline Road. The construction of on-site drainage facilities would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. In instances where significant impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist are not required and no further mitigation measures are needed.

d) Water service would be provided by the City of Susanville Water Department. Susanville has adequate water supplies for its present and near future needs to accommodate its regional housing needs throughout the planning period. The city is undertaking a study to update the water master plan and secure water for future needs. The water utility is fiscally sound with the rate revenues meeting operating needs and providing the required reserves. According to the State of California Department of Finance The population of Susanville in 2020 was approximately 13,717 citizens. The City of Susanville has two state prisons, High Desert State Prison, the California Correctional Center, that with annexation are now within the incorporated city area.

The inmate population is approximately 5,641 and is counted in the overall population demographics for the City. However, the prisons operate independent water systems and therefore, the populations must be excluded from this water management plan. The total unserved prison population in 2020 was 5,641. The 2020 served population is calculated to be 13,717 – 5,641 = 8,076. The Susanville area has had a reduction in population from 2009 through 2020. The prison population numbers are transient in nature and significantly affect the reported populations for the area. Although the growth rate may be negative and other reports have used a growth rate under 1% for the next several years, this UWMP will uses a 1% growth rate based on the 2020 population of 8,076. Using this, perhaps inflated, population growth forecast for future water demand requirements will provide for conservative planning.

The City also provides water to the Susanville Indian Rancheria (SIR). There are two areas served; the lower Rancheria on Joaquin street, which is surrounded by the City limits; and the upper Rancheria north of Spring Ridge Road, which is north of Susanville, adjacent to, but not within the City limits. The homes located within the lower Rancheria are individually metered by the City, the residents are City Customers. The homes located in the upper Rancheria are not individually metered by the City. The upper Rancheria fills two 100,000 gallon tanks from the City's system and distributes water to the

residents through the Rancheria's system. The Rancheria is the City's customer. There are four large institutional water users on the City's system. Lassen Community College, Lassen County, Lassen High School, Susanville School District, and the City of Susanville.

The City water customer needs are met by utilizing water from Bagwell Springs (located one mile north of the city), Cady Springs (located two miles west of the city) and four wells (Well #1 and Well #3 and #4 and #5) located southeast in the city. Water from the wells is primarily utilized during the summer to supplement increased demands. The city also has additional caped wells, and locations for future new wells to meet the city's water demands.

Cady Springs is located about two and a half miles west of Susanville on the north slope of the Susan River Canyon. Cady Springs is at approximately 4,600 feet in elevation which is approximately 300 feet in elevation above the Susan River. The springs are located approximately 1,000 feet south of HWY 36. Locked gates and wire fencing control access to the springs. The springs are located on 40 acres of city owned property. The City acquired the water system and water rights from California Pacific National Corporation in 1986. The City has the right to use and consume the entire flow from Cady Springs. (Fleming vs. Bennett et. al., Lassen County Superior Court Action No. 4573, dated and filed April 18, 1940) Cady Springs produces an annual average of 900 gpm (473 MMG) in a dry year to 1,500 gpm (788.4 MMG) in a wet year. In August of 2015 Cady Springs produced an average flow of 742 gpm (33.11 MMG).

Bagwell Springs is located on a wooded hillside about one and a half miles northwest of Susanville. The springs are approximately 4,485 feet in elevation. A locked gate and fencing control access to the springs. The City acquired the water system and water rights from CP National Corporation in 1986. CP National and therefore the City of Susanville has the right to use and consume for furnishing water to consumers in its water service area 2.45 cfs (1,122 gpm) (589.7 mg) of the flow of water from Bagwell Springs. (Fleming vs. Bennett et.al., Lassen County Superior Court Action No. 4573, dated & filed April 18, 1940) Bagwell Springs produces an annual average of 800 gpm (420.5 MMG). In August 2015 Bagwell Springs produced an average flow of 689 gpm (30.75 MMG).

Well #1 (Bunyan Well) and the pumping plant are located south of Riverside Drive and Grove Street. The casing is 12 inches diameter, with 320 feet of perforation between the depths of 130 and 450 feet below the ground surface. No gravel pack was constructed with this well. It was constructed in 1948. The 75 hp electric pumping unit is capable of producing about 700 gpm (367.92 MMG) annual production which is pumped directly into the water systems Pressure Zone 4. The pumping plant is turned on and off by sensing

water levels in the South Street Tank. Well production is only limited by well capacity and not limited by water right. The well can produce approximately 700 gpm (30.66 MMG) in a single month based on 100% uptime. 3.3.4 Well #3 Well #3 was constructed in 1961 and is located approximately one half mile south of the city limit, off Johnstonville Road. The casing is 12 and 14 inches in diameter with 560 feet of perforation between the depths of 90 and 650 feet below the ground surface. The 200hp electric pump is capable of producing 1,500 gpm (788.4 MMG) annual production which is pumped directly into the water systems Pressure Zone 4. The pumping plant is turns on automatically by sensing water levels in the South Street Tank. Well production is only limited by well capacity and not limited by water right. The well can produce approximately 1,500 gpm (65.70 MMG) in a single month based on 100% uptime.

Well #4 was constructed in 1992 and was online for the City of Susanville in 1995. It is located at the northwest corner of Orlo Drive and Skyline Drive. The steel casing is 8 inches in diameter with 125 to 225 feet of perforation at a depth of 290 feet below the ground surface.

Well #4 produces approximately 700 gpm (367.92 MMG) annual production which is used to augment the year-round water sources as needed. Well #4 is fully automated as of January 2003 and pumps to fill the Bagwell Springs Reservoir when the tank is depleted to a depth of 12 feet. Well production is only limited by well capacity and not limited by water right. The well can produce approximately 700 gpm (30.66 MMG) in a single month based on 100% uptime.

Well #5 (College Well) Lassen Community College originally owned and operated Well #5, (know at the time as Well #2 to the college). The well was installed in the late 1960's. The college used this well to supply their water needs. The well was rebuilt in 2006. The purpose of the well was originally intended for geothermal power generation. The desired hot well was never located and the project was abandoned. This well is now developed as one of the resources available to obtain water as needed. The Well is capable of producing about 700 gpm (367.92 MMG) annual production. Well production is only limited by well capacity and not limited by water right. The well can produce approximately 700 gpm (30.66 MMG) in a single month based on 100% uptime.

The City maintains 4 water storage tanks located thought the city with a total capacity of 2.94 MMG. These tanks are South Tank (0.5 MMG), Harris Tank (1.04 MMG), Bagwell Tank (0.5 MMG), and Spring Ridge Tank (0.9 MMG). The City has received funding through proposition 84 to bring the Cady Springs tank on line. This 0.94 MMG tank is located on the ridge near Cady Springs.

From 2001 thru 2010 water production was around 1,100 million gallons per year. From this data and population data the gpcd baseline was established at 328 with a 295 gpcd 2015 target (See section 2.2). In 2020 the City produced 815 MMG of water with a population of 8576 giving a 260 gpcd, slightly under 80% reduction from the 2010 baseline and target. In 2020 the City produced 815 MMG of water, The City Delivered 661 MMG. This indicates a water loss of 154 MMG or 18.9% of water production.

The population growth data summarized in Table 4.4-1 was used to estimate the future water use within the City. The distribution system population in 2020 was 8,576 and is projected to reach 11,173 by 2045. This is based on a 1% growth rate which is conservative.

The following table shows the projected water demand from 2020 through 2045 in MMG (millions of gallons) per year. This is based on the projected populations, the achieved gpcd of 260 in 2020, then continuing to reduce gcpd by 1 every 5 years thru 2045. The City notes that the required 2020 80% reduction to a (target: 262 gpcd, actual 260 gpcd) was achieved. The City will then continue to use best management practices in there water conservation efforts. It is anticipated that these efforts will continue to reduce gpcd.

Table 4.2-3 Projected Water Demand - 2020 to 2045

Calendar Year	Service Area Total Population	Unserved Prision Population	Distribution System Population	Targets and projected (gpcd)	Annual system gross water used (mgy)
2020	14275	5641	8634	260	815
2025	14251	5500	8751	259	827
2030	14370	5500	8870	258	835
2035	14490	5500	8990	257	843
2040	14612	5500	9112	256	851
2045	14736	5500	9236	255	860

Note: 260 gpcd is the 2020 actual / 262 gpcd is the 2020 80% reduction target.
These numbers are based on gross water production that include system losses.

Table 4.4-2 below illustrates the projected water demand from 2020 through 2045 in MMG per year based on sector. The city is fully metered. The sector amounts of water usage are based on future population projections, target reductions in gpcd, and the current sector percentage as per current utility metered water usage. The sector breakdown is Single Family 61.1%. Multi-

Family is 11.7%, Commercial is 27.2% making up the 100% total water use customers. It is not anticipated that future growth will make significant shifts in sector percentages.

Submittal Table 4-2 Retail: Use for Potable and Non-Potable[1] Water - Projected						
Use Type		Projected Water Use[2]				
Drop down list May select each use multiple times These are the only Use Types that will be recognized by the WUEdata online submittal tool	Additional Description (as needed)	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 (opt)
Add additional rows as needed						
Single Family		410	415	421	427	432
Multi-Family		78	79	80	81	83
Commercial		182	185	187	190	193
Other	System Losses	157	156	155	153	152
TOTAL		827	835	843	851	860
[1] Recycled water demands are NOT reported in this table. Recycled water demands are reported in Table 6-4.						
NOTES:						

Future water demands are illustrated above in Table 4.4-2 with the losses included. Non-Revenue water is currently at approximately 20%. All future water demands illustrated above are based on continues improvements and continuing to reduce water demand and decrease the percentage of water losses Table 4.4-1 above. These gpcd targets will be achieved by reducing water consumption utilizing the Demand Management Measures (DMMs) (see section 9), improving production efficiency, reducing system losses, and other management methods that become apparent as the city actively matches water sources and production with demand. Available resources will be focused on the methods which are calculated to provide the greatest reduction in lower gpcd with compared to the cost to implement.

Table 4.4-3 Gross Demand Vrs Capacity by source 2015 - 2040 - Projected											
Calendar Year	Cady Springs	Bagwell Springs	Well #1	Well #3	Well #4		Demand Total	Springs Total	Well Total	Springs %	Well %
Average	457.42	373.56	29.71	167.44	19.04		1059.88	830.98	228.91	78.4%	21.6%
1 yr Capacity	435.43	386.92	358.43	684.29	358.43		2223.50	822.35	1401.15	37.0%	63.0%
2020	317.00	289.00	10.00	179.00	20.00		815.00	606.00	209.00	74.4%	25.6%
2025	320.00	290.00	20.00	187.00	10.00		827.00	610.00	217.00	73.8%	26.2%
2030	320.00	290.00	20.00	195.00	10.00		835.00	610.00	225.00	73.1%	26.9%
2035	320.00	290.00	20.00	203.00	10.00		843.00	610.00	233.00	72.4%	27.6%
2040	320.00	290.00	20.00	211.00	10.00		851.00	610.00	241.00	71.7%	28.3%
2045	320.00	290.00	20.00	220.00	10.00		860.00	610.00	250.00	70.9%	29.1%
Note: 317 MMG Cady Springs and 289 MMG Bagwell Springs gives an average total springs flow of 606 MMG. The water demand total (see Demand Total above) from Table 4.4-2 can be achived by operating only one of the City's three wells. This future projection utilizes portions											

Table 4.4-2 and Table 4.4-3 above gives a conservative estimate that in 2045 that the city demand for water will be 860 MMG. It is anticipated that 250 MMG (29.1%) will need to come from the 1,759.6 MMG well pumping capacity. 250 MMG is 14.2% of the total available capacity. Table 6.6-2 Summarizes the Reasonably Available Volume and the Total Right or Safe

Yield for each of the City's 5 water sources. As previously indicated none of the cities sources are limited by water rights, only by current flow and well flow producing capacities. The City has ample water rights and capacity for the projected future demand.

Submittal Table 4-3 Retail: Total Water Use (Potable and Non-Potable)						
	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 (opt)
Potable Water, Raw, Other **Non-potable** *From Tables 4-1R and 4-2 R*	661	670	679	688	698	708
Recycled Water Demand[1] *From Table 6-4*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Optional Deduction of Recycled Water Put Into Long-Term Storage[2]						
TOTAL WATER USE	661	670	679	688	698	708

[1] Recycled water demand fields will be blank until Table 6-4 is complete

[2] Long term storage means water placed into groundwater or surface storage that is not removed from storage in the same year. Supplier may deduct recycled water placed in long-term storage from their reported demand. This value is manually entered into Table 4-3.

NOTES:

Based on the analysis and information discussed above, the Water Districts water supply exceeds the maximum daily demand projected by the Project. In addition, the District continues to develop additional water supply resources such as the recent purchase of Barry Reservoir located approximately one mile northwest of the Project site. The Project is calculated to require 7,000 gallons per day. Should the Project be approved, the City of Susanville Water Department intends to issue a Water availability letter that adequate supply exists to serve the Project. No mitigation measures beyond those already defined would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Sanitary sewer service will be provided by the Susanville Sanitary District located approximately ¼ mile north of the Project site. Susanville Sanitary District provides wastewater collection and treatment servicing the City of Susanville, CA. Susanville is about 85 miles North-Northwest of Reno, Nevada on the Eastern slopes of where the Sierra Nevada's and the Cascade Mountain ranges meet. The District's boundaries encompass

approximately 6.2 square miles. With a few exceptions, the boundaries are contiguous to Susanville City limits. The district has approximately 3,595 connections out of which 3,199 are residential, 387 are commercial and 9 are industrial. Currently, the District provides wastewater collection and tertiary wastewater treatment. The district recently went to UV disinfection in lieu of chemical treatment in order to better serve the community and protect the environment. The district owns and maintains 61 miles of collection pipelines, a wastewater treatment plant, 2 polishing ponds, and a wetland.

Wastewater is collected through 60 miles of gravity-fed pipelines and one mile of pressure sewer mains. The Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) treats approximately 1.0 million gallons of wastewater per day during dry weather and approximately 1.2 million gallons per day(mgd) in wet weather. The WWTP has the capacity to treat and discharge 2.0 mgd average monthly flow and 3.1 mgd peak wet weather flow, with a maximum hydraulic capacity of 4.0 mgd. For planning purposes, the district estimates that each resident uses approximately 250 gallons per day.

The Project is estimated to produce approximately 7,515 gallons of wastewater per day. Based on the Sanitary Districts ability to process between 1 million and 1.2 Million gallons of waste water per day, the project would generate 0.0062 million gallons per day. The Sanitary District has more than adequate capacity to handle the minimal increase in wastewater per day and annually. Impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measure are required.

Impact Analysis for Construction Related Impacts:
f) Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of the Recreational Vehicle pads, the construction of the management office and bathroom facilities for the RV Park. According to the Lassen Regional Solid Waste Management Authority, solid waste generated within the City is deposited at the Bass Hill Landfill. According to the Lassen Regional Solid Waste Management Authority website accessed April 21, 2023, the current landfill receives less than its maximum daily permitted disposal volume and construction waste generated by the project is not anticipated to cause the landfill to exceed its maximum daily disposal volume. Furthermore, the landfill is not expected to exceed its maximum daily disposal volume capacities during the Project's construction period.

Impact Analysis for Operational Impacts:
Based on a waste generation factor closest to a Recreational Vehicles daily solid waste volume (a single-family residence) of 0.41 tons per home per year as documented by the Cal Recycle website, the Projects proposed 70 Recreational Vehicle Spaces when fully occupied would generate 28.7 tons of waste per year or 0.078 tons of waste per day.

According to the Cal Recycle website accessed on April 21, 2023, the Bass Hill Land Fill has a remaining capacity of 603,404 tons. The Bass Hill Landfill is estimated to reach capacity sometime in the next 10 to 15 years. The Bass Hill Landfill receives well below its daily maximum permitted daily disposal volume and solid waste produced by the Project long term is not anticipated to exceed the landfills daily maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Because the proposed Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the daily permitted capacities of Bass Hill Landfill, the landfill will have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste from the Project and impacts would be less than significant.

g) The Project consists of a 70 space Recreational Vehicle Park. §4.408 of the California Green Building Standards Code establishes a mandatory requirement to recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 50% of the non-hazardous construction waste created by a residential construction project (excluding soil and land-clearing debris). The Contractor must submit a construction waste management plan for City approval to define the methods of compliance and provide documentation of the satisfactory accomplishment of the waste diversion efforts.

In order to assist the City and the County in achieving the mandated goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the property management company or property owner would be required to work with future refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (Cal Pub Res. Code §42911), the Project would provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. The implementation of these programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Project and diverted to landfills, which in turn would aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. The Project would comply with all applicable solid waste statutes and regulations; as such, impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Less than significant with mitigation	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?	☐	■	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	■	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	■	☐

Answers to A-C:

a) All impacts to the environment, including impacts to habitat for fish and wildlife species, fish and wildlife populations, plant and animal communities, rare and endangered plants and animals, and historical and pre-historical resources were evaluated as part of this Initial Study Checklist. Where impacts were determined to be potentially significant, mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce those impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, with incorporation of the mitigation measures imposed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment and impacts would be less than significant. All mitigation measures discussed in this Initial Study Checklist shall apply.

b) As discussed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, implementation of the Project has the potential t result in effects to the environment that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable including impacts to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Noise, Public Services (Fire), Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

In all instances where the Project has the potential to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impacts to the environment (including the resources listed above) mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce potential effects to less-than significant levels. As such, with incorporation of the mitigation measures imposed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the Project would not contribute to environmental effects that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, and impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, BIO-1, and NOI-1 shall apply.

c) The Project's potential to result in environmental effects that could adversely affect human beings, either directly or indirectly, has been discussed throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where the Project has potential to result in direct or indirect adverse effects to human beings, including impacts to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems, mitigation measures have been applied to reduce the impact to below a level of significance. With required implementation of mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study Checklist, construction and operation of the proposed Project

would not involve any activities that would result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measures: HAZ-1, HAZ-2, BIO-1, NOI-1, shall apply.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino,* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors,* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2016
Authority: Public Resources Code sections 21083 and 21083.09
Reference: Public Resources Code sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/ 21084.2 and 21084.3