

10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15128, this section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) briefly describes the potential impacts found to be less than significant that do not require mitigation. In June 2018, the City of Redding conducted an Initial Study to determine significant effects of the proposed project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the proposed project were found to be less than significant because of the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the EIR. However, many of the impacts found to be less than significant are also evaluated in greater detail in this Draft EIR. A copy of the Initial Study is in Appendix 15.1, PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT, of this EIR.

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Scenic vistas are defined as expansive views of highly-valued landscapes from publicly accessible viewpoints. Scenic vistas include views of natural features such as topography, water courses, outcrops, and natural vegetation, as well as man-made scenic structures. The project site is located on land that is highly visible from Cypress Avenue, the Sacramento River and across the Sacramento River from Park Marina Drive. The proposed project site encompasses approximately 10.55 acres of currently undeveloped vacant land. The topography of the proposed project site is flat with an elevation of approximately 480 feet above mean sea level (msl). The site is highly disturbed and previously supported multiple uses, including, but not limited to, a concrete plant, sand and gravel operation, greenhouse growing operation, and automotive-related businesses. Remnants of the past uses are still present (e.g., partially paved areas, concrete retaining walls, etc.). One vacant building is currently present on the site. The onsite plant communities/wildlife habitats, in order of abundance, consist of urban habitat, annual grassland, and riparian woodland; small stands or individuals of valley oaks and interior live oaks are present outside the riparian habitat, but do not form a distinct oak woodland community.

The proposed project has the potential to alter the visual landscape from undeveloped land to office type uses; however, there are no existing significant topographical features of high scenic value within the proposed project site and the area is not regarded or designated as visually important or “scenic” in the City’s *General Plan*. Additionally, development of the proposed project would not block or preclude views to any area containing important or what would be considered visually appealing landforms. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact 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?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There are not any scenic resources located onsite. Areas immediately north and west of the proposed project along Cypress Avenue and Hartnell Avenue, respectively, have been developed with

similar office and commercial uses.

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its purpose is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from changes that would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to highways. According to Caltrans' California Scenic Highway Program and the National Scenic Byways Program, the proposed project is not in the vicinity of a federal or state scenic highway or any roadway that is considered eligible for designation as a scenic highway. Additionally, the proposed project site is not visible from a designated local scenic highway. Therefore, impacts associated with the discussed resources are *less than significant*.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- 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?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The project site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes, nor does it possess soils that are prime for agricultural production. The site is not located within an area of Prime Farmland as identified by the California Department of Conservation's Important Farmland Series Mapping and Monitoring Program. The Soil Survey prepared by the Soil Conservation Service identifies the Riverwash, Cobbly alluvial land and Reiff fine sandy loam classifications on the property. Riverwash has little or no potential for farming. The areas of Cobbly alluvial land can be used as dryland pasture, but the potential for farming is limited. Reiff fine sandy loam, if irrigated, can be used to produce irrigated hay. These soil classifications and the past uses of the property do not represent prime suitability for agricultural use; therefore, development of the property would not result in a significant impact to agricultural resources.

- b) ***Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project site is not under a current Williamson Act contract. Therefore, project implementation would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning.

- c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: See discussions II.a and II.b, above.

III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

- e) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: Due to the characteristics of the proposed development, it is unlikely that the project would cause air emissions which would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No impact has been identified.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on State protected wetlands or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: Soil records maintained by the Natural Resources Conservation Service were reviewed to determine the soil type onsite and their potential to support wetlands. The records review showed that four soil types are present on the site: Cobbly alluvial land; Reiff fine sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes; Reiff fine sandy loam, deep, 0 to 3 percent slopes; and riverwash. Riverwash is considered hydric, while Cobbly alluvial land may contain hydric inclusions. National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps were reviewed to determine if wetland features have been previously mapped on the site. According to the NWI data, no wetlands or other waters have been mapped onsite.

A field evaluation conducted onsite concluded that the site does not support wetlands or other waters of the U.S. No evidence of wetland hydrology was observed in the study area, nor was any evidence of an ordinary high water mark observed. Although the site supports small stands of riparian trees, the herbaceous layer is dominated by upland vegetation; these areas do not qualify as “hydrophytic vegetation” pursuant to Corps standards. Because the wetland hydrology and hydrophytic vegetation criteria are not met, these areas are not wetlands subject to Corps jurisdiction.

- 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?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Due to the scale of the proposed project, the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors is not anticipated to be significant.

- e) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community, Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?*

Significance: No Impact.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: A cultural resources report dated April, 2017, was submitted by ENPLAN, who conducted a cultural resources survey on September 27, 2016. One new historic-era site was identified and recorded during the survey. However, the newly recorded site does not meet the eligibility criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and requires no further consideration.

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: No paleontological resources or unique geologic features have been identified on the proposed project site, and the potential for their occurrence is considered minimal. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

- d) ***Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There are no known burial sites on the proposed project site. If human remains are unearthed during future development of the site, the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall apply. Under this Section, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

- i) *Rupture of a known earthquake, fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publications 42.*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There are no Alquist-Priolo earthquake faults designated in the Redding area of Shasta County. There are no other documented earthquake faults in the immediately vicinity that pose a significant risk. The most significant of these faults is the potentially active Battle Creek fault, located about 16 miles south of the site. The closest fault mapped to the site is the inactive Bear Creek fault,

located about 13 miles to the southwest. The closest active fault, as zoned by the State, is the Hat Creek-McCarthur Fault System, located about 48 miles east of the site.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The impact of earthquakes on the project site depends on several factors including the particular fault, fault location, distance from the project site, and magnitude of the earthquake. Each of these factors can help determine the degree of shaking that could occur in the project area. The proposed project site is located in an area designated in the Health and Safety Element of the *General Plan* as having a low ground-shaking potential. Future structures proposed on the project site are required by State law and City ordinance to be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and to adhere to all modern earthquake construction standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There is no evidence of ground slippage or subsidence occurring naturally on the proposed project site. The type of soils and underlying geology is identified as having a low potential for liquefaction. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iv) *Landslides?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project site is located on a flat parcel surrounded by flat terrain. There are no documented landslide hazard areas identified within the immediate vicinity. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The project site contains two primary soil classifications: Cobbly alluvial land and Reiff fine sandy loam. Cobbly alluvial land consists of very gravelly, very cobbly, or very stony, coarse-textured alluvium. It is on flood plains of the Sacramento River and in some places it is along smaller streams. Reiff soils generally are near areas of Anderson, Churn, Perkins, and Tehama soils and of Cobbly alluvial land and Wet alluvial land. Cobbly alluvial land has rapid permeability while the Reiff fine sandy loam has moderately rapid permeability. These land types are excessively drained and runoff is very slow. The hazard of erosion is moderate with the Cobbly alluvial land type and is none to slight with the Reiff fine sandy loam. With the Cobbly alluvial land type, it is subject to frequent flooding, except that it is not subject to annual flooding. Shasta Dam protects much of this land type from flooding.

The proposed modification to the surface terrain is typical to site development and, based on the site soils, is not expected to alter the susceptibility of the land to unstable earth conditions or erosion.

Standard grading-control measures are applicable to the proposed Project as City ordinances and other government agency regulations will be applied. This City of Redding Grading Ordinance requires the application of "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with the City Erosion and Sediment Control Standards Design Manual (RMC Section 16.12.060, Subsections C, D, E). In practice, specific erosion-control measures are determined upon review of the final grading plan and are tailored to project-specific grading impacts. This will ensure that potential grading impacts are less than significant. Since the project is subject to uniformly applied ordinances and policies and the overall risk of erosion is not high, potential impacts related to soil erosion and sedimentation are *less than significant*.

- 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?***

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: See discussion VI.a, above.

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There is a direct relationship between plasticity of a soil and the potential for expansive behavior, with expansive soil generally having a high plasticity. Thus, granular soils typically have a low potential to be expansive, whereas, clay-rich soils can have a low to high potential to be expansive. Testing performed on two selected samples onsite found plasticity index (PI) ranging from non-plastic to approximately 11. A PI value of 11 is associated with soils having a very low to low expansion potential. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

- e) ***Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal. No impact has been identified.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

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

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the project site and transported to and from the site during construction. In addition, some potentially hazardous construction waste may be generated during the construction phase. Construction wastes from the site

would be disposed of in accordance with the Standard Specifications in the California Code of Regulations. Compliance with federal and state laws would reduce the potential for hazards related to construction waste to a *less than significant* level.

Operation of the proposed project would not include the use or transportation of significant amounts of potentially hazardous materials, including fuels or other hazardous liquids. The proposed project would therefore not result in a significant hazard to workers, the public, or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable regulations and hazardous materials plans sufficiently minimizes potential exposure and risk.

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?

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Construction of the proposed project could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous materials through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used at the proposed project site. Accidental releases of these substances could potentially contaminate soils and degrade the quality of surface water and groundwater, resulting in a public safety hazard. Compliance with standard safety procedures and hazardous materials handling regulations will reduce any impacts to a *less than significant* level.

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

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed 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.

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?

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not 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 for people residing or working in the project area?

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: There are no indications at this time that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The project site does not have a wildland fire hazard potential. The site has been disturbed in the past and is surrounded primarily by developed sites, roads and parking lots. The area adjacent to the Sacramento River west of the project site has riparian vegetation and while there is a possibility that vegetation in this area could contribute to a wildfire in the immediate vicinity, it is unlikely that the vegetation would contribute to a wildland fire hazard that exceeds levels currently identified by State and local fire agencies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

- i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Two major dams are located in the general vicinity of the proposed project: Shasta Dam and Whiskeytown Dam. The anticipated inundation resulting from the unlikely failure of these dams has been documented in the *General Plan*. According to this documentation, the proposed project would not be affected by the unlikely failure of either of these dams. Additionally, there are no levees near the proposed project.

- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The threat of a tsunami wave is not applicable to inland, central valley communities such as Redding. Seiches could potentially be generated in either Shasta or Whiskeytown Lakes during an earthquake. However, neither lake has been identified in the Health and Safety Element of the *General Plan* as having any risk to the City under such circumstances. In addition, there is no documented threat of mudflows affecting the proposed Project site. No impact has been identified.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The project does not have the potential to physically divide an established community. Although fencing is proposed along the north and west perimeters of the project site, openings are being provided to allow tenants, patients and the general public to access the Henderson Open Space area from the project site. No impact has been identified.

c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the proposed project site or area.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: A mineral resource is land on which known deposits of commercially viable mineral or aggregate deposits exist. The designation is applied to sites determined by the State Division of Mines and Geology as being a resource of regional significance and is intended to help maintain any quarrying operations and protect them from encroachment of incompatible uses. 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. There are no known mineral resources of regional value located on or near the proposed project site.

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?*

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the City's *General Plan* or other land use plan. The

proposed project is not located within or adjacent to a specific plan adopted by the City. The proposed project is not identified in the *General Plan* as having any known mineral resource value, or as being located within any "Critical Mineral Resource Overlay" area. No impact has been identified.

XI. NOISE: Would the project:

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Ground borne vibrations are usually associated with heavy vehicle traffic (including railroad traffic), and with heavy equipment operations. Vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be mostly passenger vehicles, with some light and medium trucks. This is not expected to generate significant vibrations. The proposed project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. *Less than significant* impacts are anticipated.

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

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

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

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project would not displace any existing housing. No impact has been identified.

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

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The project site is currently undeveloped. The project would not result in the displacement of people. No impact would occur in this regard.

XIII. 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:*

Schools?

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project is located in the Enterprise Elementary School District and Shasta Union High School District and may contribute to the total student enrollment in these districts. Although implementation of the proposed project would not result in the direct addition of new housing units, there is a relationship between developments of this nature and the potential increase in the number of school-age children as the result of increased employees who work and may also reside within the school districts. Therefore, the proposed project will be required to pay development impact fees on a per square foot. These fees are collected at the building permit stage. The payment of school fee as mitigation is consistent with Section 65995(3)(h) of the California Government Code and is considered adequate mitigation for indirect impacts on school facilities and potential impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Parks?

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: Although the proposed project would increase the intensity of the land use, impacts to parks and recreational facilities in the project area would not be considered substantial, as no residential uses are proposed. The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, a *less than significant* impact is anticipated.

XIV. RECREATION: *Would the project:*

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?*

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The proposed 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 proposed project is estimated to accommodate up to 180 employees. Assuming that all of the jobs were new, implementation of the proposed project could lead to demand for additional parkland to serve the added population. However, construction of new parks and recreational facilities is not a

direct physical impact of this project, and any further analysis of this subject would be speculative at this time. Secondary impacts of a growing population are managed through existing *General Plan* policy mechanisms requiring that land be dedicated or fees be paid as a condition of the creation of additional residential lots. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on parks and recreational facilities.

- 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?**

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The proposed 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. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding also has a number of recreational facilities throughout the City. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public land available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated in this regard.

XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC: Would the project:

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highway.**

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: A congestion management agency has not been established in Shasta County. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The proposed project site is located outside the established Approach Zones for both the Redding Municipal Airport and Benton Airpark; therefore, there is no potential to interfere with airport operations. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: The *General Plan* Health and Safety Policy HS4J generally requires that commercial type developments with 150 or more employees have at least two public connection points as may be determined necessary by the Fire Marshal. In accordance with this policy HS4J, the site design includes several public access points as follows: one full access southern driveway at Henderson Road/Parkview Avenue; two full access driveway to Henderson Road (North). No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Significance: No Impact.

Discussion: Parking for the proposed project would be provided by onsite surface parking totaling 549 parking spaces. No impact is anticipated.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.

Discussion: The City regulates and operates programs that promote the proper disposal of toxic and hazardous materials from households, including those created by the project. The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. *Less than significant* impacts are anticipated in this regard.