



# NEGATIVE DECLARATION

## CITY OF CHICO PLANNING SERVICE DEPARTMENT

Based upon the analysis and findings contained within the attached initial study, a  negative declaration  mitigated negative declaration was adopted by the City of Chico Planning Commission on \_\_\_\_\_, 2011, for the following project:

**PROJECT NAME:** Harvest Park Affordable Housing Project

**PROJECT NUMBERS:** PM 11-02, PDP 11-01, UP 11-10

**APPLICANTS NAME:** Central California Housing Corporation, Attn: Laurie Doyle, 3128 Willow Avenue, Suite 101, Clovis, CA 93612

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Southerly side of W. East Avenue, between Esplanade and Holly Avenue, Assessor's Parcel Number 006-150-119.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A proposed parcel map, planned development permit and use permit that would divide an 11-acre site into two parcels, develop a 5-acre multi-family apartment complex on Parcel 1, and construct a new street with traffic signal on Parcel 2 to serve both proposed parcels. No development is currently proposed on Parcel 2. The site is designated Residential Mixed-Use on the Chico General Plan Land Use Diagram and is located in the OR-PD Office Residential-Planned Development Overlay zoning district.

**PREPARED BY:** Mike Sawley

**FINDING:** The attached Initial Study indicated that:

There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, or

The project could result in potentially significant effects, and mitigation measures were adopted for the project which will reduce the significant effects to a less than significant level.

**ATTACHMENT:** Initial Study

**Initial Study**

**City of Chico**

**Environmental Coordination and Review**

**I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**A. Project Name:** Harvest Park Affordable Housing Project (PM 11-02, PDP 11-01, UP 11-10)

**B. Project Location:** The property is located on the southerly side of W. East Avenue, between Esplanade and Holly Avenue.

**C. Type of Application(s):** Parcel Map, Planned Development Permit, and Use Permit

**Assessor's Parcel Number:** 006-150-119

**D. City of Chico Zoning:**  
OR - Office Residential

**F. General Plan designation:**  
Residential Mixed Use

**G. Environmental Setting:**  
The project site is located in an urbanized area in northwest Chico, on the southerly side of West East Avenue between Esplanade and Holly Avenue. Formerly used for growing agricultural crops, the site is currently undeveloped and is regularly mowed for weed abatement. Properties south and west are developed with multifamily residential uses, and commercial uses exist east and north of the site.

**H. Project Description:**  
The project consists of a parcel map, planned development permit and use permit that would divide an 11-acre site into two parcels, develop a 5-acre multi-family apartment complex on Parcel 1, and construct a new street with traffic signal on Parcel 2 to serve both proposed parcels. No development is proposed on Parcel 2, but it's reasonable to assume that Parcel 2 will be developed with commercial uses, perhaps mixed with residential uses, in the future.

The proposed multi-family complex would total 90 units, consisting of 16 one bedroom, 34 two bedroom, 24 three bedroom, and 16 four bedroom units. The plan also includes as Community Building, 180 space parking area, and centralized open space area.

The units would be rent restricted for qualified residents with incomes ranging from 30% to 60% of the area median income. At least 9 accessible units will be dedicated to special needs residents (both mentally and physically challenged) at extremely low incomes. All first floor units will also be fully accessible and adaptable for those individuals requiring adjustments in their units for certain circumstances.

**I. Public Agency Approvals:** Site Design and Architectural Review

**J. Applicant:** Central California Housing Corporation, Attn: Laurie Doyle, 3128 Willow Avenue, Suite 101, Clovis, CA 93612

**K. Prepared By:**  
Mike Sawley, Associate Planner, City of Chico, 411 Main Street, Chico, CA 95928  
Phone: (530) 879-6812, Email: msawley@ci.chico.ca.us, and





**II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards /Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/ Housing        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/ Water Quality     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning        | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils       | <input type="checkbox"/> Open Space/ Recreation       |   |

**III. PLANNING DIRECTOR DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant impact or have a potentially significant impact unless mitigated, but at least one effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. No further study is required.

Signature 

Date 7/14/11

Printed Name (for Mark Wolfe, Planning Director)  
Mike Sawley

#### **IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

- Responses to the following questions and related discussion indicate if the proposed project will have or potentially have a significant adverse impact on the environment.
- A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- All answers must take account of the whole action involved , including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operation impacts.
- Once it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there is at least one “Potentially Significant Impact” entry when the determination is made an EIR is required.
- Negative Declaration: “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The initial study will describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 4, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, a program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 155063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 4 at the end of the checklist.
- Initial studies may incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. the general plan or zoning ordinances, etc.). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.
- The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

A. Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, including scenic roadways as defined in the General Plan, or a Federal Wild and Scenic River?			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
3. Affect lands preserved under a scenic easement or contract?			X	
4. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings including the scenic quality of the foothills as addressed in the General Plan?			X	
5. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

DISCUSSION

**A.1-4** The proposed project is not located in a foothill area or adjacent to any designated scenic roadway. The site is not affected or preserved by any scenic easement or contract, nor does it contain any visually remarkable features uncommon to the area. The project site is not located in the vicinity of a designated Wild and Scenic River.

Because the project would not impact any designated scenic resources and would not significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, aesthetic impacts would be **less than significant**. No mitigation for aesthetic impacts is required.

**A5.** All exterior lighting installed as a part of the project will be required to adhere to Chico Municipal Code standards regarding full-cut off designs and downward orientation to minimize glare. The project would have **less than significant impact** on light or glare that would affect daytime or nighttime views.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>B. Air Quality</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans (e.g. Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin 1994 Air Quality Attainment Plan, Chico Urban Area CO Attainment Plan, and Butte County Air Quality Management District Indirect Source Review Guidelines)?			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

**DISCUSSION:**

**B.1–B.5:**

Construction

Currently, most of the effort to improve air quality in the United States and California is directed toward the control of five pollutants, called “criteria” air pollutants: photochemical oxidants (ozone), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Pollutants subject to federal ambient standards are referred to as “criteria” pollutants because the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) publishes criteria documents to justify the choice of standards.

One of the primary reasons for air quality standards is the protection of those members of the population who are most sensitive to the adverse health effects of air pollution, termed “sensitive receptors”. The term sensitive receptors refers to specific population groups as well as the land uses where they would reside for long periods. Commonly identified sensitive population groups are children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill. Commonly identified sensitive land uses are residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, retirement homes or convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics. Areas sensitive to air pollutants in or near the project area may include residential areas, schools, and elderly care facilities. Other sensitive areas include the nearest right-of-way where children and the elderly have continuous access to areas such as sidewalk areas or parks.

Construction-related activities such as grading and operation of construction vehicles would create a temporary increase in dustfall on the project site and within the immediate vicinity of the project site. According to the BCAQMD, Butte County is classified as a nonattainment area for ozone and particulate matter, including particulates 10 micron in size or less and 2.5 microns in size or less, as set forth in the following table dated January 2009 from the BCAQMD website.

<b>BUTTE COUNTY AMBIENT AIR QUALITY ATTAINMENT STATUS</b>		<b>(1/09)</b>
<i>POLLUTANT</i>	<i>STATE</i>	<i>FEDERAL</i>
1-hour Ozone	Nonattainment	NA
8-hour Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment
Inhalable Particulates (PM10)	Nonattainment	Attainment
Inhalable Particulates (PM2.5)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment

Most of the dust generated should be large enough to quickly settle. Pursuant to Chico Municipal Code requirements and Butte County Air Quality Management District Rule 205, Fugitive Dust Emissions, the project will be required to implement Best Available Control Measures during construction to minimize dust emissions (BCAQMD 2010).until all surfaces are finished and/or landscaped:

- During clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering, paving of construction roads, or other dust-preventative measures.
- All material excavated or graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning or after work is done for the day.
- All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 15 mph averaged over 1 hour.
- All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by demolition, clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.
- Portions of the construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown.
- All on site roads shall be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized.

Existing City regulations require all grading plans to include a dust suppression plan specifying standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) which reduce the incidence of fugitive dust to a less than significant level. All demolition work is required to comply with National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) regulations.

Long-term impacts

The project would result in indirect emissions from project-generated traffic and area sources such as natural gas combustion for space and water heating, and operation of landscape equipment. City standard BMPs for long term air quality as set forth in the City’s Best Practices Manual are required on all building plans. Adherence to BMP requirements would reduce potential long-term air quality impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the development is consistent with the land use and cumulative buildout identified in the 2020 Chico General Plan, and would not exceed those emissions anticipated by the General Plan EIR. Therefore the project is considered to have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>C. Biological Resources</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities result in:				
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species as listed and mapped in the MEA or in other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the MEA or in other local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
5. Result in the fragmentation of an existing wildlife habitat, such as blue oak woodland or riparian, and an increase in the amount of edge with adjacent habitats.				X
6. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances, protecting biological resources?				X

**DISCUSSION:**

**C1-C5:** The undeveloped site consists of heavily disturbed ruderal grassland or exposed soil. The site has been previously graded and contains no significant vegetation or potential wildlife habitat. The site is regularly mowed to reduce fire hazards and has become dominated by invasive tumbleweed and yellow starthistle. The regular maintenance, high level of exposure, and constant traffic likely preclude any tree nesting birds, or ground nesting raptors. Therefore **No Impact** would result from development of the proposed site.

**C6:** The project does not conflict with any local ordinance regarding wildlife. Therefore there would be **No Impact** to local policies or ordinances.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>D. Cultural Resources</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the				X

significance of an historical resource as defined in PRC Section 15064.5?

2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to PRC Section 15064.5?

X

3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

X

4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

X

**DISCUSSION:**

**D.1:** Due to the chronically disturbed nature of the site, the proposed project is not considered likely to cause any adverse change to local or State historical resources. Therefore there would be **No Impact** to historical resources.

**D.2 – D.4:** The existing vacant field has previously been graded and intensely used for growing crops, making the potential of excavating cultural resources low. Grading and construction activities for the project will be required to adhere to BMP protocols in the instance that archaeological resources or human skeletal remains are discovered during excavation activities. Halting construction work and observing BMP protocols for evaluating cultural resources in the case of a discovery is standard notation required on grading and building plans. Since existing plan reviews require implementation of BMPs for archaeological resources, potential future impacts to archaeological resources are considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>E. Geology /Soils</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Div. of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42)			X	
b. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
c. Seismic-related ground failure/liquefaction?			X	
d. Landslides?			X	
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site			X	

---

landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

---

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

X

---

5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water, or is otherwise not consistent with the Chico Nitrate Action Plan or policies for sewer service control?

---

X

DISCUSSION:

**E.1:** The City of Chico is located in one of the least active seismic regions in California and contains no active faults. Currently, there are no designated Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones within the Planning Area, nor are there any known or inferred active faults. Thus, the potential for ground rupture within the Chico area is considered very low. Under existing regulations, all future structures will incorporate CBC standards into the design and construction, which will adequately minimize potential impacts associated with ground-shaking during an earthquake. The potential for seismically-related ground failure or landslides is considered **less than significant**.

**E.2-4:** Development of the site will be subject to the city's grading ordinance, which requires the inclusion of appropriate erosion control and sediment transport best management practices (BMPs) as standard conditions of grading permit issuance. Additionally, the city has developed a Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) per the Phase II requirements established by §402 of the Clean Water Act. All projects within the city's jurisdiction must adhere to the applicable standards of the SWMP, which includes both construction activity and post-construction storm water discharge BMPs.

Furthermore, the City and Air Quality District require implementation of all applicable fugitive dust control measures, which further reduces the potential for construction-generated erosion. All projects disturbing greater than one acre must obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination Permit (NPDES) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) per §402 of the Clean Water Act. Development of the site will also be required to meet all requirements of the California Building Code which will address potential issues of ground shaking, soil swell/shrink, and the potential for liquefaction.

As a result, potential future impacts relating to geology and soils are considered to be **less than significant**.

**E.5:** No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed. All structures would be connected to city sewer lines located in the adjacent public right of way, therefore the proposal is considered to have **No Impact**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>F. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>Will the project or its related activities:</b>				
1. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

**DISCUSSION:**

**F.1-2:** In October 2006, the City of Chico City Council signed the U.S. Conference of Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement confirming the City's commitment to reduce GHG emissions. By signing the Agreement, the City agreed to strive to meet or beat the Kyoto Protocol GHG emission reduction target of 7% below 1990 levels by 2012. In addition, California Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 and the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32, Health & Safety Code, Section 38501[a]) establish a statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels (or by approximately 25% from 2005 levels) by 2020, and a GHG emission reduction of 80% by 2050.

To assist the City in implementing the U.S. Mayor's Agreement, the Council formed a Sustainability Task Force (STF). The STF has overseen the development of a communitywide greenhouse gas emissions inventory and is currently finalizing a Climate Action Plan (CAP) aimed at meeting GHG reduction targets. Although the draft CAP has not been officially adopted by the City Council, it has undergone several reviews by the Council and the general framework of the draft CAP is not likely to change. The draft CAP uses a phased approach as follows:

	Target Date	Goal for Annual Citywide Emissions*	Incremental Reduction Needed to Meet Goal*
<b>Phase 1</b> – Reduction to 2005 levels	December 2012	515,990	80,142
<b>Phase 2</b> – 10% below 2005 levels	December 2015	464,391	89,762
<b>Phase 3</b> – 25% below 2005 levels	December 2020	386,992	146,671
Total Reduction Needed by 2020			316,575

\* All units are metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, or MteCo2

As of September 2010, approximately 78% of the reduction needed to meet the Phase 1 goal had been achieved, and the remainder is expected to be met through a combination of efforts that do not correspond with imposing requirements on private development projects such as the proposed project. The remaining phase 1 efforts include measures by City government operations, residential energy efficiency programs, alternative transportation programs, waste reduction programs, and community outreach and education.

A project is considered to have a potentially significant impact with regard to GHG emissions if it conflicts with or fails to include measures necessary for the implementation of the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP). The proposed project is not subject to and will not conflict with any of the measures being pursued under Phase 1 of the draft CAP applicable at this time. Therefore, with regard to greenhouse gas emissions the impact of the proposed project is considered to be **Less Than Significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>G. Hazards /Hazardous Materials</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
5. For a project located within the airport land use plan, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Study Area?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Study Area?				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

DISCUSSION:

**G.1 – G.8:** The development of the property would not result in the generation or use of a significant amount of hazardous materials. The property is not listed as a state or federal hazardous waste site (pursuant to Governmental Code Section 65962.5) or identified as a hazardous site in the General Plan EIR. The site is located just within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone D for the Chico Municipal Airport, however this zone only restricts structures over 100 feet in height – which are not included in the proposal or allowed by the zoning code. Development of the property would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Onsite circulation patterns, designs and improvements will be subject to Fire Marshal approval to ensure adequate access for emergency response situations. The property is not near a wild land fire area. Therefore the project is considered to have **No Impact** with regard to hazardous materials.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>H. Hydrology/ Water Quality</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. 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 table level (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)?			X	
3. 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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. 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?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
7. Place real property 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?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

DISCUSSION:

**H.1, H.2:** Under the existing General Construction Permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), development of the site will require preparation of a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that incorporates water quality control Best Management Practices (BMP's). The implementation of water quality control BMPs as a part of compliance with would minimize the impacts from construction of the proposed project to a level that is **Less Than Significant**.

**H.3-H.5:** Development could result in an increase in surface water runoff due to reduced absorption from the addition of impervious surfaces, however, storm water quality and quantity treatment would

be provided in accordance with the City’s Best Practices Technical Manual with review and approval by the Engineering Division. With implementation of these existing regulations the potential impacts from changing drainage patterns and increasing surface runoff would be **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**H.6-H.10:** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06007C0340E, assessed 2011, the site is located in Zone X, which is outside the 500 year flood plain, therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding or related events. Therefore there would be **No impact**.

Mitigations: None Required

<b>I. Land Use and Planning</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Conflict with General Plan or Specific Plan policies or zoning regulations?				X
2. Results in a physically divide an established community?				X
3. Results in a conflict with any applicable Resource Management or Resource Conservation Plan?				X
4. Result in substantial conflict with the established character, aesthetics or functioning of the surrounding community?			X	
5. Results in a project that is a part of a larger project involving a series of cumulative actions?			X	
6. Result in displacement of people or business activity?				X
7. Conversion of viable prime agricultural land and/or land under agricultural contract to non-agricultural use, or substantial conflicts with existing agricultural operations? (Viable agricultural land is defined as land on Class I or Class II agricultural soils of 5 acres or greater, adjacent on no more than one side to existing urban development.)				X

DISCUSSION:

**I.1:** The Site is designated Residential Mixed Use (RMU) on the General Plan Diagram and is zoned OR Office Residential. Further, the site is designated by the General Plan as an Opportunity Corridor site. The proposed development is consistent with these designations and no specific plan is applicable to the project site. Future development on proposed Parcel 2 will have to be consistent with applicable designations at the time development is proposed. Therefore, there would be **No Impact**.

**I.2:** The project is located on a major traffic corridor between established commercial and multi-family residential areas. The development of this project would be consistent with the surrounding area. Construction of this project would not divide any community; therefore there would be **No Impact**.

**I.3:** There are no resource management or resource conservation plans for the area. Therefore there would be **No Impact**.

**I.4:** The project site is vacant and the proposed two-story multi-family residential development is consistent with existing two-story multi-family residential development. This change would alter the aesthetic character of the site, but the impact on the surrounding community would be a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**I.5:** Although development of the overall site is expected to occur in separate phases, this analysis considers full development of the site. Therefore, cumulative development of the project site is expected to have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**I.6:** No people or businesses would be displaced by the project, therefore, this impact is considered to have **No Impact**.

**I.7:** The subject site has been designated for a mix of residential and commercial uses in the City's General Plan and is not located upon prime agricultural soils as identified by the California Dept. of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which maps the site as "Urban and Built-up Land." Therefore, the project will not affect farmlands and there would be **No impact**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>J. Noise</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Exposure of residents in new hotels, motels, apartment houses, and dwellings (other than single-family dwellings) to interior noise levels (CNEL) higher than 45 dBA in any habitable room with windows closed?			X	
2. Exposure of sensitive receptors (residential, parks, hospitals, schools) to exterior noise levels of 65 dBA or higher?			X	
3. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
4. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
6. For a project located within the airport land use plan, would the project expose people residing or working in the Study Area to excessive noise levels?			X	
7. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Study Area to excessive noise levels?			X	

DISCUSSION:

**J.1-2:** The project site is located adjacent to West East Avenue, a major arterial street with approximately 28,500 vehicle trips per day. According to the General Plan EIR (page 4.7-36), CNEL noise exposure levels are less than 70 dB adjacent to the roadway but exceed 65 dB up to 101 feet from the centerline of West East Avenue, or approximately 50 feet into the site. Typical modern residential construction attenuates exterior noise levels by 25 dB, and the architect has calculated that a reduction of 30 dB is expected based on the specific window and door types proposed. With exterior noise levels reduced by 30 dB, interior noise levels for the units nearest West East Avenue are expected to be below the significance threshold of 45 dB as a result of traffic noise. Exterior recreation areas of the project are located approximately 250 feet from the centerline of West East Avenue, which is approximately 150 feet outside the 65 db contour associated with traffic noise on the street. Further, the outdoor recreation areas within the development will be somewhat shielded by

the proposed buildings. Therefore, locating residents as proposed will result in noise exposure levels that are **Less Than Significant**.

**J.3:** There are no sources of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the project vicinity, therefore the project will have **No Impact**.

**J-4:** Noise sources that will likely result from the proposed subdivision will be consistent with that of residential uses, which will not create a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Increases in ambient noise levels will be **Less Than Significant**.

**J.5:** Although temporary single-noise events will be generated during the construction phase, these impacts are considered to be less than significant because they are short term, and project contractors will be required to comply with the existing noise regulations which limit the hours of construction and maximum noise levels. Therefore the impact is considered to be **Less Than Significant**.

**J.6 – J.7:** The project site is located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the Chico Municipal Airport and 1 mile northwest of emergency helicopter operations associated with Enloe Medical Center. Thus, air traffic may occasionally be noticed from the project site, but noise exposure levels to the residents from air traffic would remain **Less Than Significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>K. Open Space/ Recreation</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Affect lands preserved under an open space contract or easement?				X
2. Affect an existing or potential community recreation area?			X	
3. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
4. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

DISCUSSION:

**K.1 - K.4:** The site is not in an open space contract, nor does it contain an open space easement, or affect potential community recreation areas. The development proposal includes an onsite recreational area and pool facility which would minimize the small incremental increase in usage of existing City Parks. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>L. Population/ Housing</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities:				
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	X
4. Conflict with General Plan population growth rates for its planning areas in conjunction with other recently approved development?	X

**DISCUSSION:**

**L.1:** The type of infill development proposed is encouraged by the General Plan, where community-wide impacts of Plan build-out were considered. The population growth associated with the proposed development of 90 residential units is considered to be **Less Than Significant**.

**L.2-L.3:** The proposal would not displace existing housing or a substantial number of people, therefore, the project would have **No Impact** on population growth or displace any existing housing.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>M. Public Services</b> Will the project or its related activities have an effect upon or result in a need for altered governmental services in any of the following areas:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection?			X	
2. Police protection?			X	
3. Schools?			X	
4. Parks and recreation facilities? (See Section J Open Space/Recreation)				X
5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads, canals, etc.?			X	
6. Other government services?			X	

**DISCUSSION:**

**M.1-M.6:** Fire protection for the project area is provided by the City of Chico Fire Department. The City Police Department is responsible for enforcing State laws and City ordinances in the area of the project site. The expansion would not require any additional police or fire personnel. Development of the site will require payment of development impact fees to offset the cost of new facilities for police, fire, schools, and other public services. Impacts to police, fire, and other public services are therefore considered to be **Less Than Significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>N. Transportation/Circulation</b> Will the project or its related activities:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	

2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	X
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?	X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	X

DISCUSSION:

**N.1 – N.2, N.6:** Area roadways have been designed to accommodate the future buildout of the area based on traffic projections from the General Plan land use designations for the area. The proposed project would install a traffic signal at the intersection of the proposed new street with West East Avenue. The new signal would serve to platoon traffic flows along West East Avenue and would provide efficient means of access to and from the project site. With the proposed roadway improvements, traffic impacts from the project are considered **Less Than Significant**.

**N.3:** The project would not affect air traffic patterns and would therefore have **No Impact**.

**N.4 – N.5:** All roadway improvements will be required to adhere to adopted roadway design standards. Application of these standards would ensure that the project would not increase traffic hazards. Therefore, this impact is considered to be **Less Than Significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

<b>O. Utilities</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Will the project or its related activities have an effect upon or result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
1. Water for domestic use and fire protection?			X	
2. Natural gas, electricity, telephone, or other communications?			X	
3. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
4. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
5. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
6. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or			X	

are new or expanded entitlements needed?

7. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? X

8. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? X

9. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? X

DISCUSSION:

**O.1-O.7:** All utilities (water, storm drain, sewer, gas, phone, and electric facilities) are currently located on or adjacent to the site and have available capacity to serve the proposed project. As a result, impacts to these utilities are considered to be **less than significant**.

**O.8 and O.9:** Available capacity exists at the Neal Road landfill to accommodate waste generated by the project. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation: None Required

**V. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. The project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.				X
B. The project has possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current and probable future projects).			X	
C. The environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.				X

DISCUSSION:

**A-C:** Based on the preceding environmental analysis, the application of existing regulations will ensure that all potential impacts from the proposed project, including those related to water quality, air quality and cultural resources, would be minimized or avoided, and that the project will not result in direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings or the environment, nor result in significant cumulative impacts.

**VI. REFERENCES**

- Butte County. 2000. The Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Shutt Moen, February, 2000.
- BCAQMD. 2010. Rule 205, Fugitive Dust Emissions. Butte County Air Quality Management District . Online resource. [http://www.bcaqmd.org/page/\\_files/Final-StrikeThrough-Rule-205-Adopted-05-20-10.pdf](http://www.bcaqmd.org/page/_files/Final-StrikeThrough-Rule-205-Adopted-05-20-10.pdf)). 2010.
- California Department of Conservation. 2008. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Online resource <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/but08.pdf>. 2008.
- Chico General Plan. 2011. City of Chico General Plan, adopted April 12, 2011.
- Chico GP EIR. 2011. City of Chico General Plan Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse Number 2008122038. Adopted April 12, 2011.
- CMC. 2011. Chico Municipal Code. Various Titles. Adopted 1998, Accessed 2011.
- DTSC. 2011. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List. [www.envirostar.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.envirostar.dtsc.ca.gov). 2011.
- EPA. 2011. Groundwater Division of the Water Program of the Southwest Pacific Region. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Online resource. <http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html>. 2011.
- FEMA. 2011. Flood Insurance Rate Maps 06007C0340E. January 6, 2011. <http://gis1.msc.fema.gov/Website/newstore/viewer.htm>. 2011.
- NRCS. 2006. Soil Survey of Butte Area, California, Parts of Butte and Plumas Counties. Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006.
- Sawley. 2011. General professional knowledge of Mike Sawley, Associate Planner (Document Preparer). City of Chico. July, 2011.
- SWRCB. 2011. State Water Resources Control Board. <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov>. 2011.
- USFWS Wetlands. 2011. Wetlands Mapper from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Interactive online resource. <http://137.227.242.85/wetland/wetland.html>. 2011.
- USFWS Rivers. 2011. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Online resource. <http://www.rivers.gov/maps/conus-200.pdf>. 2011