

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Redding (City) is a Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Planning Division is responsible for preparing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project (UP-2017-00001, PM-2017-00002, GPA-2017-00003, RZ-2017-00004) (State Clearinghouse No. 2017072048). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.), California CEQA Statutes and Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, §15000 et seq.), and the rules, regulations, and procedures for implementation of CEQA, as adopted by the City. The principle State *CEQA Guidelines* sections governing content of this document are §15120 through §15132 (Content of an EIR), and §15161 (Project EIR).

CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (State *CEQA Guidelines* §15378[a]). Pursuant to CEQA's definition, the City has determined that the proposed Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion (UP-2017-00001, PM-2017-00002, GPA-2017-00003, RZ-2017-00004) is a *project*, which has the potential for resulting in significant environmental effects. The purpose of this EIR is to review the existing conditions, analyze potential environmental impacts, and identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects related to the Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project herein referenced as the "proposed project."

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The EIR is an informational document that appraises decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental effects of a proposed project. An EIR must describe a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project and identify possible means to minimize the significant effects. The City of Redding Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the EIR, including the public comments and staff response to those comments, during the public hearing process. As a legislative action, the final decision is made by the City Council, who may approve, conditionally approve, or deny the project. As provided in State *CEQA Guidelines* §15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues. The purpose of an EIR is to identify:

- *The significant potential impacts of the project on the environment and indicate the manner in which those significant impacts can be avoided or mitigated;*
- *Any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated; and*
- *Reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental impacts or reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.*

An EIR also discloses growth inducing impacts; impacts found not to be significant; and cumulative impacts of the project when taken into consideration with past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects.

The City, which has the principle responsibility of processing and approving a proposed project, and other public agencies (e.g., responsible and trustee agencies; refer to Subsection 1.7, below) that may use this EIR in the decision making or permit process, will consider the information in this EIR, along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process. CEQA requires an EIR that reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency regarding the impacts, the level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation implementation, and mitigation measures proposed to reduce the impacts. Environmental impacts are not always mitigable to a level considered less than significant; in those cases, impacts are considered significant unavoidable impacts. In accordance with §15093(b) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, if a public agency approves a project that has significant impacts that are not substantially mitigated (i.e., significant unavoidable impacts), the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project, based on the Final EIR and any other information in the public record for the project. This is termed, per §15093 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, a “statement of overriding considerations.”

This document analyzes the environmental effects of the proposed project to the degree of specificity appropriate to the current proposed action, as required by §15146 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*. The analysis considers the actions associated with the proposed project to determine the short-term and long-term effects associated with their implementation.

Reviewers of a Draft EIR are requested to focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects.

TYPE OF DOCUMENT

This EIR has been prepared as a Project EIR, addressing the environmental effects of the proposed project. In accordance with §15121 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, a primary purpose of this EIR is to provide decision makers and the public with specific information regarding the environmental effects associated with development of the site and future operations. This EIR also identifies ways to minimize the significant effects and describes reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. Mitigation measures are provided which shall be adopted as Conditions of Approval in order to reduce the significance of impacts resulting from the proposed project. In addition, this EIR is the primary reference document in the formulation and implementation of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the proposed project.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT (refer to Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION)

The proposed 10.55-acre project site is located in the City of Redding, southwest of the intersection of Cypress Avenue and Hartnell Avenue, at the northerly terminus of Henderson Road. The site is being considered for development of the North State Pavilion Project, a health care facility, by Dignity Health Mercy Medical Center Redding. The proposed project is located within a developed area in southeast Redding designated in the City of Redding *2000-2020 General Plan* (herein referenced as the *General*

Plan) as “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Greenway” (GWY), and is zoned “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Open Space” (OS).

The proposed project is a wellness center for ambulatory medical offices and clinics distributed amongst three buildings totaling approximately 129,600 square feet with associated parking, landscaping and infrastructure on 10.55 acres of land. The project is currently proposed to be developed in two phases. Phase 1 will include Building ‘A’ and Phase 2 will consist of Buildings ‘B’ and ‘C.’ Phase 1 is projected to be completed in 2022 and Phase 2 is projected to be completed in 2024. It is estimated that up to 180 persons will be employed once the project is completed. Overall, 549 parking spaces are proposed, including ADA and van accessible, compact, and motorcycle spaces. Bicycle racks will also be provided. For Phase I, 338 parking spaces are proposed.

The proposed project includes proposed right-of-way improvements to Henderson Road (North and South), Parkview Avenue (South), and Parkview Avenue (Open Space Access). The improvements include, where applicable, street widening, paving and repaving, lane striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and drainage structures. All utilities, including water, sewer, stormwater, electrical, natural gas, cable and telephone service lines and conduits, will be undergrounded.

The following actions are being requested as part of the proposed project:

- *General Plan Amendment.* Request to amend the City’s *General Plan* from the existing designations of “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Greenway” (GWY) to “Public Facilities” (PF-I) on the entire 10.55-acre site.
- *Rezone.* Request to amend the existing zoning from “General Office” (GO) and “General Commercial” (GC) to “Public Facilities” (PF).
- *Use Permit.* Request to allow for the development of the project and for a portion of the parking lot to encroach into the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulated 100-year floodplain of the Sacramento River.
- *Parcel Map.* Approval to merge existing onsite Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 107-400-008; 107-430-033, -034, -057, -059; and 107-500-017, -018, -019, -020, -024, -025, -026, into one parcel.

1.3 TERMINOLOGY

To assist reviewers in understanding this EIR, the following terms are defined:

- *Project.* The whole of an action that has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.
- *Environment.* The physical conditions that exist in the area and which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. The area involved is where significant direct or indirect impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. The environment includes both natural and man-made (artificial) conditions.

- *Impacts.* Environmental impacts analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change. Impacts are:
 - *Direct.* Primary impacts that would be caused by a proposed project and would occur at the same time and place; or
 - *Indirect.* Secondary impacts that would be caused by a proposed project and would be later in time or farther removed in distance but would still be reasonably foreseeable. Indirect or secondary impacts may include growth-inducing impacts and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use; population density or growth rate; and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.
- *Significant Impact on the Environment.* A substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions in the area affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, tribal resources, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself is not considered a significant impact on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.
- *Mitigation.* Measures that avoid or substantially reduce a proposed project's significant environmental impacts by:
 - Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
 - Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;
 - Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
 - Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or
 - Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.
- *Cumulative Impacts.* Two or more individual impacts that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The following statements also apply when considering cumulative impacts:
 - The individual impacts may be changes resulting from a single project or separate projects.
 - The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the proposed project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over time.

This EIR uses a variety of terms to describe the level of significance of adverse impacts. These terms are defined as follows:

- *Less Than Significant.* An impact that is adverse but that does not exceed the defined thresholds of significance. Less than significant impacts do not require mitigation.
- *Significant.* An impact that exceeds the defined thresholds of significance and would or could cause a substantial adverse change in the environment. Mitigation measures are recommended to eliminate the impact or reduce it to a less than significant level.
- *Significant and Unavoidable.* An impact that exceeds the defined thresholds of significance and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures.

1.4 COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA

This Draft EIR is subject to a minimum 45-day review period by responsible and trustee agencies and interested parties. Section 15087 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* lists optional procedures for noticing, including publication in a newspaper, posting onsite, or mailing to owners of a property or properties contiguous to the site. In accordance with the provision of §15085(a) and §15087(a)(1) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, the City, serving as the Lead Agency, will: 1) publish a notice of availability of a Draft EIR in the Record Searchlight, a newspaper of general circulation, and 2) will prepare and transmit a Notice of Completion (NOC) to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) (proof of publication is available at the City of Redding).

Any public agency or members of the public desiring to comment on the Draft EIR must submit their comments in writing to the individual identified on the document's NOC prior to the end of the public review period. During the public review period, the City will hold a regularly scheduled public hearing regarding the Draft EIR. The public will be afforded the opportunity to orally comment on the Draft EIR at the public hearing. Such comments shall be recorded and shall have the same standing and response requirements as written comments provided during the public review period. Upon the close of the public review period, the City will then proceed to evaluate and prepare responses to all relevant oral and written comments received from both citizens and public agencies during the public review period.

The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR, revisions to the Draft EIR, and responses to comments addressing concerns raised by responsible agencies and reviewing parties. After the Final EIR is completed, and at least 10 days prior to its certification, a copy of the Responses to Comments will be transmitted to agencies providing written or oral comments on the Draft EIR.

1.5 EIR SCOPING PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the Lead Agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the SCH in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project.

The process of determining the focus and content of the EIR is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. The scoping process is not intended to resolve differences of opinion regarding the proposed project or evaluate its merits. Instead, the process allows all interested parties to express their concerns regarding the proposed project and thereby ensures that all opinions and comments applicable to the environmental analysis are addressed in the EIR. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interest groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR.

In compliance with the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the City has taken steps to maximize opportunities for interested individuals, parties, and agencies to participate in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, an effort was made to contact various federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and other interested parties to solicit comments and inform the public of the proposed project. Accordingly, an Initial Study and NOP were published and distributed in June 2018.

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with §15063(a) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, the City undertook the preparation of an Initial Study. The Initial Study determined that a number of environmental issue areas may be impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed project. As a result, the Initial Study determined that the Draft EIR should address the project's significant impacts on a variety of environmental issue areas that are addressed in Section 5.0, DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES of this Draft EIR.

Based on the Initial Study, no impacts on agricultural resources or mineral resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, these issues are addressed in Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, in this EIR. Although geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, public services, and recreation facilities were identified as having less than significant impacts in the Initial Study, further analysis and discussion regarding these environmental issue areas is provided in Section 5.0 of this EIR.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Pursuant to the provision of State *CEQA Guidelines* §15082, as amended, the City circulated the NOP to public agencies, special districts, and members of the public who had requested such notice (over 30 copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies; and elected officials).

The release of the NOP to prepare an EIR initiated the City's 30-day public scoping period under CEQA. The NOP was filed with the SCH on June 8, 2018 (SCH# 2017072048), which initiated the 30-day public scoping period. The review period for the NOP ended on July 9, 2018. The comment period allowed the agencies and public an opportunity to comment on the scope and content of the environmental document, including the alternatives to be considered, and issues that should be addressed in the EIR.

Applicable agencies and interested members of the public had up to 30-days to respond to the NOP, indicating, at a minimum, reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR, and whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project.

The NOP, Initial Study, and comment letters received during the NOP circulation period are provided in Appendix 15.1, PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT, of this Draft EIR.

SCOPING MEETINGS

Pursuant to §15206 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the lead agency is required to conduct at least one scoping meeting for all projects of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance. The scoping meeting is for jurisdictional agencies and interested persons or groups to provide comments regarding, but not limited to, the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and environmental effects to be analyzed. The City hosted agency scoping meeting at 1:30 PM on June 26, 2018 in the Caldwell Park Conference Room at City Hall. One (1) staff member representing the Shasta County Mosquito and Vector Control District attended the June 26, 2018 meeting. The City's scoping process culminated with a noticed Planning Commission scoping presentation and hearing item at the regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting at 4:00 PM on June 26, 2018. Meeting sign-in sheets and other meeting materials are provided in Appendix 15.1, PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT.

DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR focuses primarily on changes in the environment that would result from the proposed project. The Draft EIR identifies potential impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed project and provides measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Those impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels are also identified. This Draft EIR addresses impacts in the following categories:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy Consumption

As soon as the Draft EIR is completed, a NOC is filed with the SCH, and a public notice is published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and/or public review. In addition, the NOC provides information regarding the location of drafts and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR is circulated for a 45-day period, during which time reviewers may make comments. The lead agency must evaluate and respond to comments in writing, describing the disposition of any significant environmental issues raised and explaining in detail the reasons for not accepting any specific comments concerning major environmental issues. If comments, received after public notice is published, result in the addition of significant new information to an EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

The Draft EIR is organized into fifteen (15) sections, as follows:

- Section 1.0, INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE, provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the Draft EIR and the review and certification process. Also provides summaries of the chapters included in the Draft EIR, and summaries of the issues and concerns received from the public, other organizations and public agencies during the NOP review period.
- Section 2.0, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, summarizes the elements of the proposed project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Acknowledges alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts.
- Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including the project's location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.
- Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, describes the approach and methodology for the cumulative impacts analysis.
- Section 5.0, DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES, contains a detailed environmental analysis of the existing conditions, project impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and unavoidable adverse impacts (if applicable). The analysis of each environmental category in Section 5.0 is organized as follows:
 - "Existing Conditions" or "Environmental Setting" describes the physical conditions that exist at this time and that may influence or affect the issue under investigation.
 - "Significance Criteria" provides the thresholds that are the basis of conclusions of significance, for which the primary source for the criteria is Appendix G of the State *CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations [CCR], §15000 through §15387).
 - "Project Impacts" describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur if the proposed project is implemented.
 - A designation of "no impact" is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
 - A "less than significant impact" would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
 - A "less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated" avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
 - A "significant but unavoidable impact" would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less than significant impact.
 - "Cumulative Impacts" describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur with the proposed project, together with all other reasonably foreseeable, planned, and approved future projects.

- “Mitigation Measures” are those specific measures that may be required of the proposed project to avoid a significant adverse impact; minimize a significant adverse impact; rectify a significant adverse impact by restoration; reduce or eliminate a significant adverse impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; or compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment.
 - “Level of Significance After Mitigation” discusses whether the proposed project and the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts can be reduced to levels that are considered less than significant.
- Section 6.0, GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS, discusses the cumulative and growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project.
 - Section 7.0, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or to the location of the project that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives, and provides and a determination of the environmentally superior alternative.
 - Section 8.0, OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS, describes those proposed project impacts that remain significant following mitigation and discusses significant environmental changes that would result from the proposed action, should it be implemented.
 - Section 9.0, INVENTORY OF MITIGATION MEASURES, lists mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant impacts of the proposed project.
 - Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, explains potential proposed project impacts that have been determined not to be significant.
 - Section 11.0, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED, identifies all federal, State, or local agencies, other organizations, and individuals consulted in the preparation of the Draft EIR.
 - Section 12.0, BIBLIOGRAPHY, provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.
 - Section 13.0, MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, identifies responsibilities for monitoring mitigation.
 - Section 14.0, COMMENTS AND RESPONSES, is the Final EIR and provides comments and responses pertaining to the Draft EIR.
 - Section 15.0, APPENDICES, contains comments received during the NOP comment period, the July 2018 *Scoping Report*, and the technical documentation prepared for the proposed project.

1.7 RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Certain projects or actions undertaken by a Lead Agency require subsequent oversight, approvals, or permits from other public agencies to be implemented. Such other agencies are referred to as “Responsible Agencies” and “Trustee Agencies.” Pursuant to State *CEQA Guidelines* §15381 and §15386, as amended, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies are respectively defined as follows:

- *“Responsible Agency” means a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency that have discretionary approval power over the project (State CEQA Guidelines §15381).*
- *“Trustee Agency” means a State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California. Trustee Agencies include . . . (State CEQA Guidelines §15386).*

Responsible and Trustee Agencies and other entities that may use this EIR in their decision-making process or for informational purposes include, but may not be limited to, the following:

LOCAL AGENCIES

Shasta County Air Quality Management District
 Shasta County Department of Resource Management
 Shasta County Department of Public Works
 Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

STATE AGENCIES

California Air Resources Board
 California Department of Fish and Wildlife
 California Department of Water Resources
 California Department of Transportation – District 02
 California Regional Water Quality Control Board
 California Water Resources Control Board
 Native American Heritage Commission
 State Office of Historic Preservation

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Federal Emergency Management Agency

1.8 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

In accordance with §15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines to reduce the size of the report, the following documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this Draft EIR and are available for public review at the City of Redding Planning Department. A brief synopsis of the scope and content of each of these documents is provided below.

CITY OF REDDING

City of Redding 2000 – 2020 General Plan, October 2000

The project site lies within the boundaries of the City of Redding *2000-2020 General Plan*. The *General Plan* is the long-range planning guide for growth and development for the City of Redding. Adopted in October 2000, the *General Plan* helps to ensure that day-to-day decisions conform to the long-range

program designed to protect and further the public interest as related to the City's growth and development and mitigate environmental impacts. The *General Plan* also serves as a guide the private sector of the economy in relating its development initiatives to the public plans, objectives, and policies of the City. The City's *General Plan* was utilized throughout this EIR as the fundamental planning document governing development on the proposed project site. Background information and policy information from the *General Plan* is cited in several sections of this EIR.

Final Environmental Impact Report for the City of Redding 2000 – 2020 General Plan (SCH No. 1998072103), October 2000

The purpose of the *General Plan EIR* was to assess all potential environmental impacts that could occur as a result of buildout of the *General Plan*. The analysis included evaluation of the following issues: Land Use, Housing and Population; Transportation and Circulation; Public Facilities and Services (Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage); Other Public Facilities and Services (Law Enforcement, Fire Protection Services, Schools, Parks and Recreation, Solid Waste, Electricity and other Public Utilities); Natural Environment; and Health and Safety. The *General Plan EIR* concluded that the loss of agricultural resources (project and cumulative) and air quality impacts (project and cumulative) were significant and unavoidable with buildout of *General Plan* land uses.

City of Redding Zoning Ordinance, March 2018

The Zoning Ordinance (Title 18) of the City of Redding Municipal Code (RMC) offers a precise land-use plan for the City to “promote the growth of the City in an orderly manner and to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare.” The City is divided into 29 districts in order to classify, regulate, restrict, and segregate the use of land and to regulate the density of population. Additionally, development standards are established for each district to ensure that activities can be reasonably accommodated in a manner that is compatible with adjacent land uses. The City's *Zoning Ordinance* is intended to:

- Direct growth with a priority on those areas where infrastructure and urban services can be economically provided.
- Ensure consistency between *General Plan* designations and policies and zoning districts.
- Provide compatibility between land uses.
- Establish standards regulating the use and physical development of land.

Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project Public Scoping Report, July 2018

The release of the NOP to prepare an EIR initiated the City's 30-day public scoping period under CEQA. The *Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project Public Scoping Report*, dated July 2018, includes the NOP and Initial Study and documents the issues and concerns expressed by members of the public, government agencies, and organizations during the 30-day NOP comment period that circulated from June 8, 2018 through July 9, 2018. Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in the *Dignity Health Redding North State Pavilion Project Public Scoping Report*. Comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by the City in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR.

1.10 REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR will be distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with PRC §21092 (b)(3). The NOC of the Draft EIR will also be distributed as required by CEQA. During the 45-day public review period, the Draft EIR, including technical appendices, is available for review at the City of Redding Development Services Department, Planning Division, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, California 96001. Written comments on the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Lily Toy, CFM, Interim Planning Manager

CITY OF REDDING

Development Services Department

Planning Division

777 Cypress Avenue

Redding, California 96001

Email: ltoy@cityofredding.org

Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to all substantive environmental issues raised will be prepared and available for review prior to the public hearing before the City of Redding Planning Commission and City Council, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. These environmental comments and their responses, as well as any proposed changes in the Draft EIR based on the comments, will be included as part of the environmental record for consideration by decision-makers for the proposed project.

1.11 GUIDELINES FOR COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT EIR

The purpose of the public review of the Draft EIR is to evaluate the adequacy of the environmental analysis in terms of compliance with CEQA. Section 15151 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* states the following regarding standards from which adequacy is judged:

An EIR should be prepared with sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible.

Section 15204(a) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* provides guidance to assist members of the public and public agencies in preparing comments on a Draft EIR. Section 15204.5(a) states:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.

Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a Lead Agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or

demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

Pursuant to the State *CEQA Guidelines*, an effect is not considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence; therefore, comments should be accompanied by factual support. Section 15204(c) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* states:

Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and, should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts. Or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to §15064 an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.