1.1 PREAMBLE TO THE EIR

The Vineyards at Anderson is the first large-scale project in the City of Anderson that is committed to the use of smart growth principles. Development of the 2,442.2-acre Specific Plan area, which includes the 194 acres associated with the previously approved Sanderson Subdivision (i.e., Phase 1 of the Specific Plan), would result in approximately 5,530 homes being developed within the City of Anderson over the next 18-26 years. At completion, this project would more than double the City's current population of 10,594 to an estimated 25,276 residents. This amounts to an annual population growth of approximately 4.95 percent, which is considerably higher than the 2.32 percent average that the City has experienced over the past seven years.

The 5,530 units proposed on approximately 2,442 acres represent a residential density of approximately 2.26 units/acre, which is double the existing city-wide ratio of 0.99 units/acre. When the acreage proposed for non-residential land uses is not taken into consideration, the net residential density increases to 5.71 units/acre.

The proposed project represents the majority of the residential growth that is anticipated in the City over the next twenty years. As such, housing proposed in the Specific Plan area ranges from traditional single-family detached housing to cluster and multiple family housing. The diversity of housing product and residential densities ensures that the project includes housing types for all income levels. Following "smart growth" principles, the project also proposes a mix of commercial and professional uses that would be linked to residential development by pedestrian-friendly roads, trails and sidewalks, thereby creating a more walkable, bicycle-friendly community.

Perhaps the most innovative component of the project is a commitment on the part of the applicant to install photovoltaic solar panels on at least fifty percent of the homes. This commitment, as well as other design features, such as orienting rooftops so as to maximize passive solar design principles, will substantially reduce the energy needs of the project thereby reducing the carbon footprint of the development.

Other smart growth principles of the project include the use of non-prime farmland and the protection of over half the site, which reduces impact on the existing blue oak woodland within the project boundaries.

As envisioned by the applicant, the project includes 114 acres of wine grape vineyards designed to be both a visual amenity and a functioning agricultural concern. Open space areas of various types are protected and there is an established funding mechanism for fuel maintenance efforts to ensure that wildfire is a manageable threat.

Smart Growth is a popular planning concept supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, other agencies and the planning community to improve the process of community planning and protect public health and the environment. Smart Growth Principles include:

- Create A Range Of Housing Types
- Create Walkable Neighborhoods
- Encourage Community And Stakeholder Collaboration
- Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities With A Strong Sense Of Place
- Make Development Decisions Predictable, Fair And Cost Effective
- Mix Land Uses
- Preserve Open Space, Farmland, Natural Beauty And Critical Environmental Areas
- Provide A Variety Of Transportation Choices
- Strengthen And Direct Development Towards Existing Communities
- Take Advantage Of Compact Building Design

Source: http://www.smarthgrowth.org

Vehicle movement within the project has been designed to provide a good level of service while emphasizing pedestrian and non-motorized methods of travel. Travel outside of the project area will impact area roadways. Beginning with the City's General Plan, the City has emphasized State Route 273 as a parallel to Interstate 5 for area travel. This is in recognition that the I-5 corridor will become increasingly congested and that providing upgrades to a currently underutilized parallel route is both more efficient and more economical than constantly widening I-5.

The City is a willing participant in regional traffic solutions having partnered with Shasta County and the City of Redding in the SHASTEC redevelopment program, with the RTPA in two projects (south county southern regional transportation planning study and traffic impact fee program and the Ox Yoke Road/Riverside Avenue Corridor Study and Traffic Fee Program Project) and also the Fix 5 coalition comprised of all the cities and the counties of Shasta and Tehama. The proposed Vineyards at Anderson project will contribute to, or construct, parts of the parallel route improvements as explained in this EIR.

Overall the project is large and represents substantial growth for the City of Anderson. The City has worked with the applicant in preparation of the Specific Plan and zoning, to ensure that the project is consistent with the goals of the City. As with any large project, changes are expected over time in response to new markets and technological innovation. However the City has ensured that the smart growth principles reflected in this project will represent a constant against which all subsequent projects will be measured.

The Draft EIR that follows analyzes the impacts of the proposed project in relationship to the physical environment. The EIR does so at two different levels. The first is a programmatic or 30,000 foot view of the project as much of the detail normally associated with a development proposal has yet to be formalized. The detail level is in response to a 722 lot subdivision map that will implement a portion of the Specific Plan. As such, the EIR contains two levels of discussion and mitigation. The programmatic level focused on the Specific Plan and zoning, while the development level concentrated on the subdivision map and resulting conditions of approval.

Although the project includes smart growth design features greenhouse gas emissions remain significant. Regardless of the protection of trees and limited grading planned for the site, trees will be cut down and habitat affected by the proposed project. Likewise, traffic impacts associated with the project will have impacts far beyond the property and the City of Anderson. Mitigation measures included in the EIR reduce, but cannot completely mitigate these impacts on the environment. Therefore the City will be required to balance the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project against the anticipated unavoidable environmental risks before determining whether to approve the project.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of Anderson to analyze the environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan and related phased development. The EIR provides a programmatic analysis of the impacts associated with the 20-plus year buildout of the Specific Plan. Project level analysis is also provided for "Phase 2" of the project, which encompasses a 722-unit single family subdivision. (Note: "Phase 1" is a 242 single family unit project that has already been approved by the City, but which is proposed to be included in the Specific Plan area.) This EIR evaluates impacts both within the specific plan boundaries as well as improvements needed outside of the project site.

1.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The project proposes the following development:

- A total of 5,288 residential units on approximately 2,248 acres, with a tentative subdivision map proposed for 722 residential lots on approximately 290 acres.
- Village center with mixed commercial, residential, and civic uses.
- Recreational trails and parks (both public and private).
- Production and maintenance of active vineyards.
- Roadway and infrastructure improvements to support site development.

The project applicant has identified the following project objectives:

- Create a dynamic group of neighborhoods to complement the existing City of Anderson;
- Integrate with City of Anderson;
- Increase and maintain diverse housing opportunities;
- Preserve and enhance site character; and
- Utilize "Smart Growth" development principles.
- Provide a Tier I Energy Efficient Mixed Use Community

PROGRAM LEVEL EIR (PROJECT BUILDOUT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS)

A Program EIR has been prepared that evaluates the requested actions as they relate to the proposed overall land use designation (refer to Section 3.0, Project Description, for further detail on the overall proposed project), including: approval of the Specific Plan; rezoning of land within the City of Anderson that is located in the Specific Plan area, including the previously approved Sanderson Subdivision; prezoning of the unincorporated lands in the Specific Plan area to Vineyards Planned Development (VPD); a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map; and Annexation of 1,917± acres to the City.

The proposed project encompasses separate phases of development. In order to move forward with a specific future phase, the project applicant will be required to submit a tentative subdivision map for each phase. At that time, the City will prepare a site-specific, project level analysis of the development phase's impacts, particularly with respect to that phase's compliance with the analysis set forth in this EIR for the Specific Plan (Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168, 15183).

PROJECT LEVEL EIR (PHASE 2 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS)

The EIR also includes a more detailed project level analysis of "Phase 2" of the proposed project, for which the applicant is requesting entitlements to construct. (Please refer to Section 3.0, Project Description, for further detail of the proposed Phase 2 project components.) The development proposal for this phase of the proposed project contains enough specificity to conduct a site-specific, project level environmental review and will allow the consideration of

discretionary approvals, such as a vesting tentative subdivision map approval and other associated approvals required under the City of Anderson Municipal Code.

1.4 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

The purpose of the EIR alternatives analysis is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Vineyards at Anderson project that could feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives of the project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]). An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening particular significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)].

- ***No Project Alternative:*** CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "no project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. Under the "No Project Alternative," the proposed project would not be built and the site would remain in its current undeveloped condition. The City portion of the site would still be General Plan designated Special Planning Area (SPA) and zoned a combination of Low Density Residential/Hillside Slopes (R1/HS) and Planned Development (PD). The County portion would remain General Plan designated RA and RB (Rural Residential "A" and "B") and zoned Limited Residential (RL-BA-10), Planned Development (PD), and Unclassified (U). For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed in the No Project Alternative that the majority of the project site would not be developed and would remain as grazing land.

- ***Bruce Drive/South Street One-Way Couplet:*** This alternative evaluates a different means of providing access to the City to the north of the project area. The proposed project recognizes that South Street would need to be widened to accommodate four (4) lanes of traffic at project buildout. Topographic and historic structure constraints will make widening of the roadway difficult. Instead of a four-lane roadway, this alternative would create two one-way couplets by converting a portion of South Street to one-way traffic and developing an extension of Bruce Drive to connect with West Anderson Drive.

- ***New North/South Roadway Connection to Rhonda Road:*** Under this alternative, instead of constructing an extension of Anderson Hills Parkway to Rhonda Road as proposed, the resources would be spent constructing a portion of the new north/south roadway identified in the Shasta County Southern Region Transportation Planning Study and Traffic Impact Fee Program Project along with a roundabout or intersection at the eastern edge of the specific plan area.

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City of Anderson was identified as the lead agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Anderson prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project, which was circulated from March 8, 2006 to April 14, 2006. A public scoping meeting was held on March 30, 2006. The NOP included a summary of probable effects on the environment that could result from implementation of the project. Written comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparation of the EIR. A summary of the NOP comments is included herein and the actual NOP comments were reproduced and are included as **Appendix 2.0-1**.

The NOP identified that the proposed project may result in the following summary of major environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR.

- Aesthetics: Development of the site will result in a change to existing ridgelines and change the view of the property.

- Agricultural Resources: The development of the project site would result in the conversion at buildout of approximately 2,000 acres of land designated as open grassland/oak savannah that is currently used for grazing purposes. The project would require a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to allow residential, limited commercial and recreational uses. In addition, conflicts with adjoining grazing and agricultural activities from proposed urban development has also been identified as an issue.

- Air Quality: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to the non-attainment status of the air basin for ozone and PM_{10}. The contribution to continued exceedances of non-attainment or non-classified pollutants represents a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

- Biological Resources: There may be potential impacts from project development on habitat that supports special-status species and wetlands. The project could also result in the removal of trees.

- Cultural Resources: Construction activities associated with site development may result in significant impacts on known and undiscovered historic and cultural resources.

- Geology and Soils: Development of the site would require extensive grading and other site preparation activities that may result in substantial loss of topsoil. There is the potential for construction-related erosion due to grading activities.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The proposed project would result in the limited use, transportation, and storage of hazardous materials during both construction and operational phases. The project has the potential for wildfire-related impacts.

- Hydrology/Water Quality: The project could result in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff with the potential for related impacts such as downstream flooding or increased soil erosion and siltation. Runoff from the site may contain pollutants that could impact water quality.

- Land Use and Planning: The property includes approximately 1,917 acres of unincorporated, undeveloped land in Shasta County, and an overall total of approximately 2,442 acres. The project would establish a new residential community with recreational and limited commercial uses. The proposed project site is currently zoned Residential Agricultural (RA) and would be rezoned to Residential Single-Family and Planned Unit Development. The portion of land in Shasta County would need to be annexed to the City of Anderson. Compatibility with City and County general plans and zoning codes, as well as with LAFCO and State law provisions associated with the proposed annexation, were also identified as issues.

- Noise: The proposed land uses of the project would generate traffic that would result in increased noise levels along the roadways near the project site. In addition, construction

and operational activities would result in a substantial increase in noise. The increase in roadway-related noise could be substantial.

- Population and Housing: The project proposes development that would add approximately 5,288 homes in the project area (plus the 242 units approved in Phase 1) and result in a substantial increase to the City's population by attracting approximately 14,214 new residents to area.

- Public Services: The project may increase the demand for public services such as fire protection and police protection.

- Transportation/Traffic: The proposed project is anticipated to cause an increase in traffic in the area. The vehicle trips to and from the site could add substantial volumes to area roads relative to their capacity, and could cause or increase congestion at area intersections.

- Utilities and Service Systems: The project would require the construction of new water and wastewater facilities and the extension of existing facilities. These activities may result in potentially significant impacts.

NOP COMMENTS

The following comment letters were received from public agencies and the general public during the NOP comment period.

1. Carol Gaubatz, Native American Heritage Commission, March 17, 2006
2. Douglas DeMallie, City of Redding Development Services Department, March 20, 2006
3. Rick Barnum, Shasta County Department of Resource Management, March 21, 2006
4. Janet S. Cobb, California Oaks Foundation, March 23, 2006
5. Dale H. Hansen, Cottonwood Union School District, March 30, 2006
6. Stacy S. Gotham, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, April 4, 2006
7. John Almond, Cascade Union Elementary School District, April 5, 2006
8. Michelle Millette, State of California Department of Transportation, Office of Community Planning, April 5, 2006
9. Arthur W. Parham, Jr., Cottonwood Fire Protection District, April 12, 2006
10. Kris Hollmer, Cottonwood Water District, April 13, 2006
11. Donald B. Koch, State of California Department of Fish and Game, April 17, 2006
12. Andrew Deckert, Shasta County Public Health, May 2, 2006
13. Carla Serio, Shasta County, Environmental Health Division, May 8, 2006
14. Mary Pfeiffer, Shasta County, Department of Agriculture/Weights & Measures, May 25, 2006
15. Tina Bartle, 17557 Fuzzy Lane, Anderson, March 30, 2006

NOP COMMENT LETTER SUMMARY

Fifteen comment letters were received during the NOP comment period from public agencies and individuals. A summary of these comments is provided below:

Letter 1: The Native American Heritage Commission outlines the cultural requirements for projects and do not raise any additional issues.

Letter 2: The Development Services Department of the City of Redding provides comments on the regional transportation impacts of the project. Given the project's potential for impacting transportation facilities in the City of Redding, Mr. DeMallie requests that the traffic analysis include the street segments of South Bonnyview Road between Highway 273 and Interstate 5, including the interchange with State facilities and Cypress Avenue between Bechelli Lane and Hilltop Drive as well as the interchange with Interstate 5.

Letter 3: Shasta County, Department of Resource Management raises several issues with regard to the Air Quality, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Public Services, Transportation and Growth Inducement. The Department expresses concern on the project's water use and its effect on groundwater on adjacent unincorporated areas. Additional information is requested on where the sewage effluent from the project will be discharged and its effect on the water quality of receiving waters. The Department highlights the Cottonwood Community Plan and requests the EIR address the project's consistency with the goals and policies of this Plan. The Department expresses concern over various public services that will be either increased or decreased by annexation. The Department requests the EIR consider the recent Regional Transportation Planning Agency study. Also the impact on Interstate 5, interchanges and adjacent County roads from the project was raised. The Department requests additional information on the effect of growth inducement on housing and other public services.

Letter 4: The California Oak Foundation expresses interest in the project's oak woodland plan and requests to be included on the project mailing list.

Letter 5: The Cottonwood Union School District notes that the project will cross three elementary school district boundaries whose impacts need to be evaluated in the EIR. The District notes that it will serve students located within its boundaries.

Letter 6: The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) provides comments on the Hydrology and Water Quality and Utilities and Service Systems sections of the NOP/IS for inclusion in the EIR. The RWQCB clarified that the wastewater treatment plant had a daily flow rate of 1.61 MGD in 2004 and 2005, not 1.2 MGD as estimated in the NOP. The RWQCB also notes that the City of Anderson Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is operating at 80.5% of its design capacity and that this design capacity will be reached within five years if growth within the Specific Plan area occurs as quickly as projected. The RWQCB further notes that an increase in effluent discharge would require existing RWQCB permits be revised. Concerns regarding the project's solid waste disposal impacting water quality were also raised. Lastly, the RWQCB outlined permits that may be necessary to support the project.

Letter 7: The Cascade Union Elementary School District notes that the project will impact three school districts, whose impacts need to be evaluated in the EIR. The District opines that the children to be served would be better served educationally by the establishment of a middle school (Grades 6 - 8) as well as a school for Grades K – 5.

Letter 8: The California Department of Transportation comments on the project impacts on State Route 273 and Interstate 5 corridor and their intersections. Caltrans requests the EIR address a transportation network that will effectively connect to surrounding areas and provide alternate routes. Also, the department requests information on the stormwater drainage facilities and impacts on state's facilities.

Letter 9: The Cottonwood Fire Protection District expresses concern over the long term revenue loss to the District from the detachment of 795 acres of the proposed project. The District notes its progress towards modernization of fire facilities and the impact that would result from loss of the proposed annexation area.

Letter 10: The Cottonwood Water District outlines several concerns and requests on behalf of the Board of Directors. The District made several requests: 1) That a dedicated tank site and easement be provided through the proposed detachment at an elevation of 630' or above; 2) that a groundwater study be conducted by an independent engineer; and 3) that an agreement for compensation of overage on pumping costs be agreed to prior to detachment of the project. The District also requests clarification on several items: 1) Whether wells would be drilled within the Cottonwood Water District; and 2) If yes, what impacts would be expected on the Cottonwood Water District's existing wells.

Letter 11: The California Department of Fish and Game outlines the State and Federal guidelines and requirements for protection of rare and endangered species (Silky *cryptantha crinita*), special-status plant and animal species, including aquatic, wetland and riparian habitat near seasonal or perennial streams. The DFG requests that the project applicant consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on protection of habitat for federally-listed crustaceans. The District addresses the issue of tree loss and noted the lands proposed for annexation are governed by the Oak Woodland Conservation Act and requests that protection should be extended to the project area as part of the annexation process. In addition, the District requests that the EIR address potential water quality impacts to the Sacramento River from increased effluent disposal resulting from expansion of the wastewater treatment plant resulting from the project. Lastly, the DFG outlines permits that may be necessary to support the project.

Letter 12: Shasta County Public Health Department presents several comments and suggestions on the NOP/IS and the Specific Plan in regards to public health and safety. The Department requests that minimum private and public park space be increased to allow a variety of multi-use recreation and that the ratio of private parks versus public use parks be reconsidered. There was also a request for lighting to promote after-work or after-school activities and consideration of diversity of ball fields, including soccer. The Department requests that the acreage proposed for the two school sites be reconsidered to allow adequate land for athletic fields, walking trails, school gardens and community use. The Department requests clarification on how many miles of trails are proposed for the project and who will maintain them. The Department suggests the commercial areas be increased and include grocery stores, bank, post office and other daily living services that could reduce car trips. There was also concern about the types of commercial uses that will be allowed next to the proposed school sites and how they could impact school age children. The Department requests clarification on the number of housing units that will be built on a yearly basis. The Department requests that an analysis of population increase on traffic and the subsequent environmental health problems be included in the EIR. It was noted that 115 acres are proposed solely for production of grapes and the suggestion was made that other agricultural produce be grown as community and school gardens and farm to school cafeteria. The Department requests clarification on the type of pesticides that are proposed for use in the vineyards and their effect on the health of residents. The Department notes that the Specific Plan did not address connectivity and smart growth

principles that could be applied to the project. There was concern about the need for a policy limiting the removal of trees within the project by individual property owners.

Letter 13: Shasta County Environmental Health Division provides background information on an operational solid waste landfill on West Anderson Drive and Cambridge Road and an adjacent parcel used for solid waste disposal site (burn dump) that was closed in 1965.

Letter 14: Shasta County Department of Agriculture requests clarification on the intent of agricultural activities in Common Areas, and recommended that these activities would be better managed in a Landscape Area. The Department comments on feasible buffers to minimize impacts to adjacent sensitive receptors including: Anderson Creek, parks, school and both new and existing residential units. The Department cautioned on the impact of mandatory pesticide treatments that would be imposed if the presence of Glassy Winged Sharpshooters or other pests were found in Shasta County.

Letter 15: The commenter expresses concern over development of the project within open space and the furtherance of urban sprawl. The commenter opines the 152 percent increase in population would have an adverse impact on the City of Anderson and its public services. The commenter, as a worker in the real estate lending industry, opines that the project will not contribute to affordable housing and the market cannot support additional high end housing. The commenter submitted several newspaper editorials in support of her opposition to the project.

1.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 1.0-1 displays a summary of the project's significant and potentially significant impacts along with proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize these impacts. In the table, the level of significance is indicated as a result of implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

For detailed discussions of all impacts, including those for which impacts are considered less than significant, refer to Sections 4.1 through 4.14.

TABLE 1.0-1
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Land Use		
Impact 4.1.7 Cumulatively, the proposed project (in combination with other development projects) could contribute to the conversion of rural, agricultural and open space lands to urban uses.	None feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.1.8 Cumulatively, the project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development in the City of Anderson and Shasta County could result in land use conflicts.	Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.13, Agricultural Resources.	Less than significant
Population and Housing		
Impact 4.2.1 The proposed project at buildout would result in significant population growth and the generation of employment.	None feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.2.3 Development of the Vineyards at Anderson project, combined with the development of other projects in the vicinity, would result in a cumulative increase in the regional population.	None feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
Hazards		
Impact 4.3.2 The proposed project could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials, which may result in adverse environmental impacts.	**MM 4.3.2** Concerning the widening of West Anderson Drive, and/or the installation of underground infrastructure along that road to serve the proposed project, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment shall be performed to evaluate potential risks associated with the abandoned burn dump site identified by the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Environmental Health Division. As a result of that assessment, particular actions shall be considered to alleviate potential health hazards.	Less than significant
Transportation and Circulation		
Impact 4.4.1 The project causes an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system or the project exceeds, an established level of service standard (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, congestion at intersections or the level of service).	Improvements identified in **Table 4.4.7A**, **Table 4.4.8A** and **Table 4.4.9A**.	When roadways and intersections are within the authority of the City of Anderson: Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		When outside City jurisdiction: Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.4.2 The project may exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the city congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	Improvements identified in **Table 4.4.7A**, **Table 4.4.8A** and **Table 4.4.9A**.	When roadways and intersections are within the authority of the City of Anderson: Less than significant When outside City jurisdiction: Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.4-7 Development of the Specific Plan, and the roadway improvements required as mitigation for traffic impacts, has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts.	Implement **MM 4.95a**, **MM 4.9.5b**, **MM 4.9.5c**, and **MM 4.9.5d**; implement Alternative 2; implement of the Specific Plan as proposed; and City participation in the various funding mechanism for improvements throughout the region.	When located within the authority of the City of Anderson: Less than significant When outside City jurisdiction: Significant and unavoidable
Noise		
Impact 4.5.1 Construction-generated noise levels could result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses, including proposed residential uses that are constructed and inhabited before other portions of the project are complete.	**MM 4.5.1** The following measures shall be implemented: • Construction activities (excluding activities that would result in a safety concern to the public or construction workers) shall be limited to between the daytime hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and prohibited on Sundays and Holidays, in accordance with the City's municipal code. • Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.	
Impact 4.5.4 Exposure to noise levels generated by future on-site stationary sources associated with the proposed project could result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels that could exceed the City's noise standards at noise-sensitive land uses.	**MM 4.5.4** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented: a. Residential Land Uses • Residential dwellings shall be equipped with central heating and air conditioning systems to allow windows to be kept closed and maintain acceptable interior noise levels during inclement weather conditions. b. Recreational Facilities, Parks and Schools • Use of amplified public address/sound systems within park areas shall be prohibited. • Use of park facilities and exterior recreational facilities shall be limited to the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. without prior approval from the City Manager. • Landscape maintenance activities for the proposed park and elementary school shall be limited to the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. • The City shall require an acoustical assessment be performed prior to construction of the proposed schools. Where acoustical analysis determines that stationary-source noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards, the City shall require the implementation of all practical noise-attenuation measures sufficient to achieve compliance with applicable noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Such measure may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of setbacks, sound barriers, berms, and equipment enclosures. c. Proposed Commercial Land Uses • Material deliveries, landscape maintenance, waste-collection activities, and the operation of noise-generating stationary equipment, such as solid-waste compactors and compressors (excluding building mechanical equipment [i.e., boilers, HVAC units), shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	• The City shall require an acoustical assessment be performed prior to construction of the proposed noise-generating commercial land uses. Where acoustical analysis determines that stationary-source noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards, the City shall require the implementation of all practical noise-attenuation measures sufficient to achieve compliance with applicable noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Such measure may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of setbacks, sound barriers, berms, and equipment enclosures. d. Agricultural/Public-Utility Improvements • The City shall require an acoustical assessment be performed prior to construction of the proposed noise-generating utility improvements. Where acoustical analysis determines that stationary-source noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards, the City shall require the implementation of all practical noise-attenuation measures sufficient to achieve compliance with applicable noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Such measure may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of setbacks, sound barriers, berms, or equipment enclosures.	
Impact 4.5.5 Projected on-site transportation noise levels at nearby proposed on-site development would exceed the City's noise-sensitivity standards for land use compatibility.	Implementation of **MM 4.5-4.a**; and **MM 4.5.5** The City shall require an acoustical assessment be performed to evaluate predicted future cumulative traffic noise impacts to proposed on-site land uses. Where acoustical analysis determines that traffic noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards, the City shall require the implementation of all practical noise-attenuation measures sufficient to achieve compliance with applicable interior noise standards and "conditionally acceptable" exterior noise levels. Such measure may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of setbacks, sound barriers, or berms.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.5.6 Construction-generated noise levels could result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses, including proposed residential uses that are constructed and inhabited before other portions of Phase 2 are complete.	Implementation of **MM 4.5.1**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.5.9 Exposure to noise levels generated by stationary sources would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels that	Implementation of **MM 4.5.4**.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
could exceed the City's noise standards at proposed on-site noise-sensitive land uses.		
Impact 4.5.10 Projected on-site transportation noise levels at nearby proposed on-site development would exceed the City's noise-sensitivity standards for land use compatibility.	Implementation of **MM 4.5.5**	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.5.11 Implementation of the proposed project would result in increases to cumulative traffic noise impacts.	None feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
Air Quality		
Impact 4.6.1 Construction activities, such as clearing, excavation and grading operations, as well as construction vehicle traffic and wind blowing over exposed earth, would generate increased particulate matter and ozone precursor emissions that would temporarily affect local air quality.	**MM 4.6.1** Applicants of development projects located within the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan area shall submit to the SCAQMD and receive approval for an Emissions Reduction Plan prior to groundbreaking. The Emissions Reduction Plan shall include all measures recommended by the SCAQMD, at the time of development, for the control of fugitive and mobile-source emissions associated with on-site construction activities. At the present time, these measures include, but are not limited to, the following: • All disturbed areas, including storage piles, that are not being actively used shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, a non-toxic chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover. • Provide temporary traffic control as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person). • The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely and effective manner during all phases of project development and construction. • All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent fugitive dust from leaving property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete site coverage, preferably in the mid-morning and after work is completed each day. • All on-site unpaved roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or a non-toxic chemical stabilizer/suppressant sufficient to prevent wind-generated dust	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	beyond the property line. • On-site vehicle speeds on unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 mph. • All land clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities on the project site shall be suspended when winds are expected to exceed 20 miles per hour. • All inactive portions of the development site shall be seeded and watered until a suitable grass cover is established. Seeding shall be with an approved native seed mix. • The applicant shall be responsible for applying Department of Public Works approved non-toxic soil stabilizers (according to manufacturers' specifications) to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours), in accordance with the Shasta County Grading Ordinance. • When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered and effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained. • All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. • Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours. • Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip. • Cleared vegetation shall be treated by means other than open burning, such as chipping, shredding, or grinding. • Heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, shall achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20-percent reduction and 45-percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, particulate matter traps, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	products, and/or such other options as become available. • The Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan shall identify construction schedules for on-site and off-site activities. Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize concurrent activities involving extensive use of off-highway equipment (e.g., on-site grading, off-site road construction) from occurring on the same day during the summer months when emissions of ozone precursors (e.g., ROG and NOx) are of greatest concern. • The project representative shall submit to the lead agency and SCAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 hp, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the project. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction operations occur. At least 48 hours before subject heavy-duty off-road equipment is used, the project representative shall provide the lead agency and SCAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and the name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. • Off-road construction equipment shall not be left idling for periods longer than 5 minutes when not in use.	
Impact 4.6.2 On-site sources and vehicle trips to and from the project (at buildout) would result in increased emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants and particulate matter that would exceed Shasta County AQMD significance thresholds.	**MM 4.6.2** The following measures shall be implemented: • Applicants of development projects located within the Plan Area shall submit to the SCAQMD and receive approval for an Emissions Reduction Plan (ERP) prior to issuance of building permits for the development project in question. The Emissions Reduction Plan shall include applicable SCAQMD Standard Mitigation Measures (SMM) and/or Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMM) as recommended by the Shasta County AQMD at the time development is proposed. Standard and Best Available Mitigation Measures currently recommended by the SCAQMD are included in Appendix 4.6-1. • All roads and parking areas shall be paved to reduce dust and fugitive emissions.	Significant and unavoidable

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.6.4 Receptors located in the vicinity of commercial land uses may be exposed to odorous emissions.	**MM 4.6.4** Future development projects located within the Specific Plan area shall implement the following measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions from on-site sources: • Land uses that have the potential to emit objectionable odorous emissions (e.g., dry cleaning establishments and gasoline stations) shall be located as far away as possible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors or downwind of nearby receptors. • If an odor-emitting facility is to occupy space in the commercial area, odor control devices shall be installed to reduce the exposure of receptors to objectionable odorous emissions. The Shasta County AQMD shall be consulted to determine applicable/feasible control devices to be installed. • Refuse containers from food establishments, grocery stores or other uses that could generate odors, shall be emptied daily.	Less than significant
Impact 4.6.6 Construction activities associated with Phase 2, such as clearing, excavation and grading operations, as well as construction vehicle traffic and wind blowing over exposed earth, would generate increased particulate matter and ozone precursor emissions that would temporarily affect local air quality.	Implement of **MM 4.6.1**.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.6.7 On-site sources and vehicle trips to and from Phase 2 of the project would result in increased emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants and particulate matter that would be anticipated to exceed Shasta County AQMD significance thresholds.	Implement of **MM 4.6.2**.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.6.9 Receptors located in the general vicinity of such sources may be exposed to odorous emissions.	Implement **MM 4.6.4**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.6.11 Residential wood burning and open burning from the proposed project and other regional development could result in and contribute to a cumulative increase in odor or nuisance complaints as well as result in potential violation of state and federal particulate matter ambient air quality standards in the future.	Implementation of **MM 4.6.1** and M**M 4.6.2**.	Significant and unavoidable
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact 4.7.1 Development of the proposed project may impact water quality and may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	**MM 4.7.1a** Prior to construction during each phase of development , the developer will obtain approval of a SWPPP and NPDES permit from the RWQCB and will comply with all permit requirements	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	pertaining to site grading and erosion control. **MM 4.7.1b** A master drainage plan will be submitted as part of the improvement plans for each phase of the project. The project applicant shall submit a master drainage plan of improvements and details for review by the City of Anderson Department of Public Works and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The report shall be prepared by a qualified professional and shall, at a minimum, include the following: • The drainage details shall address storm drainage management during construction and thereafter, and shall propose best management practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, etc., for both urban and agricultural land uses. Permanent water quality control features shall demonstrate that the water quality controls would ensure that storm water discharges would not result in pollutant levels or concentrations that would have a detrimental effect to aquatic life in the creeks, intermittent steams, vernal swales and vernal pools, and all other "waters of the U.S." located throughout the Specific Plan area. Stormwater discharges shall be in compliance with all current requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board. • Storm drainage from on-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and treated to protect existing water quality. The maintenance of facilities shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. When the community is under jurisdiction of the City of Anderson, then it will be the City's obligation to provide facility maintenance. Easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the City for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of future maintenance. • A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, changes in downstream flows and flood elevations, proposed on- and off-site improvements, features to protect downstream uses and property and drainage easements to accommodate downstream flows from this project. Project drainage features shall be designed to ensure no change in downstream flow conditions that would result in new or increased severity of flooding for each phase of development.	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	• Conformance with applicable City of Anderson drainage requirements shall be demonstrated. • All related underground and surface drainage systems must be addressed in order to ensure full integration of areas that would generate runoff. These areas would include rooftops, sidewalks, cut/fill slopes, patio areas, streets, parking lots, up gradient off site source areas, and impervious landscaping areas. Seepage from underground sources must also be addressed. • The report shall show that post-project flows will not exceed pre-project flows and the associated drainage improvements required to meet these standards. **MM 4.7.1c** Prior to the issuance of permits for the agricultural operations, a Chemical Application Management Plan (CHAMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Anderson and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The City will require that future agricultural areas be properly designed and operated to reduce the threat to surrounding wetland areas. The agricultural areas of the proposed Specific Plan shall utilize appropriate chemical management objectives via direct application of procedures that ensure water quality objectives are meet as defined by the RWQCB and the State Water Resources Control Board Policy for Toxic Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California. Specific water quality objectives for agricultural uses shall ensure that biostimulatory substances, floating materials, oil and grease, pesticides, and sediment shall not be in sufficient concentrations to cause a nuisance or adversely affect the beneficial uses of on-site surface waters or runoff. The CHAMP, or a similar management plan, shall incorporate the following: • A description of agricultural area design features that prevent direct discharges of surface runoff into stream channels without water quality controls (e.g., engineered wetland features); • A description of chemicals authorized for use and approved within the State of California, along with guidelines for their application. Guidelines shall include restrictions on their use near drainage systems. Chemicals include fertilizers, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides and rodenticides;	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	• Guidelines on the application of fertilizers and soil amendments that take into consideration the physical characteristics and nutrient content of the soil on the agricultural site; • Guidelines for the irrigation of the agricultural lands that take into consideration the field capacity of soil types and the timing with chemical applications; • A water quality monitoring program that includes sampling would be timed with the application of soil amendments or on a regularly scheduled basis; and • Chemical storage requirements and chemical spill response and chemical inventory response plans would be prepared and implemented. Pesticide concentrations shall not be allowed to accumulate in bottom sediments or aquatic life, nor can chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides be found in concentrations exceeding water quality standards described in this mitigation measure. Maximum Concentration Levels (MCL), per the Water Quality Goals for California Inland Surface Water for Human Health and Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, shall be met for waters surface water bodies including streams and drainages. Also, groundwaters shall not contain any chemical contaminants derived from operations in excess of the MCLs specified for domestic drinking water supplies in the CCR, Title 22, Division 4. Agricultural maintenance programs for agricultural areas will be administrated by staff that are licensed as "Pest Control Advisors" by the California Department of Agriculture. Primary responsibilities of the advisor will be to ensure compliance with state and federal pesticide regulations. To ensure the quality of surface and groundwaters are in compliance with regulations, a water monitoring system and program will be developed and implemented. All permanent surface water features shall be sampled on a quarterly sampling interval and include analyses for non-volatile synthetic organic chemicals (and their breakdown products as pesticides), total dissolved solids, chloride, sulfate, total phosphorus, boron, nitrogen as nitrate, total nitrogen, total kjeldhal nitrogen, and iron. This monitoring program shall also be implemented with consideration of the RWQCB water quality	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	objectives. The CHAMP shall contain procedures for corrective actions for identified water quality issues as a result of sampling. This will include notification to the RWQCB and City regarding the water quality issue and corrective actions implemented to ensure protection of surface water and groundwater quality.	
Impact 4.7.2 Development of the proposed project may substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a** and **MM 4.7.1c**, as well as state and federal agency requirements.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.4 Development of the proposed project will not 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.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a** through **MM 4.7.1c,** and compliance with state and federal permitting requirements.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.5 Development of the proposed project may place housing and other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.	**MM 4.7.5** As a condition of subsequent project level approvals and as part of the submittal of improvement plans for each phase of the project, the project applicant shall submit and obtain approval of a final drainage report for each phase that meets all City of Anderson requirements. This report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include the following: • The report shall show the limits of the 100-year floodplain as well as building setbacks. • The report shall show that all lot elevations will be at least two (2) feet above the 100-year floodplain and all finished floor elevations will be at least three (3) feet above the 100-year floodplain.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.6 Development of the proposed project may place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.5**; and **MM 4.7.6** Hydrologic modeling shall be completed by a registered professional for all road improvements within or immediately adjacent to the 100-year flood zone. This includes improvements to West Anderson Drive and Anderson Hills Parkway, including the crossing of Anderson Creek. If hydrologic modeling shows that road construction will re-direct flood flows, a Letter of Map Revision pursuant to FEMA requirements shall be completed.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.9 Construction and buildout of Phase 2 of the proposed project may impact water quality and may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a** through **MM 4.7.1d** and mitigation included in Section 4.8, Geology and Soils, as well as compliance with applicable state and federal laws.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
degrade water quality.		
Impact 4.7.10 Construction and buildout of Phase 2 of the proposed project may substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a** and **MM 4.7.1c**, as well as state and federal agency requirements.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.11 Construction and buildout of Phase 2 of the proposed project may substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner would result in flooding on- or off-site.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1b**; and **MM 4.7.11** The Vineyards at Anderson Phase 2 drainage plan shall include adequate provisions for erosion control at points of discharge for runoff generated within the Phase 2 development area. Provisions shall include energy dissipaters and other stabilization measures. Additional detention areas may need to be incorporated within neighborhood parks or common open space areas in the form of formal water features or dual use recreation areas. These detention ponds will have restricted outlets that will cause the majority of storm events that produce sufficient runoff rates and velocities to transport sediments to create a temporary "pool" having minimal velocity on the upstream side of the restricted outlets. This will provide for settlement of sediments.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.12 Construction and buildout of Phase 2 of the proposed project could create or contribute runoff water that could exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a** though **MM 4.7.1c**, and **MM 4.7.11**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.17 The proposed project, in combination with planned and proposed development in and near the City of Anderson, could alter drainage conditions and rates which could result in potential flooding impacts.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a**, **MM 4.7.1b**, **MM 4.7.1c**, **MM 4.7.5**, and **MM 4.7.11**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.7.18 The proposed project in combination with planned and proposed development in and near the City of Anderson could contribute to potential impacts to surface and groundwater quality from construction and operation activities.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.1a**, **MM 4.7.1b**, **MM 4.7.1c**, **MM 4.7.5**, and **MM 4.7.11**.	Less than significant
Geology and Soils		
Impact 4.8.2 Development of the proposed project may result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Implementation of **MM 4.7.2a**, **MM 4.7.2b**, and **MM 4.7.2c** described in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality; and **MM 4.8.2a** Prior to the approval of project improvement plans for	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	each phase, the project applicant shall provide the City with a final geotechnical subsurface investigation report for that phase. The final investigation shall incorporate the following measures: • The final Geotechnical Engineering Report shall address and make recommendations on the following: a) road, pavement, and parking areas; b) structural foundation, including retaining wall design; c) grading practices; d) erosion/winterization; e) special problems discovered on-site (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.); and f) slope stability. • Subsurface soils samples shall be collected and appropriate geotechnical analytical work on these samples must be completed in order to adequately define the characteristics of underlying materials. • Field investigations, sampling and laboratory testing of samples will assist geotechnical evaluations of subsurface materials in areas where other types of improvements are proposed. The bearing capacities of earth materials beneath roadways and buildings will be determined and will be required for adequate foundation design. Where unsuitable materials prone to expansion or consolidation are located, these materials may be conditioned or removed and replaced with materials more suitable for future structures. The project applicant shall include engineering details and methods to be incorporated into project improvement plans that ensure stable slope conditions on the site during and after construction. All structures and site improvements shall follow seismic design criteria addressed in the Uniform Building Code. **MM 4.8.2b** Proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation, and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans for each phase. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the improvement plans are approved and all required temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by the City. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal/vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and City of Anderson Public Works concurs with said recommendation. The project applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	regular watering, as necessary, to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project improvement plans. It is the project applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. The improvement plans shall specify erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the City. If, at any time during construction, a field review by City personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratio, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the City for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding.	
Impact 4.8.3 Buildout of the project may result in structures and/or infrastructure being located on unstable geologic units 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.	Implementation of **MM 4.8.2a** and **MM 4.8.2b,** along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.8.4 Development of the proposed project may result in structures or infrastructure being located on an expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.	Implementation of **MM 4.8.2a**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.8.8 Development of Phase 2 of the proposed project may result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Implementation of **MM 4.8.2a** and **MM 4.8.2b**, along with **MM 4.7.7a**, **MM 4.7.2b**, and **MM 4.7.2c** described in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, and permitting requirements by the State Water Resources Control Board.	Less than significant
Impact 4.8.9 Development of Phase 2 of the project may result in structures and/or infrastructure being located on unstable geologic units, 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.	Implementation of **MM 4.8.2a** and **MM 4.8.2b**, along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.8.10 Development of Phase 2 of the proposed project may result in structures or infrastructure being located on an expansive soil as	Implementation of **MM 4.8.2a**.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.		
Biological Resources		
Impact 4.9.1 Implementation of the proposed project could result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, rare, proposed, and candidate status as well as California Fully Protected species.	**MM 4.9.1a** Prior to disturbance of habitats capable of supporting special-status wildlife species, protocol-level, preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence of special-status wildlife. **MM 4.9.1b** If special-status wildlife species are detected during a preconstruction survey, or at any time during buildout of the project, construction activities may not proceed in the area of discovery until the project proponent reaches an appropriate level of consultation with the resource agency responsible for oversight of the species. **MM 4.9.1c** Major vegetation removal (including the clearing of shrubs and bushes) shall be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (i.e., September 1 through January 31) whenever feasible. If vegetation removal must take place during the bird breeding season, prior to removal, the vegetation shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist to determine if nesting raptors, migratory birds or other special-status bird species are present. If active nests are detected, the biologist shall specify appropriate avoidance measures, which may include establishing buffer zones around nests until they are vacated. In addition, no trees with cavities capable of being used by cavity-nesting birds shall be removed during the bird breeding season to avoid disturbance or mortality. Reference to this requirement and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be included in the construction specifications.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.2 Implementation of the proposed project could result in direct mortality or the loss of habitat for special-status plant species including plant species identified by the California Native Plant Society with a rating of List 1A or 1B (i.e. rare, threatened or endangered plants).	**MM 4.9.2a** Prior to the disturbance of habitats capable of supporting special-status plant species, focused surveys shall be conducted by a qualified botanist to determine if special-status plant species are present. These surveys shall be scheduled to coincide with known flowering periods, and/or during periods of phonological development that are necessary to identify the plant species of concern. **MM 4.9.2b** If special-status plant species are identified during preconstruction surveys, or at any time during buildout of the project, the project shall avoid impacts to special-status plant species by implementing the following measures:	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	1. Special-status plant species identified within an area proposed for disturbance will be protected by installing environmentally sensitive area fencing (orange construction barrier fencing) around the special-status plant species. The environmentally sensitive area fencing shall be installed at least 20 feet from the edge of the population where feasible and remain until such time that development activities no longer pose a threat to the species. The project proponent shall also consult with the appropriate resource agency and coordinate with local experts to determine whether transplantation of the special-status plant species is feasible. If the agency concurs that transplantation is a feasible mitigation measure, the botanist shall develop and implement a transplantation plan in coordination with the appropriate resource agency. 2. Special-status plant species identified outside of an area proposed for disturbance will be protected by installing environmentally sensitive area fencing (orange construction barrier fencing) around special-status plant species. The environmentally sensitive area fencing shall be installed at least 20 feet from the edge of the population where feasible and remain until such time that construction activities adjacent to the population are complete. 3. The location of the environmentally sensitive area fencing shall be marked in the field with stakes and flagging and shown on the construction drawings. The construction specifications shall contain clear language that prohibits construction-related activities, vehicle operation, material and equipment storage, and other surface-disturbing activities within the fenced environmentally sensitive area. 4. Where special-status plant species are located in wetlands, silt fencing shall also be installed. **MM 4.9.2c** The project proponent will protect against the potential introduction and spread of noxious weeds and pathogens. The project proponent will prevent the introduction of invasive, non-native plant species into sensitive plant species habitats and vegetation types by implementing recommended measures during construction, such as cleaning off-road vehicles prior to use in areas that are not proposed for development, using weed-free imported soil, restricting native vegetation removal, and requiring topsoil storage. The project proponent will also develop and implement weed management	

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	procedures to monitor and control the spread of invasive species. **MM 4.9.2d** To compensate for the direct impacts to vernal pools, as shown in Table 4.9-1, the project proponent will either create vernal pool habitat, purchase mitigation credits at a USACE- and USFWS-approved wetland mitigation bank, or pay an in-lieu fee . Mitigation ratios will be determined during consultation with the USACE and USFWS to ensure that no net loss of habitat occurs.	
Impact 4.9.3 Implementation of the proposed project would result in direct mortality or the loss of habitat for migratory birds and raptors.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.91, along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.4 Implementation of the proposed project would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of animal and plant species of concern and other non-listed special-status species.	**MM 4.9.4a** Prior to each phase of development, a preconstruction bat survey shall be performed by a wildlife biologist or other qualified professional. Appropriate measures will be specified based on the results of the surveys. **MM 4.9.4b** For any development proposed within 100 feet of suitable habitat for the northwestern pond turtle, a focused survey to determine the presence of the species, including pond turtle nests, when appropriate, shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction activities. If northwestern pond turtles are observed within the construction area, the biologist shall relocate the turtle to a suitable location at least 500 feet from the construction area. If nest are discovered, the eggs within the nests shall be excavated and relocated to a suitable location outside of the construction area. **MM 4.9.4c** In order to avoid impacts to burrowing owls outside of the owl breeding season (September to January), a qualified biologist shall conduct a protocol-level preconstruction survey at least 30 days prior to the onset of construction activities within suitable burrowing owl habitat. If burrowing owls are observed during the preconstruction survey, measures such as flagging the burrow and avoiding disturbance, or relocating the owls, shall be implemented to ensure that no owls or active burrows are inadvertently buried during construction. All measures shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the CDFG. **MM 4.9.4d** Because dead trees and snags provide nesting and foraging habitat for Nuttall's woodpeckers and roosting habitat for bats, dead trees and snags shall be left standing in conservation areas	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	(whenever possible and when not in conflict with fire hazard and public safety policies) to protect the nesting and roosting habitats of these and other species.	
Impact 4.9.5 Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in substantial adverse impacts to, and the potential loss of, jurisdictional waters of the U.S.	**MM 4.9.5a** Pending verification of the Wetland Delineation (Gallaway Consulting 2005b), and as part of each subsequent project application submittal to the City, the project applicant shall identify all potential wetland resources that occur onsite for City review. If wetland resources are proposed to be taken, the project applicant shall do the following: 1. If required, apply for a Section 404 permit from the USACE after verification of the wetland delineation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed shall be replaced or rehabilitated on a "no net loss" basis in accordance with the USACE mitigation guidelines. Onsite creation of wetland habitat is preferred to offsite mitigation. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to the USACE. 2. Obtain a Section 401 water quality waiver of certification from the RWQCB. 3. A mitigation plan shall be implemented that includes one of the following: (a) Completion of an onsite Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that includes onsite creation/preservation of the wetlands. (b) Credits may be obtained at an approved mitigation bank. The project applicant shall provide written evidence to the City from the USACE and the RWQCB that this measure has been complied with prior to recordation of final maps. **MM 4.9.5b** A 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement for removal of or disturbance to riparian habitat and Waters of the U.S. (i.e., stream, lake, or river) from CDFG would also be required for the proposed project. This agreement would include measures to minimize and restore riparian habitat. The 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement would require the project proponent to prepare and implement a riparian vegetation mitigation and monitoring plan for disturbed riparian vegetation. If impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities are not avoidable, and on-site preservation is not	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	possible, habitat compensation standards include a 2:1 (two acres of preserved habitat for every acre impacted) impact preservation ratio. **MM 4.9.5c** The project proponent shall obtain all necessary permits required by the Clean Water Act, and implement all conditions specified in those permits: • Section 404 permit from USACE for fill of waters of the United States, including wetlands; • Section 401 water quality waiver or certification from the RWQCB. **MM 4.9.5d** The best available technology in Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be employed on all work sites during construction to reduce sedimentation, erosion, water pollution, and dust to the greatest extent practicable. A Grading and Erosion Control Plan shall be prepared by the contractor and submitted to the City of Anderson Public Works and City of Anderson Planning Department for approval prior to the start of project construction, including clearing and grubbing. In areas where wetlands are within 250 feet of the project footprint, erosion control measures and construction fencing shall be emplaced, monitored for effectiveness, and maintained throughout the construction operations around all vernal pools and other wetlands.	
Impact 4.9.6 Implementation of the proposed project would result in disturbance, degradation, and removal of riparian habitat.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.9.5, along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.7 Implementation of the proposed project would result in disturbance, degradation, and removal of vernal pool habitat, including vernal swales.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impacts 4.9.2 and 4.9.5, along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.8 Implementation of the proposed project would result in disturbance, degradation, and removal of blue oak woodland.	**MM 4.9.8a** Construction plans shall clearly state which blue oak trees will be protected and which trees shall be removed. As conditions of approval for development phases, the City shall require the developer to agree to a blue oak woodland mitigation and management program that will detail measures to protect and reduce impacts to blue oaks that will be retained, and to compensate for trees that will be removed. **MM 4.9.8b** The project proponent shall prepare a tree mitigation and management plan that identifies specific measures, schedules, monitoring plan and standards to achieve the performance standards	Significant and unavoidable

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	proposed in the avoidance measures outlined in the Specific Plan. The plan shall be prepared by a registered professional forester and/ or certified arborist, and be provided to the City for review and approval. Upon City approval, the oak woodland mitigation and management plan shall be implemented.	
Impact 4.9.9 Implementation of the proposed project through build-out would result in the loss of foraging and breeding habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impacts 4.9.1 through 4.9.8 along with permitting requirements of the various resource agencies .	Annual grassland and wetland habitats: Less than significant Blue oak woodland habitat: Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.9.11 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, rare, proposed, and candidate status as well as California Fully Protected species.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impacts 4.9.1 through 4.9.8 along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan and requirements set forth under the Vineyards Open Space Preserve Operations and Management Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.12 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in direct mortality or the loss of habitat for special-status plant species including plant species identified by the California Native Plant Society with a rating of List 1A or 1B (i.e. rare, threatened or endangered plants).	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.9.2 along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.13 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in direct mortality or the loss of habitat for migratory birds and raptors.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.9.1 along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.14 Implementation of the Phase 2 would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of animal and plant species of concern and other non-listed special-status species.	Implementation of **MM 4.9.4a** through **MM 4.9.4d** along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Annual grassland and wetland habitats: Less than significant Blue oak woodland habitat: Significant and

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		unavoidable
Impact 4.9.15 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in substantial adverse impacts to, and the potential loss of, jurisdictional waters of the U.S.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.9.2 and 4.9.5 along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.17 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in disturbance, degradation, and removal of vernal pool habitat.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impacts 4.9.2 and 4.9.5.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.18 Implementation of Phase 2 would result in disturbance, degradation, and removal of blue oak woodland.	Implementation of **MM 4.9.8a** and **MM 4.9.8b** along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.9.19 Implementation and buildout of Phase 2 would result in the loss of foraging and breeding habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impacts 4.9.1 through 4.9.8.	Less than significant
Impact 4.9.21 Cumulatively, development of the proposed project will result in direct mortality and loss of habitat for special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the U.S.	Implementation of mitigation measures identified under Impact 4.9.1 and 4.9.8 along with policies included in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan.	Significant and unavoidable
Cultural and Paleontological Resources		
Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the project could impact the following archaeological sites: Vineyards #2, #3, #9, #10, #11, #13, and CA-SHA-1188/H.	**MM 4.10.1a** Vineyards #2, #3, #9, #10, #11, and #13 do not require any mitigation. Site CA-SHA-1188/H is not located in a project area identified for development. The site shall be identified as a culturally sensitive area on project plans (e.g., grading plans) and shall be avoided during project implementation and preserved in place. If current project designs change and site CA-SHA-1188/H cannot be avoided during project implementation and preserved in place, subsurface excavations shall be conducted at the site to recover its data potential. Subsurface excavations, if necessary, shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology and in consultation with the Native American community. **MM 4.10.1b** Ground disturbing project activity (e.g., grading) and/or any subsurface archaeological excavations will be monitored by members of the Native American community as appropriate and as agreed to by the City of Anderson in consultation with the Native American community.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the proposed project could potentially destroy or damage undiscovered prehistoric and historical cultural resources and human remains on the project site.	**MM 4.10.2a** If, during the course of construction, cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Based on the significance of the discovery, the professional archaeologist shall present options to the City of Anderson and project applicant for protecting the resources. The City and the project applicant shall consider the recommendations presented by the professional archaeologist for any unanticipated discoveries. The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consult and agree upon implementation of a protection measure or measures that the City of Anderson and project applicant deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement the necessary measures for the protection of cultural resources as agreed to by all parties. **MM 4.10.2b** The Native American community will be notified of any unanticipated and accidental discoveries of prehistoric or historic Native American cultural resources and will monitor activities associated with determining the significance of any discoveries as agreed to by the City of Anderson in consultation with the Native American community. **MM 4.10.2c** If human remains are discovered, all work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be notified, and the County Coroner must be notified, according to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.	**MM 4.10.3** Should any potentially unique paleontological resources (fossils) be encountered during development activities, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be immediately notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Based on the significance of the discovery, the qualified paleontologist shall present options to the City of Anderson and project applicant for protecting the resources. Appropriate action may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources. The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consider the recommendations of the qualified paleontologist for any unanticipated discoveries. The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consult and agree upon implementation of a protection measure or measures that the City of Anderson deems feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement the necessary measures for the protection of paleontological resources as agreed to by all parties.	Less than significant
Impact 4.10.5 Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could potentially destroy or damage undiscovered prehistoric and historical cultural resources and human remains on the project site.	Implementation of **MM 4.10.2a**, **MM 4.10.2b**, and **MM 4.10.2c**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.10.6 Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.	Implementation of **MM 4.10.3**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.10.7 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and foreseeable development in the City of Anderson and Shasta County could result in cumulative impacts to prehistoric and historic resources and human remains in the region.	Implement **MM 4.10.1a**, **MM 4.10.1b**, **MM 4.10.2a**, **MM 4.10.2b** and **MM 4.10.2c**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.10.8 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development in the City of Anderson and Shasta County, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources in the region.	Implementation of **MM 4.10.3**.	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Public Services		
Impact 4.11.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project would locate homes and structures near wooded areas and expose residents to wildland fire hazards.	**MM 4.11.1.2** Project CC&Rs shall require residents to maintain defensible space around residential structures by removing and clearing away brush, flammable vegetation, or combustible growth in a manner consistent the requirements of the Anderson Fire Protection District and Public Resources Code Section 4291.	Less than significant
Impact 4.11.1.6 Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could potentially locate homes and structures near wooded areas and would expose residents to wildland fire hazards.	Implementation of **MM 4.11.1.2**.	Less than significant
Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact 4.12.1.3 Development of the proposed project may substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). This impact is considered to be potentially significant.	**MM 4.12.1.3** Prior to establishing permanent well sites within the project area, test well data shall be provided to the City Engineer sufficient to indicate anticipated drawdown. If the test well data indicates that preexisting wells in the vicinity of the site would be adversely impacted by anticipated pumpage, the proposed well site shall be relocated.	Less than significant
Impact 4.12.2.1 At buildout, the project would require new conveyance facilities to adequately serve the proposed development. Construction of these new conveyance facilities could potentially result in significant environmental effects. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant.	**MM 4.12.2.1** Prior to final map approval for the initial phase of development (i.e., Phase 2), the South Anderson Sewer Trunk Line shall be developed in accordance with the City's Master Sewer Plan or as modified by the City Engineer.	Less than significant
Impact 4.12.2.2 During development of the proposed project, increased wastewater flows would require additional treatment capacity at the City's WWTP. In order to increase the design capacity, it would eventually require physical expansion of the WWTP. Expansion of the WWTP could potentially result in significant environmental effects.	**MM 4.12.2.2** Prior to the approval of each final map, the project applicant shall secure from the City a commitment that the WWTP has adequate capacity to serve the proposed phase of development. If the WWTP does not have adequate capacity, the City shall deny approval of the map until improvements to the City's WWTP are complete and adequate capacity is available to serve the proposed phase of development.	Less than significant
Impact 4.12.2.3 At Phase 2, the project would require new conveyance facilities to adequately serve the proposed development. This impact is considered potentially significant.	Implement **MM 4.12.2.1**.	Less than significant
Impact 4.12.4.2 Buildout of the proposed project would require the extension of infrastructure for electricity, natural gas, cable and	Implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5, Noise, Section 4.6, Air Quality, Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water	Less than

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
telephone service, which may result in a physical impact on the environment.	Quality, and Section 4.10, Cultural and Paleontological Resources.	significant
Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
Impact 4.13.4 The proposed project would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting to a previously undeveloped area, resulting in an increase in ambient light levels.	No additional mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.13.6 Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project would create new sources of lighting in undeveloped areas. Increased nighttime lighting could have an adverse affect on adjacent areas and land uses.	No additional mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 4.13.7 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with anticipated development in the region, would alter the visual character of the area resulting in a change to public views as well as increased daytime and nighttime glare and lighting levels.	No additional mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Significant and unavoidable
Agricultural Resources		
Impact 4.14.2 At build-out, the project would place urban land uses adjacent to agricultural uses, which may impair adjacent cattle grazing activities and result in land use compatibility conflicts.	**MM 4.14.2a** For those residential properties proposed north of West Anderson Drive and immediately adjacent to County lands designated for full-time agricultural use (i.e., A-G), unless sufficiently buffered by topography, the project's design shall incorporate a physical barrier, such as a low masonry wall topped with wrought iron, between the residential properties and existing ranch parcels. The barrier shall be six feet in height and be of sufficient design to prevent cattle from entering residential lots, and restrict the development's residents from entering the adjoining ranch lands (i.e., no gates). The development's homeowners association shall adequately maintain the barrier to provide continued effectiveness of the barrier. **MM 4.14.2b** Prior to approval of the first final map and subsequent maps, the project applicant shall include a disclosure statement in the project's Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) stating, in effect, that: *If your property is adjacent to property used for agricultural/grazing operations, you may be subject to inconveniences or discomforts arising from such operations on a 24-hour basis. Said discomforts may include, but shall not be limited to, noise, odors from manure or*	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	other chemicals, truck traffic, flies, and dust or smoke. Shasta County and The City of Anderson recognizes and supports the right to farm agricultural lands in a manner consistent with accepted customs and standards. Shasta County and City of Anderson has also determined that inconvenience or discomforts with such agricultural operations shall not be considered a nuisance if such operations are consistent with accepted customs and standards.	
Impact 4.14.5 The project would convert approximately 2,248 acres of grazing land to urban uses. This loss would contribute to the cumulative loss of farmland in the region and could contribute to cumulative conflicts with agricultural uses.	Implementation of **MM 4.14.2a** and **MM 4.14.2b**.	Less than significant
Impact 7.2.1 The project would contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	Implementation of **MM 4.6.2**.	Significant and unavoidable