

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Zone Amendment 22-0012
(Chad and Cori Abel 2019 Trust)

September 3, 2024

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY &
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
WITH
References and Documentation

Prepared by
SHASTA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, California 96001
SHASTA COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. **Project Title:**
Zone Amendment 22-0012 (Chad and Cori Abel 2019 Trust)
2. **Lead agency name and address:**
Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, CA 96001-1759
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Tara Petti, Senior Planner, (530) 225-5532
4. **Project Location:**
The 4.96-acre project site is an undeveloped property located in the Mountain Gate area at the end of Monique Lane, Redding, CA 96003, approximately 0.1 miles east of the intersection of Monique Lane and Holiday Road (Assessor's Parcel Number 307-210-027).
5. **Applicant/Owner Name and Address:**
Chad and Cori Abel 2019 Trust
2726 Vermeer Place
Redding, CA 96002
6. **Representative Name and Address:**
DKM/Horrocks Engineers
6172 Meister Way, Suite 1
Anderson, CA 96007
7. **General Plan Designation:**
Rural Residential A (RA)
8. **Zoning:**
Highway Commercial combined with Design Review (C-H-DR)
9. **Description of Project:**
The project is a zone amendment to change the zoning for a 4.96-acre parcel from the Highway Commercial combined with Design Review (C-H-DR) zone district to the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone district for the expansion of a recreational vehicle (RV) and boat storage facility (Exalt Boat & RV Storage Phase 1). The project site is located on 1.77 acres of the 4.96-acre parcel and consists of 30 recreational vehicle and boat storage spaces totaling approximately 17,220 square feet. The applicant is proposing three (3) storage areas that will either be fully enclosed warehouse space, covered awning space or open parking spaces, or a combination thereof. The proposed northern storage area is 5,040 square feet with 40-foot long spaces. The proposed eastern storage area is 6,300 square feet in size with 50-foot long spaces. The proposed southern storage area is 5,880 square feet in size with 35-foot long spaces. The various size storage areas are proposed to accommodate various size RV's and boats. If any of the spaces are enclosed within a warehouse unit, the warehouse units would be 17 feet tall with 12-foot by 14-foot roll up doors and neutral colored metal siding and roofing. If the storage spaces are covered by an awning, the awnings would be 17 feet tall with neutral colored metal roofing.

The project would consist of 37,249 square feet of permanent improvements including the proposed storage areas, drive aisles, and one ADA parking space. The project would require improvements to Monique Lane, including resurfacing and installation of a gate with a Knox key override for fire department access. The project site will be secured by 6- to 8-foot tall-screened fencing on the north, east and south sides, and 6- to 8-foot tall ornamental iron fencing on the west side. A 25-foot non-disturbance area is designated adjacent to a stream channel that runs along the southern property line. Drainage improvements include a slope drain at the bottom of the eastern slope, an infiltration trench to capture stormwater in conformance with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)

permit requirements, and a culvert with an armored outlet on the southwest edge of the project site. The project also includes trench work for utilities, landscaping along the western property line, and other ancillary onsite improvements.

Approximately 1.77 acres would be graded, consisting of 11,000 cubic yards of cut and 6,350 cubic yards of fill, in order to prepare the site for the proposed improvements. Finished slopes will be graded to a 2:1 ratio and hydroseeded. Approximately 5,150 cubic yards of excess cut material will be used to make improvements to Monique Lane and the remainder of the material will be hauled off-site.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site slopes upward from west to east, rising from approximately 870 feet to 970 feet in elevation. Vegetative cover is characterized as Blue Oak-Foothill Pine and Montane Hardwood habitats with blue oaks and interior live oaks on the eastern portion of the property and grasslands on the western portion. Tree cover is increasingly dense toward the east end of the property. A low ridge runs east to west through the center of the property. Runoff sheet flows to either side of this ridge in a northerly or southerly direction. Both the northern and southern hillslopes drain to an ephemeral stream along the south property line. Runoff from the project site and the hillslope to the east drains to this stream then to a culvert that transports water under and west of Interstate 5 to a tributary of Moody Creek. This stream flattens out near the southwest corner of the property resulting in a small wetland area.

The project site is adjacent to Mountain Gate RV Park which exists on property to the north that is zoned Commercial Recreation combined with Design Review (C-R-DR). A 43.54-acre undeveloped property with significant slopes is situated uphill and adjacent to the eastern extent of the project site that is in the Rural Residential (R-R) zone district. This property has an extensive tree canopy mapped as Blue Oak-Foothill Pine and Montane Hardwood habitats. The existing Luxe Boat and RV Storage facility is located to the west on an approximately 6.24-acre property and is currently zoned C-R after having been rezoned from the Rural Residential combined with Mobile Home and Design Review (R-R-T-DR) zone district in 2019 to facilitate the development of the facility. Holiday Road and Interstate 5 lie just west of the project site. A 29.27-acre undeveloped property is located to the south of the project site. This property is characterized as annual grassland on the western half and Blue Oak-Foothill Pine and Montane Hardwood habitats on the eastern half, and is located in the R-R-T-DR zone district.

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

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Mountain Gate Community Services District (Water Department)
Mountain Gate Community Services District (Fire Department)
Shasta County Department of Public Works

12. 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.?

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California & Toyon-Wintu Center (Tribe), filed and Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1 the Department of Resource Management sent a certified letter to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request formal consultation on the project in writing. The Tribe received a certified letter of notification on November 7, 2022, with the 30-day notification period ending December 7, 2022. To date, no response has been received.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental

review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the initial evaluation:


- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Copies of the Initial Study and related materials and documentation may be obtained at the Planning Division of the Department of Resource Management, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001. Contact Tara Petti, Senior Planner, at (530) 225-5532.



Tara Petti
Senior Planner

9/3/24
Date

 For:

Adam Fieseler
Acting Director of Resource Management

9/3/24
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if all the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more, “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less-than-significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are “Less-than-significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. General Plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify the following:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
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 a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			✓	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	

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

a-c) The project would not substantially damage any scenic resource within a state scenic highway and would not have an adverse effect on any scenic vista. The project site is located at the terminus of Monique Lane, to the east of Holiday Road and Interstate 5 (I-5) in the Mountain Gate area. The project site is not located in a designated scenic corridor. The project site is within a segment of I-5 that is identified in the Shasta County General Plan, Scenic Highways Section 6.8, as a state route eligible for scenic designation as a corridor in which the natural and man-made environments contrast. Construction of recreational related facilities are consistent with surrounding uses.

The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project would be located behind the existing Exalt Boat and RV storage development. Forested areas are present between the project site and the recreational vehicle park located approximately 100 feet to the north and the nearest residences located approximately 800 feet to the south. There is an undeveloped residential parcel south of the project site. The project includes 6- to 8-foot tall screened fencing on the north, south and eastern sides of the project area, and a 6- to 8-foot tall ornamental iron fence on the western property line. The visual buffer provided by the forested areas and the proposed fencing would sufficiently obscure views of the project site from the north, south and east. Landscaping is required along the project frontage, except for within the 25-foot designated non-disturbance buffer adjacent to the stream along the southern property line. Once the landscaping is established, it will obscure views of the project from northbound I-5. Grading during construction would temporarily degrade the views of the west facing hillside on the project parcel; however, all disturbed areas, including the hillside, will require permanent erosion control including revegetation in accordance with the Shasta County grading standards and the Construction General Permit required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for all grading that disturbs one acre or more of land.

The conditions of approval will require the proposed buildings to be constructed with neutral color metal siding and roofing that is antiglare. The proposed siding and roofing material colors shall be provided with the building permit application(s) and approved by the Shasta County Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit(s). The project as proposed is consistent with the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The use of non-reflective construction materials would eliminate potential glare. All project lighting plan will be required to meet Shasta County Zoning Plan Section 17.84.040 standards which require that lighting be designed and located so as to confine direct lighting to the premises and that a light source shall not shine upon or illuminate directly on any surface other than the area required to be lighted. The C-R zone district development standards will include that all exterior lighting be fully shielded (bulb not visible), fully cut-off (no light above horizontal), and appropriately located so as to meet these requirements. On site lighting will include a combination of motion sensor lighting and constant lighting for safety. A lighting plan, including the location and cut sheets for the proposed lighting fixtures and bulbs, shall be submitted with the building permit application(s) and approved the Shasta County Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit(s).

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<p>II. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</u> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				✓
c) 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?				✓

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

- a) The subject property is not identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Statewide Importance on the map titled Shasta County Important Farmland 2016. The project site is mapped as “Other Land.” Therefore, the project would not convert any Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland).
- b) Neither this property nor the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use nor are they in a Williamson Act Contract. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.
- c) The project site is not forest land, timberland or zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the project would not 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) The project site is not forest land. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- e) The project would not result in any other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-

agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project is not forest land or Farmland and is not adjacent forest land or Farmland. The site is not located in an area of significant agricultural soils.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	

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

a-b) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2021 Attainment Plan for Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin as adopted by Shasta County Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), or any other applicable air quality plan. The project would be subject to standard conditions governing air quality and would not violate any air quality standards. The project would not contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. There is no existing air quality violation and there is not a projected violation as a result of the proposed project.

During construction the operation of gas- and diesel-powered off-road equipment would be the primary sources of air contaminants, including engine emissions and fugitive dust. The bulk of air contaminants from these sources would be emitted during the site preparation phase of the construction project from activities such as grading and excavation to prepare the site for improvements. Other potential sources of air contaminants during construction could include application of architectural coatings and the use of adhesives and sealants. However, the emissions emitted during construction would be limited and temporary.

The project does not include any stationary source of air contaminants. During operations vehicular traffic generated by the facility would be the primary source of air contaminants. A commercial storage facility for recreational vehicles and boats with 30 units would be expected to generate an average of 9 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekdays and 7 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekends. These estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual* trip generation rates, and an analysis of actual trip generation for Phase 1 of the applicant's RV and boat storage facility which has 160 storage units. This is not a significant increase in traffic, and the project is consistent with the air quality attainment plan.

The NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2021) designates Shasta County as an area of Nonattainment with respect to the ozone California ambient air quality standards. Nitrogen oxides (NOx) are a group of highly reactive gasses and are also known as "oxides of nitrogen." Because NOx is an ingredient in the formation of ozone, it is referred to as an ozone precursor. NOx is emitted from combustion sources such as cars, trucks and buses, power plants, and off-road equipment. Construction equipment and activities associated with making probable improvements would generate air contaminants, including oxides of nitrogen (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon dioxide (CO2) and particulate matter (PM10), in the form of engine exhaust and fugitive dust. However, the emissions emitted during construction would be limited and temporary. The facility would provide recreational enthusiasts an opportunity to stage equipment such as boats and off-highway vehicles nearer recreational opportunities in the vicinity, including Lake Shasta and the Chappie-Shasta Off-Highway Vehicle Area. This could result in beneficial air quality impacts through increased fuel efficiency associated with a reduction in vehicle towing miles traveled by users of the facility.

In addition, the Shasta County General Plan requires Standard Mitigation Measures and Best Available Mitigation Measures on all discretionary land use applications as recommended by the SCAQMD in order to mitigate both direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment pollutants. The SCAQMD has reviewed the project and no concerns were raised. The project would not 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 and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the NSVPA Air Quality Attainment Plan (2021) as adopted by Shasta County, or any other applicable air quality plan.

c-d) The nearest sensitive receptors are the Mountain Gate RV Park located approximately 100 feet to the north and residential development approximately 800 feet south of the project site. Potential impacts from exhaust odor during construction and from delivery trucks would depend on the degree of transport, relative concentration upon arrival at the project site, and/or sensitivity of the receiving party. Equipment used to construct the proposed improvements would produce emissions that some may find objectionable. However, the emissions emitted during construction would be limited and temporary, dissipate quickly over distance, and not likely be noticeable beyond the project boundaries. Mobile equipment operators and truck drivers would be subject to SCAQMD and State diesel idling rules which minimizes the length of time that a diesel engine can remain idle and be subject to all engine emissions regulations and standards. Substantial pollutant concentrations are not anticipated due to the limited scope and duration of construction. Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or 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?				✓

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

a) Project-related construction activities include the removal of roughly 38 oak trees along with 1.77 acres of ground disturbance involving grading and trenching. A Biological Review (BR) prepared by Wildland Resource Managers determined, through a records search, that 8 listed species and species of special concern, and two rare plant species have potential to occur on-site or in the general project area. Biological and botanical surveys of the project site were conducted by Wildland Resource Managers on five separate dates between April 19, 2023, and May 15, 2023, and no special status species were observed. In addition, no suitable

habitat for any of those wildlife species is present on the project site.

While no special status species were observed during surveys conducted at the project site, the BR confirms that project area contains suitable habitat for tree- and ground-nesting birds. Nesting migratory birds and raptors, if present, could be directly or indirectly impacted by construction, land modification, and vegetation removal activities. Direct effects could include mortality resulting from vegetation removal and/or construction equipment operating in an area containing an active nest with eggs or chicks. Indirect effects could include nest abandonment by adults in response to loud noise levels, human encroachment, or a reduction in the amount of food available to young birds due to changes in feeding behavior by adults. Mitigation Measure IV.a.1 would require that ground disturbance and vegetation and tree removal take place outside of the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds or surveys must be conducted prior to disturbance. If an active nest(s) is discovered during surveys, a non-disturbance buffer would be established around the nest. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on any candidate, sensitive, or special-status avian species that may be present at the time construction commences.

The BR also confirms that the project area contains suitable habitat for bat species which are non-game mammals protected by State law. Construction activity, including ground disturbance and vegetation removal, could have a potentially significant impact if bats are present on-site. Mitigation Measure IV.a.2 would require that a survey be conducted for roosting opportunities prior to tree removal and that ground disturbance and vegetation removal must take place outside of the roosting period and, if roosting habitat is discovered, said trees must be removed through a two-step process. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on bats that may be present at the time construction commences.

Lighting from the project is limited to five shielded and down-directed service lights that would each be located between the proposed storage areas to illuminate the interior drive aisle. All project lighting plan will be required to meet Shasta County Zoning Plan Section 17.84.040 standards which require that lighting be designed and located so as to confine direct lighting to the premises and direct that a light source shall not shine upon or illuminate directly on any surface other than the area required to be lighted. The C-R zone district development standards require that all exterior lighting be fully shielded (bulb not visible), fully cut-off (no light above horizontal), and appropriately located so as to meet these requirements. While lighting has been shown to have adverse effects on wildlife and plant species, the minimal lighting proposed by the project and strict conformance to the C-R zone district development standards, impacts from lighting on wildlife or plants would be less-than-significant.

- b-c) The BR indicates that a Federal and State jurisdictional ephemeral stream (0.0048 acres) and connected wetland (0.0029 acres) that is a tributary to Rancheria Creek is located along the southern property line. There is sparse riparian habitat on the north bank within the proposed disturbance area. A 25-foot non-disturbance buffer along the ephemeral stream and connected wetland is proposed as part of the project to protect the integrity of the existing vegetation and riparian habitat. Accidental infringement into the identified 25-foot non-disturbance buffer during construction could inadvertently deposit fill into jurisdictional waters, damage existing trees and vegetation and compact the soil. Mitigation Measure IV.b.1 would require that the 25-foot non-disturbance area be fenced off prior to any on-site disturbance.

Shasta County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 95-157 provides voluntary Oak Woodland Management Guidelines for private landowners. Oak woodlands are listed as a sensitive natural community on the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Natural Community List. Under CEQA section 21083.4, a lead agency shall determine if a project may result in a conversion of oak woodlands that will have a potentially significant effect on the environment, and if so, the lead agency shall require mitigation measures that conserve existing oak trees, compensate for the loss of oak trees proposed to be removed and/or contribute funds to the Oak Woodland Conservation Fund.

Shasta County performed an oak woodland impact analysis in accordance with the University of California Oak Woodland Impact Decision Matrix, as recommended by CDFW, during early consultation. The current condition of the oak woodlands and degree to which the baseline condition will be altered as a result of the project were assessed. There is evidence of prior disturbance on the western portion of the subject property, where the existing oak canopy cover is approximately 25 percent, and vegetative cover is predominantly annual grasses and forbs with little midstory and overstory vegetation. The habitat on the western portion is characterized in the BR as oak stands with open grassland and edge habitat. The density of oak trees and midstory species is significantly greater on the eastern portion of the subject parcel, outside the proposed limits of disturbance.

Project improvements would be concentrated within a 1.77-acre area in the western portion of the subject property. The project would convert approximately 0.85 acres of the 1.77-acre project site to impervious surface. Slopes would be graded and cut in a 2:1 configuration to accommodate building construction in conformance with the California Building Standards Code. Additional improvements include a drainage conveyance and stormwater infiltration system and construction of road access and utility improvements from the project site west to Holiday Road. The proposed improvements and associated grading will alter existing hydrology and result in the removal of 38 oak trees, 24 of which are greater than 12 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH).

Based on the anticipated reduction of percent canopy cover from the removal of oak trees, changes in hydrology from grading,

and the permanent conversion of vegetated edge habitat to impervious surface, it was determined that the oak woodlands would be moderately impacted by the construction of permanent improvements, and mitigation measures would be necessary to avoid potentially significant impacts to oak woodlands, and the associated loss of nesting, denning, burrowing, hibernating and roosting structures, habitats and refugia for sedentary species, hydrologic function, and environmental conditions supporting natural regeneration of oak species.

Mitigation Measure IV.b.2 would require that oak trees not slated for removal be clearly marked for preservation prior to any tree removal or ground disturbance, and that all oak trees identified for removal are replaced at a 3:1 ratio.

Soil compaction resulting from construction activities could potentially impede the natural regeneration of oak trees in the areas surrounding the proposed permanent improvements. Mitigation Measure IV.b.2 would require that all disturbed areas located on site that are not subject to permanent improvements be decompacted through mechanical ripping to facilitate natural regeneration.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities including oak woodlands.

- d) The BR indicates that there is no suitable habitat for fish on the project site and that the project would not interfere with wildlife corridors and migratory routes that were observed during site surveys on the eastern portion of the subject property.
- e) The project would not conflict with any ordinances or policies which protect biological resources.
- f) The project would not 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 such plans have been adopted that encompass or otherwise apply to the project site.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts from the project to biological resources would be less-than-significant.

- IV.a.1) In order to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and Section 3503.5, including their nests and eggs, one of the following shall be implemented:
 - a. Conduct vegetation and tree removal activities associated with construction between September 1 and January 31 when birds are not nesting; or
 - b. If vegetation or tree removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of vegetation removal or construction activities. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No vegetation removal, tree removal or construction activities shall occur within this non-disturbance buffer until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by the qualified biologist. The results of the pre-construction surveys shall be sent electronically to CDFW at RICEQARedding@wildlife.ca.gov.
- IV.a.2) In order to avoid impacts to bats, the following shall be implemented:
 - a. Conduct removal and disturbance of trees outside of the bat maternity season and bat hibernacula (September 1 to October 31).
 - b. If removal or disturbance of trees will occur during the bat maternity season, when young are non-volant (March 1 - August 31), or during the bat hibernacula (November 1 - March 1), large trees (those greater than 5 inches in diameter) shall be thoroughly surveyed for cavities, crevices, and/or exfoliated bark that may have high potential to be used by bats within 14 days of tree removal or disturbance. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or arborist familiar with these features to determine if tree features and habitat elements are present. Trees with features potentially suitable for bat roosting should be clearly marked prior to removal and humane evictions must be conducted by or under the supervision of a biologist with specific experience conducting exclusions. Humane exclusions could consist of a two-day tree removal process whereby the non-habitat trees and brush are removed along with certain tree limbs on the first day and the remainder of the tree on the second day.
- IV.b.1) In order to avoid impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities including oak woodlands, the following shall be implemented:
 - Construction fencing shall be installed along the perimeter of the 25-foot non-disturbance area prior to any on-site disturbance and until the Regional Water Quality Control Board determines the project site is stable and closes the Construction General Permit.

- IV.b.2) In order to avoid impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities including oak woodlands, the following shall be implemented:
- a. All oak trees not identified to be removed on sheet 2 of 6 of the project plans that are located along the stream on the south side of the project site, along the northern property line, and adjacent to but outside the eastern boundary of the proposed disturbance area shall be clearly marked to remain prior to any tree removal or ground disturbance.
 - b. Blue Oak and Live Oak shall be planted from seed at a 3:1 ratio to replace the 38 trees proposed to be removed. Viable acorns shall be planted in the fall after the first rains using the following protocol: Scalp a circle two feet in radius around each planting spot to remove other vegetation. Plant acorns in pairs, placed on their sides in approximately 2-inch holes, cover with soil, and cover the scalped area and planting sites with mulch such as oak leaves or weed free straw.
 - c. All disturbed areas located that are not subject to permanent improvements shall be decompacted using mechanical ripping along the slope contours to facilitate natural regeneration of oak trees.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✓
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✓
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓

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

- a-b) In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California & Toyon-Wintu Center (Tribe) filed and Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1, the Department of Resource Management sent a certified letter to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request formal consultation on the project in writing. The Tribe received a certified letter of notification on November 7, 2022, with the 30-day notification period ending December 7, 2022. To date, no response has been received.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the project would result in any significant effect to historical, archeological, paleontological, unique geologic resource, or human remains, there is always the possibility that such resources or remains could be encountered. Therefore, if, in the course of development, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered or otherwise detected or observed, ground disturbance activities in the affected area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to review the site and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Environmental Review Officer, appropriate mitigation shall be required.

- c) The project site is not on or adjacent to any known cemetery or burial area. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would disturb any human remains. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site until the coroner has determined if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the coroner determines that human remains are not subject to his or her authority and recognizes or has reason to believe the remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

- a) The project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. During construction there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources required for the movement of equipment and materials. Compliance with local, State, and federal regulations (e.g., limit engine idling times, requirement for the recycling of construction debris, etc.) would reduce and/or minimize short-term energy demand during construction to the extent feasible, and construction would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Furthermore, through compliance with applicable requirements and/or regulations of the 2016 California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code, individual project elements would be consistent with State reduction policies and strategies, and would not consume energy resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner. During operation of the completed project, there are no unusual project characteristics or processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than is used for comparable projects or the use of equipment that would not conform to current emissions standards and related fuel efficiencies.
- b) The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. State and local agencies regulate the use and consumption of energy through various methods and programs. As a result of the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) (the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) which seeks to reduce the effects of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions, a majority of the state regulations are intended to reduce energy use and GHG emissions. These include, among others, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11– California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The project is a consumer and end user of electricity and fuel. It is assumed that electricity consumed by the project would be provided by the applicable service provider in accordance with state renewable energy plans and that vehicles used during the construction phase would conform with state regulations and plans regarding fuel efficiency. At the local level, the County’s Building Division enforces the applicable requirements of the Energy Efficiency Standards and Green Building Standards in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Rupture of a known earthquake, fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publications 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? 			✓	

<u>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			✓	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			✓	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				✓
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓

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

- a) The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i, ii, iii) Rupture of a known earthquake fault; Strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;

According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps for Shasta County, there is no known earthquake fault on the project site. According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. The entire County is in Seismic Design Category D. According to the Seismic Hazards Assessment for the City of Redding, California, prepared by Woodward Clyde, dated July 6, 1995, the most significant earthquake at the project site may be a background (random) North American crustal event up to 6.5 on the Richter scale at distances of 10 to 20 km. All structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted California Building Standards Code (CBC). In addition, a soils report would be required for the project that would determine the expansive potential of site soils and provide recommendations for site preparation and construction methods. Compliance with these CBC standards and soils report recommendations would ensure that the structures and associated improvements are designed and constructed to withstand expected seismic activity and associated potential hazards. This impact would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides.

The project is located in the vicinity of soils classified by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Soil Conservation Service Web Soil Survey as Goulding very rocky loam. This soil class is steeper than the topography within the project area, with 50 to 70 percent slopes and a moderate erosion hazard rating. It is found to the east of the project area and within the boundaries of the subject property. Grading at the eastern edge of the project area could potentially affect the drainage pattern and soil stability in the vicinity of the steeper slopes to the east. All the sloped areas disturbed during project construction will be graded to a 2:1 ratio and hydroseeded. In addition, The CBC enforced by Shasta County requires a soils report be prepared and submitted with building permit applications that would provide recommendations for site preparation and construction methods. The report must be prepared by a California Licensed Engineer and would adequately address soil conditions at the site. Implementation of soil stabilization measures and strict conformance to the recommendations in the soils report would reduce the susceptibility of the project to landslides to a less than significant level.

- b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The United USDA, Soil Conservation Service Web Soil Survey identified the soils in the project site area as Auburn Clay Loam, with 8 to 30 percent slopes. This soil type is rated moderate for erosion hazard.. The proposed area of disturbance has approximately 10 percent slopes. Approximately 11,000 cubic yards of cut and 6,350 cubic yards of fill will be necessary to prepare the project site for permanent improvements in accordance with the CBC. Slopes will be graded to a 2:1 ratio and hydroseeded. A grading permit from the Building Division is required prior

to any site disturbance. The grading permit includes requirements for erosion and sediment control, including retention of topsoil. In addition, a state Construction General Permit (CGP) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is required prior to initiation of grading activities because the project would involve the disturbance of more than one acre of land. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed in accordance with the CGP. The SWPPP will include construction Best Management Practices (BMP's) to prevent erosion and loss of topsoil during construction, and post-construction BMP's to prevent erosion from ongoing project operations., and The C-R zone district development standards will require that CGP from the RWQCB will be obtained prior to issuance of a grading permit by the Building Division.

- c) The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. According to the Shasta County General Plan Section 5.1, Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. Based on records of construction in the area, there is no evidence to support a conclusion that the project is on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Furthermore, all structures shall be constructed according to the seismic requirements of the currently adopted Building Code. A geotechnical report is required to be submitted with building plans for the project. This report would address any site specific geotechnical deficiencies which may exist.
- d) Soils within the site are not described as expansive soils in the Soil Survey of Shasta County, completed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service in August of 1974. Identified soils within the boundaries of the subject property are Auburn clay loam, 8 to 30 percent slopes, eroded; and Goulding very rocky loam, 50 to 70 percent slopes, eroded. Both soil types are considered to have low shrink-swell (expansive) potential. The California Building Standards Code enforced by Shasta County requires a soils report be prepared and submitted with building permit applications that would determine the expansive potential of site soils and provide recommendations for site preparation and construction methods. The report must be prepared by a California Licensed Engineer and would adequately address soil conditions at the site.
- e) The project does not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.
- f) Upon review of the Minerals Element of the General Plan, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature. There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features in the project vicinity.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

- a-b) In 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing that it is the State of California's goal to reduce statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emission levels. Subsequently, in 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act. In part, AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board to develop and adopt regulations to achieve a reduction in the State's GHG emissions to year 1990 levels by year 2020. In 2016, SB 32 and its companion bill AB 197 amended Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, establishing a new climate pollution reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

California Senate Bill (SB) 97 established that an individual project's effect on GHG emission levels and global warming must be assessed under CEQA. SB 97 further directed that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop guidelines for the assessment of a project's GHG emissions. Those guidelines for GHG emissions were subsequently included as amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. The guidelines did not establish thresholds of significance and there are currently no state, regional or county guidelines or thresholds with which to direct project-level CEQA review. As a result, Shasta County reserves the right to use a qualitative and/or quantitative threshold of significance until a specific quantitative threshold is adopted by the state or regional air district.

The County has historically utilized a quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold based on a methodology recommended by the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) and accepted by the California Air Resources Board. According to CAPCOA's Threshold 2.3, CARB Reporting Threshold, 10,000 metric tons of carbon-dioxide equivalents per year (mtCO₂eq/yr) is recommended as a quantitative non-zero threshold. This threshold would be the operational equivalent of 550 dwelling units,

400,000 square feet of office use, 120,000 square feet of retail, or 70,000 square feet of supermarket use. This approach is estimated to capture over half the future residential and commercial development projects in the State of California and is designed to support the goals of AB 32. The use of this quantitative non-zero project-specific threshold by Shasta County, as lead agency, would be consistent with certain practices of other lead agencies in the County and throughout the State of California.

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

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

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

Operational emissions from the proposed project would be significantly less than the quantitative non-zero project-specific thresholds described above. The scope of the proposed project improvements will not involve a significant number of equipment hours to complete and would not generate significant traffic volumes during construction. All off-road equipment used during construction would be in conformance with applicable emissions standards. Post-construction, the commercial storage facility for recreational vehicles and boats is not expected to generate significant GHG emissions. As noted previously, a commercial storage facility for recreational vehicles (RV's) and boats with 30 units would be expected to generate an average of 9 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekdays and 7 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekends. These estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual* trip generation rates, and an analysis of actual trip generation for Phase 1 of the applicant's RV and boat storage which has 160 storage units. This is not a significant increase in traffic. The project is a consumer and end user of electricity and fuel. It is assumed that electricity consumed by the project would be provided by the applicable service provider in accordance with state renewable energy plans and that vehicles used during the construction phase would conform with state regulations and plans regarding fuel efficiency. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, nor would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			✓	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				✓

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

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

- a-b) The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No hazardous materials or generator fuels are proposed as part of the project’s on-going operations. Hazardous materials such as industrial fuels, oils, hydraulic fluids, lubricants and solvents may be stored at the site during construction. If hazardous materials are to be handled during construction in reportable quantities (55 gallons (liquids), 500 pounds (solids), or 200 cubic feet for a compressed gas), the applicant is required by law to have a Hazardous Materials Business Plan in place prior handling hazardous materials at the site. The C-R zone district development standards will require compliance with this regulatory requirement. In addition, the SWPPP required under the CGP requires Best Management Practices for the handling accidental spills of hazardous materials during construction to prevent release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c) The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is 1.20 miles to the southwest.
- d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There is no historical evidence of any commercial activity on the site that would have used hazardous materials.
- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f) A review of the project, the Shasta County and City of Anderson Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Shasta County Emergency Operations Plan, indicates that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- g) The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The project is located in an area which is designated as a “Very High” fire hazard severity zone and is within the State Responsibility Area. The proposed use of a recreational vehicle and boat storage facility would not have a large number of people frequenting the site at any given time. All improvements would be constructed in accordance with the Shasta County Fire Safety Standards. These standards also require the clearing of combustible vegetation around all structures for a distance of not less than 30 feet on each side or to the property line. The California Public Resources Code Section 4291 includes a “Defensible Space” requirement of clearing 100 feet around all buildings or to the property line, whichever is less. The project site is located within the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District and all development plans will require their review and approval prior to issuance of building permits.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			✓	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may			✓	

X. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u>: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (iv) impede or redirect 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 management plan?			✓	

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

- a) The project is located in a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4) area and is therefore subject to the requirements of Shasta County’s Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance. The ordinance requires the implementation of construction and post-construction BMPs that control the discharge of pollutants to the County storm water conveyance system or receiving waters to the maximum extent practical. A Shasta County grading permit will be required for this project. The project involves land disturbance of one acre or more, and as a result a Construction General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance activities (CGP) from the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will also be required. The provisions of the CGP would address construction and post construction storm water pollution. Through adherence to the provisions of the County MS4 and grading ordinances and the CGP water quality and waste discharge standards will not be violated. Nor would surface or ground water quality be otherwise substantially degraded. Therefore, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.
- b) The project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Water service for the proposed development would be provided by the Mountain Gate Community Services District (District). The District is responsible for review of groundwater supplies prior to approving the water supply for the project. The District has indicated in response to an informal consultation referral sent by the Shasta County Department of Resource Management Planning Division that they have no concerns regarding the proposed project. Therefore, the project is unlikely to result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c) The project would disturb approximately 1.77 acres and would result in approximately 0.85 acres of new impervious surface area. The surrounding hillslopes would be graded to prepare the project site for permanent improvements in accordance with the California Building Standards Code, and final slopes will be stabilized at 2:1 configuration and hydroseeded. Consequently, the project would alter the existing drainage pattern and increase the rate and volume of stormwater discharge from the project.

The applicant proposes to reduce the potential for downstream flooding as a result of these increases by capturing and infiltrating stormwater on-site and providing controls to reduce the volume and rate of flow to a pre-project level in accordance with MS-4 requirements. A stormwater infiltration trench is proposed around the perimeter and through the center of the proposed site improvements and an engineered outlet control structure is proposed at the terminus of the infiltration trench in the southwest corner of the project site. Site contours would be engineered, along with concrete valley gutters and storm drains to control and direct the flow of stormwater to the proposed infiltration trench. Stormwater infiltration infrastructure and controlled discharge through the outlet control structure would minimize peak flows from the project during a rain event. Design calculations prepared by Horrocks Engineers Inc./ DKM indicate that the proposed facilities would reduce post-development peak flows from the property so as not to exceed pre-development peak flows for the 10-, 25- and 100-year rain events. Therefore, as proposed the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or create or

contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. County MS4 and RWCQB Construction General Permit requirements address erosion control. Compliance with these requirements would ensure the project does not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

- d) The project is not in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.
- e) Through adherence to the proposed stormwater treatment measures, the provisions of the required grading permit and RWQCB Construction General Permit, including erosion and sediment control measures, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				✓
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?				✓

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

- a) The project does not include the creation of any road, ditch, wall, or other feature which would physically divide an established community.
- b) The project as proposed does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project is a zone amendment from Commercial Highway and Design Review (C-H-DR) to Commercial Recreation (C-R) for the construction and operation of a storage facility for RV’s and boats. The purpose of the C-R zone district is to provide opportunities for the development of privately owned land for commercial recreational activities which need or utilize, and provide for the enjoyment of, the natural environment. A storage facility is a permitted use in the C-R zone district when used for recreational equipment. The existing Luxe Boat and RV Storage facility is located to the west on an approximately 6.24-acre property and is currently zoned C-R after having been rezoned from the Rural Residential combined with Mobile Home and Design Review (R-R-T-DR) zone district in 2019 to facilitate the development of the facility. The proposed RV and boat storage facility is located in close proximity to Shasta Lake and Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by Bureau of Land Management. The location of the project site is visible from and has direct access to Interstate 5 which provides a convenient location and easy access for local residents and other vacationers to store boats and recreational equipment.

The C-R zone district is consistent with all General Plan designations, including the Rural Residential A (RA) designation of the project site, when the development blends harmoniously with the surrounding natural environment. The project is consistent with similar facilities in the Mountain Gate area and will include design features and neutral color palette to more effectively blend with the natural environment.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

- a) There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State.
- b) The project site is not identified in the General Plan Minerals Element as containing a locally-important mineral resource. There is no other land use plan which addresses minerals. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✓	
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?				✓

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

- a) The project would not result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project site is located approximately 550 feet east of Interstate 5. The Shasta County General Plan designates the year 2020 transportation noise level in the area of the project site to be within the 60dB and 65dB noise levels. Noise sensitive uses in this area are exposed to ambient noise levels that are generally greater than areas located further from the Interstate 5 corridor. There will be an increase in noise levels caused by the daily activities of clients using the facility, but due to the nature of the project, these activities would not be expected to substantially increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project is not expected to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Project related construction activities will result in temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and will be prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays. The temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project is expected to be less-than-significant.
- b) The project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Vibration attenuates rapidly with distance. The construction and operation of the project would not involve equipment or activities that could generate perceptible vibrations. The project does not include the use of equipment or conduct of activities that are commonly associated with potentially significant groundborne vibration and noise.
- c) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

- a) The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. No onsite manager or caretaker facility is proposed. The project does not include the development of new homes or businesses, nor would any new jobs be created as a result of the project. The project would include the development of an access driveway and extensions of utilities solely to serve the proposed RV and boat storage facility. There would be no extension of other infrastructure. Therefore, the project is not expected to induce substantial growth in the area.
- b) The project does not include the demolition of any existing housing. The project would not displace any people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be no impact.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?			✓	
Police Protection?			✓	
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other public facilities?			✓	

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

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for:

Fire Protection

The project is located in an area which is designated as a “Very High” fire hazard severity zone and within the State Responsibility Area. The property receives fire protection services from the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District which has expressed no fire suppression concerns for this project. Construction plans will be reviewed by the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District for compliance with all applicable Fire Safety Standards. The project includes the installation of an additional fire hydrant, and no additional personnel, or otherwise significantly impact fire protection services are anticipated.

Police Protection

The County employs a total of 165 sworn and 69 non-sworn County peace officers (Sheriff’s deputies) to serve a population of 66,850 persons that reside in the unincorporated area of the County (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, April 1, 2020). This

level of staffing equates to a ratio of approximately one officer per 286 persons. The project will not result in additional residences and would not warrant any additional Sheriff's deputies. The Shasta County Sheriff's Office provided a response to early referral expressing concerns that crimes of opportunity such as theft, burglary and vandalism are common with businesses and locations similar to the proposed RV and boat storage facility, and that the proposed project could, as a result, increase calls for service in response to crimes occurring at the proposed location. The Sheriff's Office recommended security measures to deter property related crimes, and those security measures are incorporated into the C-R zone district development standards.

Schools

The project not be expected to directly or indirectly generate any new school enrollments or otherwise affect schools. Potential impacts to schools would be mitigated through the payment of applicable development impact fees prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Parks

The project is located in the unincorporated portion of Shasta County which does not have a formal park and recreation program normally found within incorporated cities.

Other Public Facilities

As noted in section XIV. Population and Housing, subsection a), the project is not expected to result in substantial population growth. Therefore, the project would not create a need for the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or physically altered governmental facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Development of the site would increase its value for property tax purposes. County General Fund revenue derived from property taxes can be spent on general government services, public health, the library system, animal control, and other public facilities at the discretion of the Shasta County Board of Supervisors. Any funds dedicated to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or physically altered governmental facilities would be subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVI. RECREATION:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✓
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓

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

- a) The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The County does not have a neighborhood or regional parks system or other recreational facilities.
- b) The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project would result in construction and operation of a storage facility for recreational vehicles and boats which typically use existing recreational facilities including rivers, lakes, forests, and other public lands available for recreation in the Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XVII. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u>: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			✓	
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: Based on the related documents listed in the Sources of Documentation for Initial Study Checklist, staff review of the project, observations on the project site and in the vicinity, the following findings can be made:

a) The project would not conflict with a program, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The project site is in a rural area with no transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or associated programs or plans in the project vicinity. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and conditioned this project to comply with County road policies and standards. The project would generate a negligible number of new vehicle trips entering and leaving the site. A commercial storage facility for RV's and boats with 30 units would be expected to generate an average of 9 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekdays and 7 one-way vehicle trips per day on weekends. These estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual* trip generation rates, and an analysis of actual trip generation for Phase 1 of the applicant's boat and RV storage which has 160 storage units. This increase would have a negligible effect on traffic operations. The project would not conflict with the goals and policies of the Shasta County Circulation Element, the Regional Transportation Plan, or any other programs or policies addressing the circulation system. The project would not generate enough traffic to significantly reduce the volume-to-capacity ratio of adjacent roadways to a reduced level of service. This impact would be less than significant.

b) The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Senate Bill (SB) 743 of 2013 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 et seq.) established a change in the metric to be applied in determining transportation impacts associated with development projects. Rather than the delay-based criteria associated with a Level of Service (LOS) analysis, the change in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a result of a project is now the basis for determining CEQA impacts with respect to transportation and traffic. As of the date of this analysis, the County of Shasta has not yet adopted thresholds of significance related to VMT. As a result, the project related VMT impacts were assessed based on guidance provided by the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the publication *Transportation Impacts (SB 743) CEQA Guidelines Update and Technical Advisory, 2018*.

Pursuant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's December 2018 Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, this project would be considered a small project, generating significantly fewer than 110 trips per day, and is assumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

c) The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Access to the project site would be from Monique Lane off of Holiday Road. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and conditioned this project to comply with County road policies and standards.

d) The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Access to the project site would be from Monique Lane off of Holiday Road. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and conditioned this project to comply with County road policies and standards. Access driveways would be designed to comply with County Code and inspected by the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District to ensure adequate emergency access. The project has been reviewed by the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District which identified no concerns regarding inadequate emergency access.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

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

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

- a) The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as there is no evidence of historical resources at the site that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources; or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1, the Wintu Tribe of Northern California & Toyon-Wintu Center (Tribe) filed and Shasta County received a request for formal notification of proposed projects within an area of Shasta County that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Tribe. Pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1 the Department of Resource Management sent a certified letter to notify the Tribe that the project was under review and to provide the Tribe 30 days from the receipt of the letter to request formal consultation on the project in writing. The Tribe received a certified letter of notification on November 7, 2022, with the 30-day notification period ending December 7, 2022. To date, no response has been received.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

<u>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocations 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 which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓

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

- a-c) The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project will be served by the Mountain Gate Community Services District. The Mountain Gate Community Services District has indicated that it has adequate capacity to serve the project without the need for construction of new water treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities. The project, as proposed would not require on-site waste-water treatment.
- d) The project would not 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. The project would be served by the West Central Landfill which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.
- e) The project would comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
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 or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			✓	
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?			✓	

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

- a) The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and conditioned this project to comply with County road policies and standards. Additionally, the project has been reviewed by the Mountain Gate Fire Protection District for compliance with fire Safety Standards. The project would not result in any changes to local roads that would affect how evacuation plans may be implemented or that would impede access for emergency response vehicles in the area. The project would not necessitate new or expanded evacuation routes. Further, no lane closures or other road obstructions would occur during the project construction phase. The project would not affect implementation of the Shasta County and City of Anderson Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or the Shasta County Emergency Operations Plan.
- b) The project is in the “Very High” fire hazard severity zone. No onsite caretaker unit is proposed. The proposed RV and boat storage facility would not have a large number of people frequenting the site at any given time. All improvements would be constructed in accordance with the Fire Safety Standards. These standards also require the clearing of combustible vegetation around all structures for a distance of not less than 30 feet on each side or to the property line. California Public Resources Code, Section 4291 includes a “Defensible Space” requirement of clearing 100 feet around all buildings or to the property line, whichever is less. The proposed project would require modifications to the existing topography. Approximately 11,000 cubic yards of cut and 6,350 cubic yards of fill will be necessary to prepare the project site for permanent improvements in accordance with the California Building Standards Code. Alterations to the existing topography would create a level area where the permanent improvements will be constructed with adjacent cut slopes with a finish grade of 2:1. These alterations are not expected to significantly exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. The project would not modify or redirect prevailing winds or include significant sources of potential ignition that would significantly exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- c) The project would require the installation of a new fire hydrant and 6-inch water line. The new fire hydrant would give fire fighters access to on-site water to fight any fires that may occur on-site and would not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.
- d) The project would not 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. Project development would require a grading permit and compliance with all provisions of the permit which would address erosion. In addition, the project will disturb more than an acre of land. Therefore, the applicant will also be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and obtain a General Construction Storm Water Permit (GCP) from the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The SWPPP and GCP would specify and require specific erosion and sediment control measures to stabilize soil and control stormwater runoff during project construction.

Mitigation/Monitoring: None proposed.

XXI. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				✓
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓

Discussion:

- a) Based on the discussion and findings in Section IV. Biological Resources, there is evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below the self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. With the incorporation of mitigation measures into the project specified in Section IV. Biological Resources, the impacts will be less-than-significant.

Based on the discussion and findings in Section V. Cultural Resources, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to suggest that the project would have significant impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based on the discussion and findings in all Sections above, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation/Monitoring: With the mitigation measures being proposed, the impacts from the project would be less than significant. See the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) for a complete listing of the proposed mitigation measures, timing/implementation of the measures, and enforcement/monitoring agent(s).

INITIAL STUDY COMMENTS

PROJECT NUMBER ZA22-0012 – Chad and Cori Abel 2019 Trust

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Special Studies: The following project-specific studies have been completed for the proposal and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Mitigated Negative Declaration. These studies are available for review through the Shasta County Planning Division and online via the link [CEQA Documents and Notices \(non-EIR documents\) | Shasta County California](https://www.shastacounty.gov/planning/page/ceqa-documents-and-notice-non-eir-documents) or via the browser web address at: <https://www.shastacounty.gov/planning/page/ceqa-documents-and-notice-non-eir-documents>.

1. Exalt Boat and RV Storage Phase 3 Biological Review, Wildland Resource Managers, October 2023
2. Post Construction Worksheet_MS4, DKM Engineering, May 2024
3. Stormwater Management Report, DKM Engineering, March 2024

Agency Referrals: Prior to an environmental recommendation, referrals for this project were sent to agencies thought to have responsible agency or reviewing agency authority. The responses to those referrals (attached), where appropriate, have been incorporated into this document and will be considered as part of the record of decision for the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Copies of all referral comments may be reviewed through the Shasta County Planning Division. To date, referral comments have been received from the following State agencies or any other agencies which have identified CEQA concerns:

1. California Department of Fish and Wildlife
2. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
3. Shasta County Sheriff

Conclusion/Summary: Based on a field review by the Planning Division and other agency staff, early consultation review comments from other agencies, information provided by the applicant, and existing information available to the Planning Division, the project, as revised and mitigated, is not anticipated to result in any significant environmental impacts.

SOURCES OF DOCUMENTATION FOR INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All headings of this source document correspond to the headings of the initial study checklist. In addition to the resources listed below, initial study analysis may also be based on field observations by the staff person responsible for completing the initial study. Most resource materials are on file in the office of the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, 1855 Placer Street, Suite 103, Redding, CA 96001, Phone: (530) 225-5532.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

1. Shasta County General Plan and land use designation maps.
2. Applicable community plans, airport plans and specific plans.
3. Shasta County Zoning Ordinance (Shasta County Code Title 17) and zone district maps.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.8 Scenic Highways, and Section 7.6 Design Review.
2. Zoning Standards per Shasta County Code, Title 17.
3. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Scenic Highways. <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways> (accessed September 17, 2021).

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands.
2. Shasta County Important Farmland 2016 Map, California Department of Conservation.
3. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timber Lands.
4. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.

III. AIR QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan Section, 6.5 Air Quality.
2. Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin, 2021 Air Quality Attainment Plan.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Air Quality Management District.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.2 Timberlands, and Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
2. Designated Endangered, Threatened, or Rare Plants and Candidates with Official Listing Dates, published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
3. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
4. Federal Listing of Rare and Endangered Species.
5. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.7 Fish and Wildlife Habitat.
6. State and Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
7. Natural Diversity Data Base Records of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
8. County of Shasta. Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 95-157. Oak Woodland Management Guidelines.
9. Oak Woodland Impact Decision Matrix 2008, published by UC Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.10 Heritage Resources.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. The Northeast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico.
 - b. State Office of Historic Preservation.
 - c. Local Native American representatives.
 - d. Shasta Historical Society.

VI. ENERGY

1. California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)
2. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 – California Energy Code
3. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11 – California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.1 Seismic and Geologic Hazards, Section 6.1 Agricultural Lands, and Section 6.3 Minerals.
2. County of Shasta, Erosion and Sediment Control Standards, Design Manual
3. Soil Survey of Shasta County Area, California, published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, August 1974.
4. Alquist - Priolo, Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps.
5. California Department of Conservation. California Geological Survey. California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Shasta Regional Climate Action Plan
2. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (White Paper) CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act
3. Shasta Regional Transportation Authority, 2018 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Shasta Region

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.4 Fire Safety and Sheriff Protection, and Section 5.6 Hazardous Materials.
2. County of Shasta Multi-Hazard Functional Plan
3. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
 - b. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
 - c. Shasta County Sheriff's Department, Office of Emergency Services.
 - d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - e. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.2 Flood Protection, Section 5.3 Dam Failure Inundation, and Section 6.6 Water Resources and Water Quality.
2. Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Shasta County prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, as revised to date.
3. Records of, or consultation with, the Shasta County Department of Public Works acting as the Flood Control Agency and Community Water Systems manager.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Shasta County General Plan land use designation maps and zone district maps.
2. Shasta County Assessor's Office land use data.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

1. Shasta County General Plan Section 6.3 Minerals.
2. Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1997. *Mineral Land Classification of Alluvial Sand and Gravel, Crushed Stone, Volcanic Cinders, Limestone, and Diatomite within Shasta County, California*. DMG Open-File Report 97-03.

XIII. NOISE

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 5.5 Noise and Technical Appendix B.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.1 Community Organization and Development Patterns.
2. Census data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
3. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.3 Housing Element.
4. Shasta County Department of Housing and Community Action Programs.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.5 Public Facilities.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Fire Prevention Officer.
 - b. Shasta County Sheriff's Department.
 - c. Shasta County Office of Education.
 - d. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - e. Mountain Gate Community Services District
 - f. Mountain Gate Fire Department

XVI. RECREATION

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 6.9 Open Space and Recreation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. Shasta County General Plan, Section 7.4 Circulation.
2. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Shasta County Department of Public Works.
 - b. Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
 - c. Shasta County Congestion Management Plan/Transit Development Plan.
3. State of California. Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2018. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.

4. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Rates.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Tribal Consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Records of, or consultation with, the following:
 - a. Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
 - b. Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division.
 - c. Shasta County Department of Public Works.

XX. WILDFIRE

1. Office of the State Fire Marshall-CALFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps.
2. County of Shasta Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

None

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM (MMP)
FOR ZA22-0012 – ABEL**

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
Section IV. Biological Resources			
<p>IV.a.1) In order to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and/or raptors protected under federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and Section 3503.5, including their nests and eggs, one of the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct vegetation and tree removal activities associated with construction between September 1 and January 31 when birds are not nesting; or b. If vegetation or tree removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of vegetation removal or construction activities. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, a non-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest by a qualified biologist in consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No vegetation removal, tree removal or construction activities shall occur within this non-disturbance buffer until the young have fledged, as determined through additional monitoring by the qualified biologist. The results of the pre-construction surveys shall be sent electronically to CDFW at R1CEQARedding@wildlife.ca.gov. 	<p>Prior to issuance of development permits/if buffers are required, through completion of construction and/or until birds are fledged, whichever occurs first.</p>	<p>Resource Management, Planning / Building Division/ California Department of Fish & Wildlife</p>	
<p>IV.a.2) In order to avoid impacts to bats, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct removal and disturbance of trees outside of the bat maternity season and bat hibernacula (September 1 to October 31). b. If removal or disturbance of trees will occur during the bat maternity season, when young are non-volant (March 1 - August 31), or during the bat hibernacula (November 1 - March 1), large trees (those greater than 5 inches in diameter) shall be thoroughly surveyed for cavities, crevices, and/or exfoliated bark that may have high potential to be used by bats within 14 days of tree removal or disturbance. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or arborist familiar with these features to determine if tree features and habitat elements are present. 	<p>Prior to issuance of development permits.</p>	<p>Resource Management, Planning Division / California Department of Fish & Wildlife</p>	

Mitigation Measure/Condition	Timing/Implementation	Enforcement/Monitoring	Verification (Date & Initials)
<p>Trees with features potentially suitable for bat roosting should be clearly marked prior to removal and humane evictions must be conducted by or under the supervision of a biologist with specific experience conducting exclusions. Humane exclusions could consist of a two-day tree removal process whereby the non-habitat trees and brush are removed along with certain tree limbs on the first day and the remainder of the tree on the second day.</p> <p>IV.b.1) In order to avoid impacts to riparian habitat, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:</p> <p>a. Install construction fencing along the perimeter of the 25-foot non-disturbance area prior to any on-site disturbance and until the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) determines the project site is stable and closes the Construction General Permit.</p> <p>IV.b.2) In order to avoid impacts to oak woodlands, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:</p> <p>a. All oak trees not identified to be removed on sheet 2 of 6 of the project plans that are located along the stream on the south side of the project site, along the northern property line, and adjacent to but outside the eastern boundary of the proposed disturbance area shall be clearly marked to remain prior to the removal of any oak trees on the project site.</p> <p>b. Blue Oak and Live Oak shall be planted from seed at a 3:1 ratio to replace the 38 trees proposed to be removed. Viable acorns shall be planted in the fall after the first rains using the following protocol: Scalp a circle two feet in radius around each planting spot to remove other vegetation. Plant acorns in pairs, placed on their sides in approximately 2-inch holes, and cover with soil, and cover the scalped area and planting sites with mulch such as oak leaves or weed free straw.</p> <p>c. All disturbed areas located that are not subject to permanent improvements shall be decompacted using mechanical ripping along the slope contours to facilitate natural regeneration of oak trees.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of development permits/throughout construction.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of development permits/throughout construction.</p> <p>Prior to grading permit final inspection.</p> <p>Prior to grading permit final inspection.</p>	<p>Resource Management, Planning Division / RWQCB</p> <p>Resource Management, Planning Division</p>	