INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: North State Rendering Anaerobic Minor Use Permit (MUP20-0004)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Butte County – Department of Development Services
   Planning Division
   7 County Center Drive
   Oroville, CA 95965

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Mark Michelena, Principal Planner
   530.552.3683
   mmichelena@buttecounty.net

4. Project Location: The project site is the existing North State Rendering, Inc., facility located at 15 Shippee Road northeast of the intersection with State Highway 99 APN: 041-200-023.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Chris Ottone
   c/o 1660 Humboldt Road, Unit 6
   Chico, CA 95928

6. General Plan Designation: Industrial (I)

7. Zoning: Heavy 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.)

   Minor Use Permit in connection with a current use permit (UP10-0004) to include and allow sewer septage to be processed by North State Rendering, Inc., (NSR) within its existing anaerobic digester. The NSR facility consists of a former rendering facility, bio-digester and pond system. Rendering at the facility was discontinued in 2016. The primary operation since that time is use of the bio-digester to convert food wastes to bio-gas. The material processed includes food waste products such as grease trap material, commercial processed food waste and other waste material (e.g., fruit waste, cheese whey, cow manure, glycerin and olive processing waste). The bio-digester converts the material to methane gas (bio-gas). The waste material is mixed into a slurry and then is fed into the bio-digester which breaks down the waste and produces bio-gas which is used for electrical generation. It is also compressed and used for vehicle fuel. The byproduct is then transferred to the existing process wastewater pond system. The entire system is comprised of three existing tanks within which the digestion process occurs. The entire process takes between 40 and 60 days. The combined capacity of three tanks comprising the bio-digester system is approximately 950,000 gallons. The estimated current daily average input volume is approximately 16,000 gallons. NSR has a fleet of vehicles that collect waste material and hauls it to the facility. Local haulers also deliver waste material to the facility. The proposed project would allow the processing of septic waste that would otherwise be disposed of the Neal Road Landfill. A pilot study conducted by NSR

determined that the bio-digester can process a mixture of food and septic waste and produce both useable bio-gas and an effluent stream that is acceptable for disposal into the existing process wastewater ponds.

With approval of MUP20-0004, septage waste would be delivered by septic haulers and unloaded into the existing bio-digester concrete pit. It would be blended with the existing food waste and sent to the bio-digester system. The project would not change the overall operation, require any additional infrastructure or expand the capacity of the facility. The septage material would replace a portion of the food waste and offer an alternative to landfill disposal as a method of processing. Solid waste from the screening process would continue to be stored in dumpsters for landfill disposal.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

   The project site is an Industrial parcel surrounded by agricultural parcels. The nearest residence is located approximately 600 feet to the east of the eastern property line. Several parcels in proximity to the site include single-family residential dwellings and accessory agricultural buildings. The site is accessed by Shippee Road from Highway 99 adjacent to and west of the facility and State Route 149 located to the east/northeast.

Direction	General Plan Designation	Zoning	Existing Land Use(s)
North	Agriculture	AG	Agricultural
South	Agriculture	A-160	Agricultural
East	Agriculture	A-20	Agricultural w/single-family
West	Agriculture	A-40	Agricultural

   The project site is developed with an existing rendering facility and wastewater processing ponds. Domestic water and sewer services for existing development is provided by a groundwater well and an onsite septic system.

   Highway 99 provides primary access to the project site. The road is a two-lane paved County road approximately 24' wide with striped paved safety shoulder and gravel shoulders. Shippee Road is covered with a mix of pavement and gravel and is approximately 16' wide. No access improvements are proposed as part of the project.

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

    - Regional Water Quality Control Board amended Waste Discharge Requirements

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

    See Discussion 1.18

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. Where checked below, the topic with a potentially significant impact will be addressed in an environmental impact report.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forest Resources	☐	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Energy
☐	Geology / Soils	☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards / Hazardous Materials
☐	Hydrology / Water Quality	☐	Land Use / Planning	☐	Mineral Resources
☐	Noise	☐	Population / Housing	☐	Public Services
☐	Recreation	☐	Transportation	☐	Tribal Cultural Resources
☐	Utilities / Service Systems	☐	Wildfire	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance
		☒	None	☐	None with Mitigation Incorporated

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.

Mark Michelena — March 24, 2023

Prepared by Mark Michelena, Principal Planner — Date

Dan Breedon — March 24, 2023

Reviewed by: Dan Breedon, Planning Manager — 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.

1.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics.				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact. The area comprising the project site is the existing North State Rendering facility. Surrounding land use is agricultural with several single-family residences and outbuildings that support agricultural production. Views from Highway 99 are of native and non-native vegetation and various building and the bio-digester tanks that support operation of the project. There are no unique visual features or scenic vistas in the project area. The project action would require no infrastructure improvements; and thus, no effect on visual resources. Therefore, the project will not substantially interfere with any scenic views, or otherwise, have a substantive negative aesthetic impact.

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

No impact. The proposed project does not include new construction that would disturb features such as trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Further, the project site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway and there are no scenic resources on the project site.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less than significant impact. The nearest publicly accessible area to the project site is Highway 99 which is located adjacent to and west of the site. Shippee Road is located adjacent to and south of the site. The project would allow processing of septage material in the existing bio-digester system. It would have no effect on the rural visual character of surrounding area.

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

No impact. Outdoor safety and security lighting currently operates on the project site and is visible from public areas. Processing septage material in the existing bio-digester system would have no effect on lighting. The proposed project would not create new sources of substantial lighting or glare that would generate a significant impact.

1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department 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:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Regulatory Setting

Williamson Act/Land Conservation Act (LCA) Contracts

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly known as the Williamson Act, was established based on numerous State legislative findings regarding the importance of agricultural lands in an urbanizing society. Policies emanating from those findings include those that discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses and discourage discontinuous urban development patterns, which unnecessarily increase the costs of community services to community residents. The Williamson Act authorizes each County to establish an agricultural preserve. Land that is within the agricultural preserve is eligible to be placed under a contract between the property owner and County that would restrict the use of the land to agriculture in exchange for a tax assessment that is based on the yearly production yield. The contracts have a 9-year term that is automatically renewed each year unless the property owner or county requests a non-renewal or the contract is canceled.

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) develops statistical data for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. The FMMP program characterizes "Prime Farmland" as land with the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics that are able to sustain long-term production of agricultural crops. "Farmland of Statewide Importance" is characterized as land with a good combination of physical and chemical characteristics for agricultural production, but with less ability to store soil moisture than prime farmland. "Unique Farmland" is used for the production of the state's major crops on soils not qualifying as prime farmland or of statewide importance. The FMMP also identifies "Grazing Land", "Urban and Built-up Land", "Other Land", and "Water" that is not included in any other mapping category.

California Public Resources Code Section 4526

"Timberland" means land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the board on a district basis.

California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)

"Forest land" is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Discussion

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?

No impact. The California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designates the site as "Other". Project improvements would not impact prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact. The project site is zoned Heavy Industrial (HI) and not under an existing Williamson Act Contract. All actions associated with the project would be confined to the project site. The project will not conflict with existing zoning or agricultural use of a parcel under 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))?

No impact. The project site is zoned Heavy Industrial and surrounding area is not classified as forestland, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), or as timberland, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526. The project site is not zoned or designated for forest or timber resource uses.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. The project site is a developed industrial facility. There are no trees or timber resources classified as forestland, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), or as timberland, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a 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?

No impact. The project site is designated as "Other" under the California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. All proposed development and subsequent use of the site would occur within the areas of the property that are designated as "Other". Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use.

1.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.				
Are significance criteria established by the applicable air district available to rely on for significance determinations?	☒ Yes		☐ No	
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Butte County is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), comprising the northern half of California's 400-mile long Great Central Valley. The SVAB encompasses approximately 14,994 square miles with a largely flat valley floor (excepting the Sutter Buttes) about 200 miles long and up to 150 miles wide, bordered on its east, north and west by the Sierra Nevada, Cascade and Coast mountain ranges, respectively.

The SVAB, containing 11 counties and some two million people, is divided into two air quality planning areas based on the amount of pollutant transport from one area to the other and the level of emissions within each. Butte County is within the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which is composed of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Sutter, Tehama, and Yuba Counties.

Emissions from the urbanized portion of the basin (Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, and Placer Counties) dominate the emission inventory for the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, and on-road motor vehicles are the primary source of emissions in the Sacramento metropolitan area. While pollutant concentrations have generally declined over the years, additional emission reductions will be needed to attain the State and national ambient air quality standards in the SVAB.

Seasonal weather patterns have a significant effect on regional and local air quality. The Sacramento Valley and Butte County have a Mediterranean climate, characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, wet winters. Winter weather is governed by cyclonic storms from the North Pacific, while summer weather is typically subject to a high-pressure cell that deflects storms from the region.

In Butte County, winters are generally mild with daytime average temperatures in the low 50s°F and nighttime temperatures in the upper 30s°F. Temperatures range from an average January low of approximately 36°F to an average July high of approximately 96°F, although periodic lower and higher temperatures are common. Rainfall between

October and May averages about 26 inches but varies considerably year to year. Heavy snowfall often occurs in the northeastern mountainous portion of the County. Periodic rainstorms contrast with occasional stagnant weather and thick ground or "tule" fog in the moister, flatter parts of the valley. Winter winds generally come from the south, although north winds also occur.

Diminished air quality within Butte County largely results from local air pollution sources, transport of pollutants into the area from the south, the NSVAB topography, prevailing wind patterns, and certain inversion conditions that differ with the season. During the summer, sinking air forms a "lid" over the region, confining pollution within a shallow layer near the ground that leads to photochemical smog and visibility problems. During winter nights, air near the ground cools while the air above remains relatively warm, resulting in little air movement and localized pollution "hot spots" near emission sources. Carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matters and lead particulate concentrations tend to elevate during winter inversion conditions when little air movement may persist for weeks.

As a result, high levels of particulate matter (primarily fine particulates or PM2.5) and ground-level ozone are the pollutants of most concern to the NSVAB Districts. Ground-level ozone, the principal component of smog, forms when reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) – together known as ozone precursor pollutants – react in strong sunlight. Ozone levels tend to be highest in Butte County during late spring through early fall, when sunlight is strong and constant, and emissions of the precursor pollutants are highest (Butte County CEQA Air Quality Handbook 2014).

Air Quality Attainment Status

Local monitoring data from the BCAQMD is used to designate areas a nonattainment, maintenance, attainment, or unclassified for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The four designations are further defined as follows:

Nonattainment – assigned to areas where monitored pollutant concentrations consistently violate the standard in question.

Maintenance – assigned to areas where monitored pollutant concentrations exceeded the standard in question in the past but are no longer in violation of that standard.

Attainment – assigned to areas where pollutant concentrations meet the standard in question over a designated period of time.

Unclassified – assigned to areas were data are insufficient to determine whether a pollutant is violating the standard in question.

Table 1.3-1. Federal and State Attainment Status of Butte County

POLLUTANT	STATE DESIGNATION	FEDERAL DESIGNATION
1-hour ozone	Nonattainment	-
8-hour ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon monoxide	Attainment	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment
24-Hour PM10	Nonattainment	Attainment
24-Hour PM2.5	No Standard	Attainment
Annual PM10	Attainment	No Standard
Annual PM2.5	Nonattainment	Attainment

Source: Butte County AQMD, 2018

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are frequently occupied locations where people who might be especially sensitive to air pollution are expected to live, work, or recreate. These types of receptors include residences, schools, churches, health care facilities, convalescent homes, and daycare centers. The project is located on an industrial site surrounded by agricultural land to the north, south and east. Orchards are located to the west. Table 1.3-2 lists sensitive receptors that were identified in the project vicinity and the distances from the project site.

Table 1.3-2. Sensitive Receptors in the Project Vicinity

SENSITIVE RECEPTORS	DISTANCE FROM PROJECT SITE TO RECEPTOR
Residence (87 Shippee Road)	600 feet east
Residence (47 Nelson Road)	4,000 feet southwest
Residence (15 Shippee Road)	1,800 fee east
Source: Butte County Geographical Information System/Google Earth imagery	

Butte County Air Quality Management District

The Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) is the local agency with primary responsibility for compliance with both the federal and state standards and for ensuring that air quality conditions are maintained. They do this through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues.

Activities of the BCAQMD include the preparation of plans for the attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution, inspection of stationary sources of air pollution and response to citizen complaints, monitoring of ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implementation of programs and regulations required by the FCAA and CCAA.

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make significance determinations for potential impacts on environmental resources. BCAQMD is responsible for ensuring that state and federal ambient air quality standards are not violated within Butte County. Analysis requirements for construction and operation-related pollutant emissions are contained in BCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook: Guidelines for Assessing Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impacts for Projects Subject to CEQA Review*. Established with these guidelines are screening criteria to determine whether or not additional modeling for criteria air pollutants is necessary for a project. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook also contains thresholds of significance for construction-related and operation-related emissions: ROG, NOx and PM10. The screening criteria listed in Table 1.3-4 were created using CalEEMod version 2013.2.2 for the given land use types. To determine if a proposed project meets the screening criteria, the size and metric for the land use type (units or square footage) should be compared with that of the proposed project. If a project is less than the applicable screening criteria, then further quantification of criteria air pollutants is not necessary, and it may be assumed that the project would have a less than significant impact on criteria air pollutants. If a project exceeds the size provided by the screening criteria for a given land use type then additional modeling and quantification of criteria air pollutants should be performed (Butte County Air Quality Management District 2014).

Table 1.3-4. Screening Criteria for Criteria Air Pollutants

LAND USE TYPE	MAXIMUM SCREENING LEVELS FOR PROJECTS
Single-Family Residential	30 Units
Multi-Family (Low Rise) Residential	75 Units
Commercial	15,000 square feet
Educational	24,000 square feet
Industrial	59,000 square feet
Recreational	5,500 square feet
Retail	11,000 square feet
Source: Butte County AQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2014	

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No impact. A project is deemed inconsistent with an air quality plan if it would result in population or employment growth that exceeds the growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan (i.e., generating emissions not accounted for in the applicable air quality plan emissions budget). Therefore, proposed projects need to be evaluated to determine whether they would generate population and employment growth and, if so, whether that growth would exceed the growth rate included in the applicable air quality plan.

The proposed project would not result in population growth in the County. No additional employees would be required to operate the facility. Further, the project would not result in a substantial increase in criteria air pollutants that would cause significant impacts to regional air quality.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

No impact. The proposed project would generate miminal additional truck trips as the amount of material input into the bio-digester system would not change. The point of origination for the haul trucks may change from existing conditions but the number of trips would not change. Overall, operational emissions generated by the project are not expected to change and would not violate existing air quality standards. Further, no new structures or upgrades to existing facilities would be required or otherwise exceed the Industrial land-use type screening criteria listed above in Table 1.3-3. Thus, the project would not exceed the significance thresholds established in the BCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No impact. Sensitive receptors in the project area and their distances from the project site area contained Table 1.3-2. Based on the information provided in section b.), above, the proposed project would not result in the violation of any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

Less than significant impact. Odors are associated with operation of the unloading area. These are confined on-site and concentrated where off-loading organic waste material occurs. The project will not create a new source of objectionable odors nor would odors be detectable at off-site properties. Because odors would be temporary and limited to periodic off-loading events, and because the project site is located in a rural area of the county, odors would not impact a substantial number of people for an extended time.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or the 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, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

Vegetation Communities

Agricultural Land

The site is zoned Heavy Industrial and the project is an existing rendering facility and surrounded by agricultural land. Common species observed within this community type includes mourning dove, American crow, Brewer's blackbird, sandhill crane, various raptor species, egrets, and many species of rodents. Special-status wildlife species associated with agricultural lands, such as the northern harrier and giant garter snake, may use adjacent irrigation canals and freshwater marsh vegetation for foraging or breeding. Giant garter snakes have the potential to occur in irrigation canals and can use the adjacent agricultural lands as foraging and basking habitat. Swainson's hawks also will forage

in agricultural lands. Irrigated pastures may provide suitable nesting habitat for the northern harrier and short-eared owl.

Special-Status Species

Many species of plants and animals within the State of California have low populations, limited distributions, or both. Such species may be considered "rare" and are vulnerable to extirpation as the state's human population grows and the habitats these species occupy are converted to agricultural and urban uses. A sizable number of native species and animals have been formally designated as threatened or endangered under State and Federal endangered species legislation. Others have been designated as "Candidates" for such listing and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) have designated others as "Species of Special Concern". The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) has developed its own lists of native plants considered rare, threatened or endangered. Collectively, these plants and animals are referred to as "special status species."

Various direct and indirect impacts to biological resources may result from the small amount of development enabled by the project, including the loss and/or alteration of existing undeveloped open space that may serve as habitat. Increased vehicle trips to and from the project site can result in wildlife mortality and disruption of movement patterns within and through the project vicinity. Disturbances such as predation by pets (e.g., cats and dogs) and human residents may also occur at the human/open space interface, while conversion of land from lower to higher density residential use can lead to a predominance of various urban-adapted wildlife species (e.g., coyotes, raccoons, ravens and blackbirds) that have been observed to displace more sensitive species.

California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15065 requires a mandatory finding of significance for projects that have the potential to substantially degrade or reduce the habitat of a threatened or endangered species, and to fully disclose and mitigate impacts to special status resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, the California Environmental Quality Act (Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code) defines mitigation as measure(s) that:

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

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was reviewed to determine if any special-status species have the potential to occur on the project site or its vicinity. Table 1.4-1 lists each special-status species identified within a two-mile radius of the project site, along with regulatory status and habitat requirements for each special-status species.

Table 1.4-1 Federal and State Listed Species in the vicinity of the project site						
Scientific Name	Common Name	FEDLIST	CALLIST	CNPS List	CDFW Status	Habitat
Balsamorhiza macrolepis	big-scale balsamroot	None	None	1B.2		Dry open areas
Fritillaria pluriflora	adobe-lily	None	None	1B.2		Grassland, Oak Woodland & Savanna
Hibiscus lasiocarpos var. occidentalis	woolly rose-mallow	None	None	1B.2		Marshes and wet soils
Juncus leiospermus var. leiospermus	Red Bluff dwarf rush	None	None	1B.1		Moist habitat, including vernal pools and valley grassland
Limnanthes floccosa ssp. Californica	Butte County meadowfoam	Endangered	Endangered	1B.1		Seasonal wetlands, deep areas of vernal pools
Trifolium jokerstii	Butte County golden clover	None	None	1B.2		Vernal pools, pastures, and ephemeral creeks
Agelaius tricolor	tricolored blackbird	None	None		SSC	Wetland and grassland
Lanius ludovicianus	loggerhead shrike	None	None		SSC	Low grassland, shurbs and low trees
Setophaga petechia	yellow warbler	None	None		SSC	Edges of marshes and swamps, willow-lined streams. Also dry areas such as orchards, farmlands.
Emys marmorata	western pond turtle	None	None		SSC	Sandy banks near water, including lakes and ponds.
Branchinecta lynchi	vernal pool fairy shrimp	Threatened	None			vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, and stagnant ditches
Lepidurus packardi	vernal pool tadpole shrimp	Endangered	None			seasonal pools in grassland
Source: California Native Diversity Database Version 5; December 2021						

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No impact. The site is occupied by an existing rendering/bio-gas processing facility. Vegetation on-site is comprised of ruderal weed species, non-native grasses and ornamental trees. The project will allow the processing of septage material as part of the bio-digestion process. No new facilities would be constructed. No impact to habitat would occur as a result of the project action.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No impact. As stated, the site is occupied by an existing rendering/bio-gas processing facility. Vegetation on-site is comprised of ruderal weed species, non-native grasses and ornamental trees. There are no areas of native vegetation including riparian woodland vegetation or oak trees. Thus, no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would be affected by allowing septage processing at the existing facility.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No impact. A natural drainage feature appears to be located along the north/northwestern boundary of the site. It may be a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The processing ponds are not naturally occurring features with no natural connectivity to a jurisdictional resource. No expansion of the existing facility or ponds is proposed. The project action would have no effect on any state or federally protected wetlands, marsh areas or vernal pool resources.

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?

No impact. The project site is fenced and not located within the Butte County migratory deer corridors. No major migratory routes or corridors have been designated through the project site, and the existing developed components of the project area (i.e. processing buildings, bio-digester tanks, drive aisles and perimeter fencing) preclude use of the area as a migratory wildlife corridor for large mammals. Processing septage at the facility would not interfere with existing migratory wildlife populations that may use land adjacent to the site.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No impact. No native oak trees are known to occur on the site and no trees are proposed to be removed as part of the project. Thus, no trees would be affected by processing septage at the proposed facility.

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?

No impact. The Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP) is a joint Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/National Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) that is currently being prepared for the western half of the Butte County. In the event the BRCP is adopted, individual projects and development that occur in the BRCP planning area would need to be coordinated with the Butte County Association of Governments to ensure that the project does not conflict with the BRCP. No resources affected by the plan occur on-site. Further, because the plan has not been adopted, the proposed project will not conflict, nor interfere with, the attainment of the goals of the proposed plan.

1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	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 pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

No impact. The project site is fully developed. No new construction or ground-disturbing activities are proposed that would result in impacts to historic resources. No features exist on the property, including objects, sites, or landscapes, that could be considered as having historic value to California Native American tribes, or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

No impact. No new construction or ground-disturbing activities are proposed that would result in impacts to known historic or cultural resources. No features exist on the property, including objects, sites, or landscapes, that could be considered as having cultural value to California Native American tribes, or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No impact. No new construction or ground-disturbing activities are proposed that would result in impacts to unknown human remains. Processing septage material would have no effect on previously undiscovered human remains.

1.6 ENERGY

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

Discussion

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

No impact. Project development consumes energy primarily in two ways: (1) construction activities consume energy through the operation of heavy off-road equipment, trucks, and worker traffic, and (2) operation of new facilities would consume energy from electricity and propane gas consumption, energy used for water conveyance, and vehicle operations to and from the project site.

In this case, the project would allow the processing of septage material in the existing bio-digester system. It would not require the construction of any new facilities that would consume energy during the construction process. Further, operation of the facility would not change with respect the amount of material processed. The amount of material that can be input into the system is limited by the existing capacity. Thus, no more than approximately 16,000 gallons per day of septage and food waste material would input into the bio-digester system. The project action would not require an increase in energy consumption. Thus, no impact to energy consumption would occur.

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

No impact. Many of the state and federal regulations regarding energy efficiency are focused on increasing building efficiency and renewable energy generation, as well as reducing water consumption and Vehicles Miles Traveled. Proposed development would not change the processing system or otherwise increase energy demand. Thus, the project would not result in wasteful or inefficient use of nonrenewable energy sources. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils.				
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey 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, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

Less than significant impact. No known active faults are underlying, or adjacent to, the project site. The Cleveland Hill fault is the only active fault zone in Butte County identified in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The Cleveland Hill fault is located east of Dunstone Drive and Miners Ranch Road, between North Honcut Creek and Mt. Ida Road, approximately 4± miles southeast of the City of Oroville and 14± miles southeast of the site. Because the nearest active fault is located a considerable distance from the project site, the likelihood of a surface rupture at the project site is very low and would not be a design or operational consideration for the project.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than significant impact. Ground shaking at the project site could occur due to the earthquake potential of the region's active faults. However, active faults are relatively distant from the project site and would result in low to moderate intensity ground shaking during seismic events.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant impact. According to Butte County General Plan 2030, areas that are at risk for liquefaction can be found on the valley floor, especially near the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, and their tributaries, which have a higher potential to contain sandy and silty soils. However, no new construction activities are proposed that would result in development of a structure that would be potentially impacts to liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?

No impact. The project site is flat. No steep slopes are located on the site. As a result, there is no potential for landslide on the project site. No impact would occur under this threshold.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No impact. According to Figure HS-7 of Butte County General Plan 2030, the project site has a slight potential for soil erosion. Surface soil erosion and loss of topsoil have the potential to occur in any area of the county from disturbances associated with the construction-related activities. The proposed action would not require new construction or related ground disturbance. Thus, the project would have no impact with respect to soil erosion or 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?

No impact. According to Butte County General Plan 2030 (Figure HS-5 and HS-6), the project site is located in an area with no or low potential for landslides. To date, there have been no documented incidents of subsidence in Butte County. Further, the project would not require new development or related soil disturbances on the site. Future operation of the facility would not be exposed to greater potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading and subsidence with implementation of the proposed action.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less than significant impact. According to Figure HS-8 in the Butte County General Plan, the project site is located in an area with low potential for expansive soils. Expansive soils are those that have potential to undergo significant changes in volume, either shrinking or swelling, with changes in moisture content. Periodic shrinking and swelling of expansive soils can cause extensive damage to buildings, other structures and roads. Soils of high expansion potential generally occur in the level areas of the Sacramento Valley, including the City of Oroville and other population centers. The project would not require new development or related soil disturbances on the site. Future operation of the facility would not be exposed to greater potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading and subsidence with implementation of the proposed action.

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?

Less than significant impact. The volumes of material being processed through the bio-digesters would not change with implementation of the project. The only change would be in the composition of material processed. All wastewater would continue to be discharged into existing settling ponds. The ponds would not require expansion or other modifications to accommodate the processing wastewater. The number of employees would not change; thus, quantities of domestic wastewater would not change and would continue to be accommodated in the existing septic system. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

No impact. No paleontological resources are known to occur on the project site and no excavation would be required to implement the project action. No impact to paleontological resources would occur.

1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Butte County updated Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted on December 14, 2021. The 2021 Climate Action Plan (CAP) is Butte County's strategic plan to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the unincorporated county. The 2021 CAP allows Butte County (County) decision makers, staff, and the community to understand the sources and magnitude of local GHG emissions, reduce GHG emissions, and prioritize steps to achieve reduction targets.

The 2021 CAP is an update of the 2014 CAP, providing updated information, an expanded set of GHG reduction strategies, and a planning horizon out to 2050. The 2021 CAP contains an inventory of the community's GHG emissions from the agriculture, transportation, energy, solid waste, off-road equipment, water and wastewater, and stationary source sectors. The 2021 CAP also includes informational GHG emissions from the land use and sequestration sector and the wildfire and controlled burn sector. The 2021 CAP also presents a work plan and monitoring program for the County to track progress over time.

The Butte County CAP provides goals, policies, and programs to reduce GHG emissions, address climate change adaptation, and improve quality of life in the county. The Butte County CAP also supports statewide GHG emission-reduction goals. Programs and actions in the CAP are intended to help the County sustain its natural resources, grow efficiently, ensure long-term resiliency to a changing environmental and economic climate, and improve transportation. The Butte County CAP also serves as a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy under CEQA, simplifying development review for new projects that are consistent with the CAP.

The County's goal is to reduce GHG emissions from energy, transportation, water, solid waste, and agricultural sources in the unincorporated county 40 percent below 1990 equivalent levels by 2030 and continue to reduce emissions toward carbon neutrality, reducing emissions to at least 80 percent below 2006 levels by 2050.

A 2006 baseline GHG emission inventory was prepared for unincorporated Butte County. The inventory identified the sources and the amount of GHG emissions produced in the county. The leading contributors of GHG emissions in Butte County are agriculture (43%), transportation (29%), and residential energy (17%). The Climate Action Plan (CAP) adopted by the County provides a framework for the County to reduce GHG emissions while simplifying the review process for new development. Measures and actions identified in the CAP lay the groundwork to achieve the adopted General Plan goals related to climate change, including reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2030.

New projects are evaluated to determine consistency with the CAP and to identify which GHG emission reduction measures would be implemented with project approval.

Discussion

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would allow processing septage material in the existing bio-digester system as one element of the overall source material used. The process would continue to create methane gas for use an alternative fuel source. The overall volume of material processed would not change from existing conditions. No additional employees would be required to operate the facility. The number of haul truck trips may increase to deliver the septage material; however, as noted, the overall volume of material processed would remain the same as existing conditions. No new construction would be required; thus, no new emissions associated with the operation of construction equipment would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would process septage material in the existing bio-digesters. The overall volume of material processed through the facility would not change. Septage material is currently disposed of at the Neal Road landfill. The volume of septage material that is landfilled would be reduced with the project. This is generally consistent with Climate Action Plan Solid Waste Measure W-1 *Sustain a Maximum Practical Methane Capture Rate at the Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility*. The project would utilize material that would otherwise be landfilled as source material used to produce a sustainable supply of bio-gas. While not directly consistent with Measure W-1, the proposed action would facilitate consistency with this measure. Impacts would be less than significant under this threshold.

1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No impact. The proposed action would require the delivery of septage material by private, licensed/certified pumpers/haulers. This material is currently hauled to the Neal Road landfill for disposal. A portion of that material would be hauled to the existing rendering facility rather than to the landfill. Septage material is not considered hazardous waste; thus, no hazardous waste would be transported with approval of the proposed action. https://www.fedcenter.gov/assistance/facilitytour/hazardous/whatis/flowchart/.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than significant impact. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials. As stated, septage is not considered hazardous waste. The facility currently uses publicly-available hazardous materials (e.g., paint, maintenance supplies) for maintenance and cleaning. These materials are not used in sufficient strength or quantity to create a substantial risk of fire or explosion, or otherwise pose a substantial risk to human or environmental health. The processing of septage material would not create a permanent significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No impact. No existing or proposed schools have been identified within one-quarter mile of the project site.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No impact. A review of regulatory agency databases, which included lists of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5, did not identify a contamination site within one-quarter mile of the project site.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No impact. No public use airports have been identified to be located within two miles of the project site. The closest public use airport is the Oroville Municipal Airport, located approximately 6 miles southeast of the project site. The proposed project is located outside the compatibility zones for the area airports, and therefore, would not result in impacts to people residing on, or visiting, the project site.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No impact. The proposed action would not require the design, construction, and maintenance of driveways in accordance with applicable standards associated with vehicular access. Thus, emergency access would not be affected. The project would not include any actions that physically interfere with emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Additional trips added to deliver the septage material would result in a negligible change, if any, to overall volumes on Highway 99 and Shippee Road. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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

Less than significant impact. The project is located in a moderate fire hazard area as designated by the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. It is located within a rural area northwest of the City of Oroville. The project site is within a Local Responsibility Area (SRA), which means that the Butte County has fiscal responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires. The nearest staffed fire station is Butte County Fire Station #45, located at 2367 Campbell Street, Durham, California, approximately 8 miles northwest of the site. The

proposed action would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. A less than significant impact would occur under this threshold.

1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

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

No impact. The proposed action would incorporate septage into the existing material stream used in the bio-digestion process. The project would not change the quality or volume of water exiting the system into the settling ponds or otherwise impact groundwater quality. The existing facility operates under a Waste Discharge

Requirements (WDRs) issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (93-083). Incorporation of septage into the slurry mixture entering the bio-digester system is consistent with the existing WDRs, which allows septage as a feedstock for the digester, thus, no impact to water quality standards and related discharge requirements would occur with the project.

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

No impact. The Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin supplies a portion of the municipal and agricultural water demands for the City of Oroville and surrounding unincorporated areas. The project site is located over the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin which underlies the majority of eastern Butte County. The project site is not located within a water service district; thus, water is obtained from a private well.

According to the Butte County Groundwater Management Plan (2005), groundwater supplies approximately 31% of potable water demand county-wide. Water demand for the unincorporated areas of the county was projected to grow from 8,322.3 million gallons in 2000 to 9,736.4 million gallons in 2030, an increase of 17 percent. As noted, a private well currently supplies domestic water. No additional water demand would be associated with implementation of the proposed project.

No new development would occur; thus, the net increase in impervious surfaces relative to existing conditions would not change. The proposed action would not cause a change in surface infiltration or a decrease in the percolation of water in the settling ponds into the underlying aquifers. As shown in Figure 2-7 of the Butte County Groundwater Plan, the project site is not located in a groundwater recharge area for the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin. No impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would occur.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;

No impact. The proposed action would have no effect on erosion or siltation occurring on- or off-site. The material processed would be processed using existing infrastructure. No changes to the landform or drainage patterns would occur. No ground disturbance would occur as a result of the project. See response to 1.10 (a) above. The project would not alter the course of a stream or river. No impact would occur under this threshold.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

No impact. The proposed action would not require an increase in impervious surface area from construction of new facilities. The existing drainage patterns on-site would not be affected. Storm flows would be retained and treated on-site as occurs under existing conditions. The project would not result in on- or off-site flooding. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

No impact. Stormwater drainage systems in the project area currently consists of roadside ditches and culverts that capture surface runoff, which ultimately infiltrate into the underground aquifer or

conveyed to area waterways. Precipitation that falls on vacant land percolates into the soil. On-site stormwater from impervious areas is conveyed to the settling ponds.

The project would not increase runoff from impervious surfaces or otherwise affect the ability of existing on-site stormwater detention to accommodate stormflows. No impacts would occur under this threshold.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

No impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year mapped flood zone (FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06007C0760E, January 6, 2011). As referenced, the project would not redirect on-site drainage patterns or impede or redirect flood flows. All on-site drainage would be managed to ensure existing flows off-site are maintained. The project would not expose people or structures to flood hazard from severe storm events. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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

No impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year mapped flood zone (FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06007C760E, January 6, 2011). The project would not redirect on-site drainage patterns or impede or redirect flood flows. All on-site drainage would be managed to ensure pre-construction flows off-site are maintained. The project would not expose people or structures to flood hazard from severe storm events. Per the General Plan Health and Safety Element Figure HS-4, the project site, is not located in a dam inundation zone. The project site is not located in an area that would be impacted by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflows. Because the site is not located in a dam inundation zone, no impact would occur under this threshold.

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

No impact. The project site is located within the Butte County Groundwater Management Plan area. As referenced, the site is within the Sacramento River Valley Groundwater Basin. Provided future development is consistent with the zoning designation, the project would be part of demand projections through 2030 as summarized above. The project would not affect groundwater demand or recharge. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Land Use and Planning.				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

Butte County General Plan

The General Plan represents the community's values, ideals and aspirations with respect to land use, development, transportation, public services, and conservation policy that will govern Butte County through 2030. The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates the land use of areas within the County and includes a description of the characteristics and intensity of each land use category. The land use designation for the proposed project site is as follows:

> Industrial
>
> This designation allows the processing, manufacturing, assembly, packaging, storage, and distribution of goods and commodities. It also allows for warehouses, storage, logistics centers, trucking terminals, and railroad facilities. Alternative energy facilities are allowed in the Industrial designation, subject to permit requirements. In addition, this designation allows hazardous waste management facilities where it can be demonstrated that potential environmental impacts can be mitigated. Industrial uses are allowed by right where applicants can demonstrate that adequate existing services are already available.

Butte County Zoning Ordinance

The Zoning Ordinance implements the goals and policies of the Butte County General Plan by regulating the uses of land and structures within the County. The zoning designation of the proposed project site and the intended uses of the site are as follows:

> Heavy Industrial
>
> The purpose of the HI zone is to allow for a full range of industrial uses, including operations that necessitate the storage of large volumes of hazardous or unsightly materials, or which produce dust, smoke, fumes, odors, or noise at levels that would affect surrounding uses. Uses permitted in the HI are similar to the General industrial zone, except those heavy industrial uses are permitted either as of-right or with a Conditional Use Permit, and retail, personal service and restaurant uses are not allowed. The maximum permitted floor area ratio in the HI zone is 0.5. The HI zone implements the Industrial land use designation in the General Plan.

Minor Use Permit

As stated, the proposed action is subject to approval of a Minor Use Permit. The finding associated with approval of a Minor Use Permit application are as follows:

Butte County Code §24-222 (Minor Use Permit – Findings)

A. The proposed use is allowed in the applicable zone.

B. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity of the subject property.

C. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of the County.

D. The proposed use is properly located within the County and adequately served by existing or planned services and infrastructure.

E. The size, shape, and other physical characteristics of the subject property are adequate to ensure compatibility of the proposed use with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity of the subject property.

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The subject property is currently developed with an existing rendering facility. The site already operated to temporarily operate to receive septage to determine if it can handle the capacity. This temporary use was allowed with the Central Valley Regional Quality Control Board. The proposed action would allow the use of septage as one of the elements in the bio-digester process as a permanent use. The project would not require any changes to the existing facility. No structures would be removed nor would neighboring parcels be affected by the project.

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

No impact. The project is deemed consistent if the proposed use is consistent with the applicable General Plan designation and text, the applicable General Plan is legally adequate and internally consistent, and the anticipated types activities are appropriate to the land use designated for the area. The proposed project does not include an amendment to the existing land use designation and would be consistent with the zoning designation provided a MUP is approved. The proposed project is a request for a MUP, consistent with Section 24-175.2 of the Butte County Zoning Ordinance. Implementation of the project would not result in a conflict with zoning ordinances because the project is a conditionally allowed use in the HI zone with the approval of a MUP. The project will not generate any inconsistencies with applicable zoning standards and General Plan policies.

1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

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?

No impact. The majority of Butte County's sand and gravel deposits occur in two regions, along the Sacramento River and within a band running from north to south down the center of the county. There are no known economically viable sources of rock materials in the immediate vicinity of the project site and no mining has occurred on the project site or surrounding area. Approval of the proposed action would not preclude future extraction of available mineral resources. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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?

No impact. The project site is not within or near any designated locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Further, processing septage material would not require the use of mineral resources. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.13 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.Noise.				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

According to the Butte County General Plan 2030, noise is a concern throughout Butte County, but especially in rural areas and in the vicinity of noise-sensitive uses such as residences, schools, and churches. Noise is discussed in the Health and Safety Chapter of the Butte County General Plan 2030. Tables HS-2 and HS-3 in the County General Plan (included as Tables 1.13-1 and 1.13-2 below) outline the maximum allowable noise levels at sensitive receptor land uses.

Table 1.13-1. Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Transportation Noise Sources

	Exterior Noise Level Standard for Outdoor Activity Areas[a]		Interior Noise Level Standard	
LAND USE	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{eq}, dBA[b]	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{eq}, dBA[b]
Residential	60[c]	-	45	-
Transient Lodging	60[c]	-	45	-
Hospitals, nursing homes	60[c]	-	45	-
Theaters, auditoriums, music halls	-	-	-	35
Churches, meeting halls	60[c]	-	-	40
Office Buildings	-	-	-	45
Schools, libraries, museums	-	70	-	45
Playgrounds, neighborhood parks	-	70	-	-

Source: Table HS-2, Butte County General Plan 2030

[a] Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise-level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

[b] As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

[c] Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise-level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.

Table 1.13-2. Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Non-Transportation Noise Sources

	Daytime 7 am - 7 pm		Evening 7 pm - 10 pm		Night 10 pm - 7 am	
NOISE LEVEL DESCRIPTION	Urban	Non-Urban	Urban	Non-Urban	Urban	Non-Urban
Hourly Leq (dB)	55	50	50	45	45	40
Maximum Level (dB)	70	60	60	55	55	50

Source: Table HS-3, Butte County General Plan 2030

Notes:

1. "Non-Urban designations" are Agriculture, Timber Mountain, Resource Conservation, Foothill Residential and Rural Residential. All other designations are considered "urban designations" for the purposes of regulating noise exposure.

2. Each of the noise levels specified above shall be lowered by 5 dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises. These noise level standards do not apply to residential units established in conjunction with industrial or commercial uses (e.g. caretaker dwellings).

3. The County can impose noise level standards which are up to 5 dB less than those specified above based upon determination of existing low ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

4. In urban areas, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving property. In rural areas, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied at a point 100 feet away from the residence. The above standards shall be measured only on property containing a noise sensitive land use. This measurement standard may be amended to provide for measurement at the boundary of a recorded noise easement between all affected property owners and approved by the County.

Table 1.13.1, above, identifies the maximum allowable noise exposure to a variety of land uses from transportation sources, including from roadways, rail and airports. Table 1.13-2 identifies the maximum allowable noise exposure from non-transportation sources. In the case of transportation noise sources, exterior noise level standards for residential outdoor activity areas are 60 dB (Ldn/CNEL). However, where it is not possible to reduce noise in an outdoor activity area to 60 dB Ldn /CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise-reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise-level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with applicable standards.

Butte County Noise Ordinance

Chapter 41A, Noise Control, of the Butte County Code of Ordinance applies to the regulation of noise. The purpose of the noise ordinance is to protect the public welfare by limiting unnecessary, excessive, and unreasonable noise. Section 41A-7 specifies the exterior noise limits that apply to land use zones within the County, which are provided in Table 1.13-2.

The Butte County Noise Ordinance provides the County with a means of assessing complaints of alleged noise violations and to address noise level violations from stationary sources. The ordinance includes a list of activities that are exempt from the provisions of the ordinance. Relevant information related to the exterior and interior noise limits set out by the Butte County Noise Ordinance are included below.

Chapter 41A-9 Exemptions

The following are exempted activities identified in Chapter 41A-9 that are applicable to the proposed project:

(f) Noise sources associated with construction, repair, remodeling, demolition, paving or grading of any real property or public works project located within one thousand (1,000) feet of residential uses, provided said activities do not take place between the following hours:

- Sunset to sunrise on weekdays and non-holidays;
- Friday commencing at 6:00 p.m. through and including 8:00 a.m. on Saturday, as well as not before 8:00 a.m. on holidays;
- Saturday commencing at 6:00 p.m. through and including 10:00 a.m. on Sunday; and,
- Sunday after the hour of 6:00 p.m.

Provided, however, when an unforeseen or unavoidable condition occurs during a construction project and the nature of the project necessitates that work in process be continued until a specific phase is completed, the contractor or owner shall be allowed to continue work into the hours delineated above and to operate machinery and equipment necessary to complete the specific work in progress until that specific work can be brought to conclusion under conditions which will not jeopardize inspection acceptance or create undue financial hardships for the contractor or owner;

(g) Noise sources associated with agricultural and timber management operations in zones permitting agricultural and timber management uses;

(h) All mechanical devices, apparatus or equipment which are utilized for the protection or salvage of agricultural crops during periods of adverse weather conditions or when the use of mobile noise sources is necessary for pest control;

(i) Noise sources associated with maintenance of residential area property, provided said activities take place between 7:00 a.m. to sunset on any day except Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday, or between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; and, provided machinery is fitted with correctly functioning sound suppression equipment;

Chapter 41A-8 Butte County Interior Noise Standards

Interior noise standards discussed in Chapter 41A apply to all noise sensitive interior area within Butte County. The maximum allowable interior noise level standards for residential uses is 45 dB Ldn/CNEL, which is designed for sleep and speech protection. The typical structural attenuation of a residence from an exterior noise is 15 dBA when windows facing the noise source is open. When windows in good condition are closed, the noise attenuation factor is around 20 dBA for an older structure and 25 dBA for a newer dwelling constructed consistent with Title 24 of the California Energy Code.

Table 1.13-3. Maximum Allowable Interior Noise Standards

NOISE LEVEL DESCRIPTION	Daytime 7 am - 7 pm	Evening 7 pm - 10 pm	Nighttime 10 pm - 7 am
Hourly L_{eq} (dB)	45	40	35
Maximum Level (dB)	60	55	50
Source: Butte County Code Chapter 41A-8, Interior Noise Standards			

Discussion

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?

Less than significant impact. Noise associated with operation of the project include those commonly associated with industrial processing facilities. The proposed project would allow septage to be processed in the facility. The project site approximately 700 feet west of the nearest sensitive property. Other than the addition of negligible haul truck trips daily on Highway 99 and Shippee Road, the proposed action would not change existing noise levels.

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

No impact. The proposed action would not involve construction or related activities that could result in temporary or permanent sources of groundborne vibration.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No impact. The Oroville Municipal Airport is located approximately 6 miles southeast of the site. As referenced, the project site is located outside of the Airport Influence Area. Thus, while aircraft overflights would be audible at the project site, future development would not expose people residing on the parcels to excessive noise levels from a public use airport or private airstrip. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing.				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No impact. The project would allow septage waste to be processed at the existing facility. No new jobs would be generated nor would the action induce population growth in the County.

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

No impact. The proposed processing of septage material would not result in the loss of existing housing or cause a significant increase in the local population that would displace existing residents, necessitating the construction of additional housing.

1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?

Less than significant impact. The project is located in a moderate fire hazard area as designated by the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. It is located within a rural area northwest of the City of Oroville. The project site is within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA); thus, Butte County has fiscal responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires. The nearest staffed fire station is Butte County Fire Station #45, located at 2367 Campbell Street, Durham, California, approximately 8 miles northwest of the site. The proposed action would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. A less than significant impact would occur under this threshold.

Police protection?

No impact. The Butte County Sheriff's Office (BCSO) provides law enforcement service to the site from the headquarters located in the City of Oroville. The BCSO also maintains a mutual aid agreement with the Oroville Police Department. Municipal police departments are responsible for protecting the citizens and property within their jurisdictions. Under the terms of the mutual aid agreements, the BCSO can assume that role in these jurisdictions upon request or in the event of the inability of municipal police departments to provide law enforcement. Implementation of the proposed project could increase service calls when development occurs. The project would not require any new law enforcement

facilities or the alteration of existing facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives. No increase in demand for law enforcement is anticipated. No impact would occur under this threshold.

Schools?

No impact. The proposed action would allow the processing of septage material on the site. It would not affect demand for school facilities in the area. No impact would occur under this threshold.

Parks?

No impact. The project would not affect demand for existing local and regional park facilities. Approval of the project would allow septage to be processed at the existing facility. No impact would occur under this threshold.

Other public facilities?

No impact. Development of the project does not require the extension of any public infrastructure, such as roads, water, or sewer systems. The project may increase demand for County services such as fire protection and road maintenance. Other services such as law enforcement, schools, recreation and libraries would not be affected.

1.16 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation.				
Would the project:				
a) 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) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No impact. The proposed project would allow processing septage waste as part of the input stream. It would not have an impact on recreation resources. No impact would occur under this threshold.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No impact. The project would not include recreational facilities nor would allowing the processing of septage material require the expansion of existing recreational facilities. The project would not result in any adverse physical effects on the environment from construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.17 TRANSPORTATION

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

Discussion

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would allow the processing of septage material as part of the bio-digester process. The size of the system would not be increased; thus, the volume of material processed will not change from existing conditions. However, the number of truck trips may negligibly increase to accommodate the septage haulers. Operation of Highway 99 and Shippee Road is not expected to be affected by the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

There are no designated pedestrian or bicycle transportation facilities located near the project site, nor are such facilities proposed for the project area. Highway 99 is not identified as an existing or planned bike route in the adopted *2011 Butte County Bicycle Plan*. Development of the project would not impact alternative transportation facilities.

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

No impact. Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) was approved in 2013 and revised the method for assessing transportation impacts under CEQA. The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has recommended the use of vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as the required metric to replace the automobile delay-based Level of Service (LOS). The VMT assessment is required to satisfy CEQA guidelines that utilize VMT as the required metric to determine transportation impacts. To aid in SB 743 implementation, the state Office of Planning and Research (OPR), released a *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory) in December 2018. The Technical Advisory provides advice and recommendations regarding the assessment of VMT, thresholds of significance, VMT mitigation measures, and screening thresholds for certain land use projects.

VMT impact analysis is usually prepared using modified version 1.1–3.17.21 of the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS) travel demand model. This includes a review of the model's VMT forecasts by traffic analysis zone (TAZ) and adjustments to account for travel outside the model boundary. However, due to the uniqueness of the proposed project, a qualitative analysis for VMT was used.

The project proposes to include sewer septage to be processed by North State Rendering, Inc., (NSR) within its existing anaerobic digester and ponds. It is anticipated that approximately 7 trips per week will be generated (approximately 350 trips per year) to the facility. Currently sewer septage is transported directly to facilities near Orland and Lincoln, or transported to a transfer station at the Neal Road Recycling Waste Facility and then transferred to on of the two facilities outside of Butte County. With the processing of the sewer septage at NSR, VMT will be reduced by the following percentages from different parts of the County:

	Lincoln (miles)	Orland (miles	NSR (miles)	VMT % Reduction	
				Lincoln	Orland
Paradise	70	35	17	76	51
Chico	74	20	15	80	25
Oroville	52	43	14	73	67
Palermo	48	50	20	58	60
Magalia	74	39	21	72	46
Bangor	49	60	30	39	50

Note: Miles are an approximate determination

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

No impact. The proposed project would not change the configuration (alignment) of area roadways, and would not introduce types of vehicles that would result in dangerous conditions on area roads.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact. The project site would be accessed via an existing private driveway off Shippee Road. No changes to site access would occur; thus, no impact to emergency access would occur with approval of the proposed action.

1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.				
Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)?	☐ Yes			☒ No
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:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

Tribal Cultural Resources are defined as a site feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object, which is of cultural value to a Tribe and is either on or eligible for the California Historic Register, a local register, or a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion, chooses to treat as such (Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(1)).

Butte County contains a rich diversity of archaeological, prehistoric and historical resources. The General Plan 2030 EIR observes that the "archaeological sensitivity of Butte County is generally considered high, particularly in areas near water sources or on terraces along water courses" (Butte County General Plan EIR, 2010, p. 4.5-7).

A substantial adverse change upon a historically significant resource would be one wherein the resource is demolished or materially altered so that it no longer conveys its historic or cultural significance in such a way that justifies its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or such a local register (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, sub. (b)(2)). Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic period archaeological sites; historical features, such as rock walls, water ditches and flumes, and cemeteries; and architectural features. Cultural resources consist of any human-made site, object (i.e., artifact), or feature that defines and illuminates our past. Often such sites are found in foothill areas, areas with high bluffs, rock outcroppings, areas overlooking deer migratory corridors, or near bodies of water.

Per Assembly Bill AB 52 (Statutes of 2014) Notification Request, Public Resources Code Section 21080.3(b), the County received three letters for notification. One was from the Torres Martinez Cahuilla Indians, located in southern California near the Salton Sea, the United Auburn Indian Community, located near the City of Auburn and the Mechoopda Tribe in Chico. It was determined through discussion with the Torres Martinez Cahuilla Indians that they do not identify lands within Butte County within their geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation. The United Auburn Indian

Community provided a map of their area of traditional and cultural affiliation, which did not include the project site. The Mechoopda Tribe identified for projects in the Chico Area, which is does not include the project site.

Discussion

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:

a) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?**

No impact. The proposed action would allow septage to be processed at the existing rendering facility. It would not require any excavation or other ground disturbing activities. No historic resources occur on-site and none would be affected by the project. No impact would occur under this threshold.

b) **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?**

No impact. As detailed in response to Checklist Question 1.5b, no new construction or ground-disturbing activities are proposed that would result in impacts to known historic or cultural resources. No features exist on the property, including objects, sites, or landscapes, that could be considered as having cultural value to California Native American tribes, or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.

1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

Solid Waste

Most municipal wastes are hauled to the Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility, which is owned by Butte County and managed by the Butte County Department of Public Works. The Neal Road Facility is located at 1023 Neal Road, one mile east from State Highway 99, and seven miles southeast of Chico, on 190 acres owned by Butte County. The Neal Road Facility is permitted to accept municipal solid waste, inert industrial waste, demolition materials, special wastes containing nonfriable asbestos, and septage. Hazardous wastes, including friable asbestos, are not accepted at the Neal Road Facility or any other Butte County disposal facility, and must be transported to a Class I landfill permitted to receive untreated hazardous waste. The landfill has a design capacity of 25,271,900 cubic yards and is permitted to accept 1,500 tons per day; however, the average daily disposal into the landfill is approximately 466 tons. As of November 2017, the remaining capacity of the Neal Road Facility is approximately 15,449,172 cubic yards, which would give the landfill a service life to the year 2048 (Neal Road Recycling & Waste Facility, 2017).

Discussion

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

No impact. The project site is currently served by electric power (PG&E) and wireless phone service. Domestic wastewater is disposed of via a septic system. Processed wastewater is discharged into settling ponds. The proposed action would not affect the amount of either domestic or process wastewater discharged; and thus, would not require expansion of existing treatment systems. The project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded infrastructure including water services, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities.

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

No impact. Domestic water demand for the existing facility would not change with implementation of the proposed action. Existing groundwater supplies are anticipated to be available to serve the proposed project, and no additional or expanded entitlements are required for groundwater extraction and use.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

No impact. Domestic wastewater disposal is provided via a private on-site septic system. Process waste material is discharged into the settling ponds. No wastewater treatment provider currently serves the project area.

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

No impact. Operations would not result in an increase of biosolids or domestic waste that would require disposal at the Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility. The Neal Road Facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 1,500 tons per day, and an estimated current daily average throughput of 466 tons per day. Therefore, the facility would have adequate capacity to continue serving the existing facility.

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

No impact. The proposed project would comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Waste generated by the proposed project would consist of domestic refuse, material screened from the processed organic material and biosolids. The material would continue to be collected in approved trash bins and removed from the project site by a waste hauler.

1.20 WILDFIRE

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

Environmental Setting

The project site is designated as a moderate fire hazard by the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The project site is located within a designated Local Responsibility Area (LRA); thus, Butte County has fiscal responsibility for preventing and suppressing any potential wildfires.

Discussion

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

No impact. No on-site improvements would be required. Thus, no lane closures on Highway 99 or Shippee Road would occur. No project-related actions would create restrictions affecting emergency access or interfere with an emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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

No impact. The project site is located in an a predominantly agricultural area with flat topography. The nearest fire station to the project site is Butte County Fire Station #45 located at 2367 Campbell Street, Durham, California, approximately 8 miles northwest of the site. No conditions or factors have been identified in the project area that would exacerbate wildfire risks. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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

No impact. No off-site infrastructure improvements are needed to address fire or emergency access requirements. The existing driveway would accommodate emergency vehicles. No increase in the risk of wildland fires would occur with the approval of the project. No impact would occur under this threshold.

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

No impact. According to Butte County General Plan 2030 (Figure HS-5 and HS-6), the project site is located in an area with no or low potential for landslides (see discussion Section 1.7.a – Geology Soils). Therefore, no impacts from post-fire instability or drainage changes have been identified. No impact would occur under this threshold.

1.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

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

Less than significant. Potential impacts to biological resources and cultural resources associated with future project development were analyzed in this Initial Study. All direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts were determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact. No special status species or their habitat was identified on the site. Development of the project would not cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels or restrict the movement/distribution of a rare or endangered species. No mitigation would be required.

Development would not affect known significant historic resources or known archaeological or paleontological resources. There are no known unique ethnic or cultural values associated with the project site, nor are known religious or sacred uses associated with the project site. No excavation or other ground disturbing activities would occur; thus, no mitigation is required to address the potential discovery of unknown resources during excavation or other soil disturbance associated with development. No impact to cultural and paleontological would occur.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less than significant. The project would have no impact or a less than significant impact with respect to all environmental issues pursuant to CEQA. Due to the limited scope of direct physical impacts to the environment associated with the project, potential impacts are project-specific in nature. No mitigation measures would be required.

The cumulative effects resulting from build out of the Butte County General Plan 2030 were previously identified in the General Plan EIR. The type, scale, and location of the type of activity proposed would be consistent with the County's General Plan and zoning designation with approval of a MUP and is compatible with existing development on-site and adjacent agricultural uses. Because of this consistency, the potential cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project would fall within the impacts identified in the County's General Plan EIR.

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

Less than significant. There have been no impacts discovered through the review of this application demonstrating that approval of the MUP application and implementation of the proposed action would cause substantial adverse effects to human beings either directly or indirectly. No mitigation measures are required to reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

Authority for the Environmental Checklist: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21083.5.

Reference: Government Code Sections 65088.4.
Public Resources Code Sections 21080, 21083.5, 21095; *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.

Environmental Reference Materials

1. Butte County. *Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Butte County Airport Land Use Commission. November 15, 2017. Available at http://www.buttecounty.net/Portals/10/Docs/ALUC/BCALUCP_11-15-17/Butte_County_Airport_Land_ Use_Compatibility_Plan_2017-11-15.pdf

2. Butte County. *Butte County Bicycle Plan*. June 14, 2011. Available at https://www.buttecounty.net/Portals/22/downloads/BikewayMastserPlan/5-23-11%20FINAL%20Draft_County_Bike_Plan%20June%2014%202011%20with%20Table%20of%20Contents.pdf

3. Butte County. *Butte County Climate Action Plan*. February 25, 2014. Available at http://www.buttecap.net/

4. Butte County. *Butte County General Plan 2030 Final Environmental Impact Report*. April 8, 2010. Available at http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2010-08-30_FEIR/default.asp.

5. Butte County. *Butte County General Plan 2030*. October 26, 2010. Available at http://www.buttecounty.net/dds/Planning/GeneralPlan/Chapters.aspx

6. Butte County. *Butte County General Plan 2030 and Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*. June 17, 2015. Available at http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2012-05-31_GPA_ZO_SEIR/default.asp

7. Butte County. *Butte County General Plan 2030 Setting and Trends Report Public Draft*. August 2, 2007. Available at http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/SettingandTrends/default.asp.

8. Butte County. *Butte County Code of Ordinances, Chapters 19, 20, 24 & 41A*. Available at https://www.municode.com/library/ca/butte_county/codes/code_of_ordinances/

9. Butte County. *Butte County Department of Development Services GIS Data*. March 2020.

10. Butte County Air Quality Management District. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook – Guidelines for Assessing Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impacts for Projects Subject to CEQA Review*. October 23, 2014. Available at https://bcaqmd.org/planning/air-quality-planning-ceqa-and-climate-change/

11. Butte County Public Works Department, Division of Waste Management. Joint Technical Document-Neal Road Recycling and Waste Facility, Butte County, California. November 2017.

12. Butte County. Butte County Groundwater Management Plan, September 2004. http://www.buttecounty.net/waterresourceconservation/groundwatermanagementplan

13. California Department of Conservation. *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California. Altquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zone Maps*. Special Publication 42. Interim Revision. 2007.

14. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. *A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*. 2004.

15. California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2009. *Envirostor Database*. Accessed on May 2021. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public.

16. California Department of Finance. *Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018*. March 5, 2019.