
DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
EASTSIDE AGGREGATES PROJECT

Shasta County - SCH No. 2000062079

Prepared for:

SHASTA COUNTY
Department of Resource Management
Planning Division
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, CA 96001-1759

Prepared by:

PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS
140 Independence Circle, Suite C
Chico, CA 95973

AUGUST 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTIONS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Project Background	1-1
1.2	Legal Authority and Purpose	1-1
1.3	Scope and Content	1-2
1.4	Organization of the EIR	1-3
1.5	Intended Uses of the EIR	1-4
1.6	Impact Classifications	1-5
2.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
2.1	Purpose of the EIR	2-1
2.2	Project Characteristics	2-1
2.3	Issues of Concern	2-3
2.4	Project Alternatives	2-3
2.5	Other Impacts	2-3
2.6	Summary of Environmental Impacts	2-4
3.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
3.1	Project Location and Regional Setting	3-1
3.2	Site Description	3-1
3.3	Project Objectives	3-8
3.4	Project Characteristics	3-8
3.5	Prior Environmental Review	3-19
3.6	Required Permits and Approvals	3-21
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	
4.1	Introduction to the Environmental Impact Analysis	4.1-1
4.2	Aesthetics and Visual Resources	4.2-1
4.3	Air Quality	4.3-1
4.4	Biological Resources	4.4-1
4.5	Geology and Soils	4.5-1
4.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4.6-1
4.7	Hydrology and Water Quality	4.7-1
4.8	Noise	4.8-1
4.9	Recreation	4.9-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.0	ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT	
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Alternative 1 - No Project	5-1
5.3	Alternative 2 - Alternative Sites	5-3
5.4	Alternative 3 - Alternative Aggregate Source	5-6
5.5	Alternative 4 - Restricted Hours of Operation	5-7
5.6	Environmentally Superior Alternative	5-8
6.0	OTHER EVALUATIONS REQUIRED BY CEQA	
6.1	Cumulative Impacts	6-1
6.2	Growth Inducing Impacts	6-3
6.3	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	6-3
7.0	REPORT PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED	
7.1	Preparers of the EIR	7-1
7.2	Individuals and Persons Consulted	7-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
Appendix B	Traffic Volume Estimates
Appendix C	Air Quality Analysis
Appendix D	Biological Studies
Appendix E	Geologic and Hydrologic Studies
Appendix F	Shasta County Fire Department Standards
Appendix G	Peer Review - Hydrology and Geology

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NUMBER		PAGE
2-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	2-5
3-1	Project Acreage	3-11
3-2	Aggregate Quantities and Uses	3-11
3-3	Estimated Daily Traffic Volumes Generated by Project	3-19
4.3-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards	4.3-2
4.3-2	Control Measures and Adoption Status	4.3-4
4.3-3	SCAQMD Emission Thresholds for Stationary Sources	4.3-6
4.3-4	Estimated Emissions from Project Operations	4.3-8
4.3-5	Estimated Air Quality Impacts from Project Operations	4.3-8
4.3-6	Comparison of Project Emissions to Total County Emissions	4.3-15
4.3-7	Cumulative Emissions in Burney Valley Area	4.3-16
4.5-1	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale for Earthquakes	4.5-6
4.7-1	Water Budget for Burney Basin	4.7-15
4.8-1	Ambient Noise Measurement Results, Eastside Aggregates Project Site Vicinity, May 30, 2000	4.8-6
4.8-2	Noise Level Performance Standards for New Projects Affected by or Including Non-Transportation Sources	4.8-8
4.8-3	Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure, Transportation Noise Sources	4.8-9
4.8-4	Major Noise-Producing Equipment and Associated Noise Levels, Eastside Aggregates Project - Shasta County	4.8-11
4.8-5	Distances from Project-Related Activities to Nearest Residences and Predicted Noise levels, Eastside Aggregates Project - Shasta County	4.8-12
4.8-6	Predicted Traffic Noise Levels at Nearest Existing Residences, Eastside Aggregates Project - Shasta County	4.8-13

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NUMBER		PAGE
3-1	Regional Location	3-2
3-2	Site Location	3-3
3-3	Site Map with Current Land Uses	3-5
3-4	Project Features	3-6
3-5A	Site Map with Proposed Land Uses	3-9
3-5B	C-M Zone	3-10
4.2-1	View of Project Site from SR 89/Clark Creek Road Intersection	4.2-2
4.2-2	View of Project Site from Hat Creek Construction Entrance	4.2-2
4.2-3	View of Project Site South of Hat Creek Construction Entrance	4.2-2
4.2-4	View of Bluff from eastern Dike of Log Pond Site	4.2-4
4.4-1	Permanent Pond on Project Site	4.4-2
4.4-2	Seasonal Pond between Bluff and Eastern Dike	4.4-5
4.5-1	Mineral Resource Zones	4.5-3
4.5-2	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones	4.5-5
4.7-1	Burney Creek Watershed	4.7-2
4.8-1	Typical A-Weighted Sound Levels of Common Noise Sources	4.8-2
4.8-2	View of Nearest Residences to Project Site, Looking Northwest from SR 89	4.8-3
4.8-3	Hat Creek Project Site, Approximate Locations of Proposed Project Components and Nearest Residences	4.8-5

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the Eastside Aggregates project, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed project is located in northeastern Shasta County, along State Route (SR) 89 approximately 3.7 miles north of its intersection with SR 299 East. Under CEQA procedures, Shasta County (County) is the Lead Agency for the Eastside Aggregates project. The original application for the project was submitted to the County in June 1999.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project applicant, Hat Creek Construction, Incorporated, proposes the establishment of a rock quarry and the construction of a crushing and screening operation, a concrete batch plant, and an asphalt plant. Also proposed are a truck repair shop, an outdoor area for the retail sale of landscaping material and for trailer rentals, stockpile and truck staging areas, and retention basins and fill areas.

The project would be located on approximately 109 acres of a 343-acre parcel located along SR 89. The parcel is zoned for industrial use, and a sawmill had been in operation on the site historically. There is a residential area and mobile home park located northwest of the project site across SR 89, with the closest residence approximately 0.5 miles away.

The project would require a zone amendment to rezone approximately 24 acres, the issuance of two use permits and approval of a reclamation plan by Shasta County. Approval of these actions, except for the zone amendment, must be granted by the Shasta County Planning Commission. The zone amendment must be approved by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors.

1.2 LEGAL AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000-21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3). In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this EIR is to serve as “an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.”

As the Lead Agency, Shasta County has discretionary approval authority, and thus the responsibility to consider the environmental effects of the project. The Lead Agency also has the responsibility to consult with responsible agencies and trustee agencies during the environmental review process. Responsible agencies include all other public agencies that have discretionary approval authority over the project.

A trustee agency, as defined by CEQA, is a “state agency having jurisdiction, by law, over natural resources affected by a project which are held in trust for the people of California.” An example is

1.0 INTRODUCTION

the California Department of Fish and Game, which exercises administration over the fish and wildlife resources of California under the authority of, and in accordance with, the provisions of Section 1802 of the Fish and Game Code.

This EIR will be used by the lead, responsible and trustee agencies to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of implementing the project, in accordance with the provisions set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. The purposes of the EIR are to address potentially significant environmental issues identified during the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation phases of environmental review, and to recommend technically feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that will reduce or eliminate significant adverse environmental impacts.

1.3 SCOPE AND CONTENT

In compliance with the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study on the environmental effects of the Eastside Aggregate Project. From this Initial Study, the County determined that an EIR would be required for the project. The County also solicited comments through distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP). Comments received in response to the NOP process, and the analysis within the Initial Study, formed the basis for the technical scope of the EIR. The NOP, Initial Study and comments are in Appendix A of this document.

The EIR includes analysis of the following issues:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

In addition, the Initial Study identified potential cumulative effects of the project, which are also addressed in this EIR.

IMPACTS DETERMINED TO NOT BE SIGNIFICANT

Based upon the analysis contained in the Initial Study, the following environmental issues were determined not to be significantly affected by the proposed project:

- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources

- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

For an explanation as to why potential impacts in these issue areas were determined to not be significant, please refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A of this document. For some environmental issues determined to not be significant, the Initial Study identified mitigation measures for potential impacts. These mitigation measures are described in Section 4.1, Introduction to Environmental Impact Analysis, and have been incorporated within this EIR.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This EIR has been designed to serve as a concise working document for decision-makers and the general public. The document has been organized in the following format:

Section 1.0 - Introduction

This section introduces the project and describes the EIR process and the contents of this EIR.

Section 2.0 - Executive Summary

This section provides a summary of the project and its potential environmental impacts. It includes a table that presents the environmental impacts identified in this EIR and the measures to mitigate these impacts.

Section 3.0 - Project Description

This section gives a detailed description of the project. It also includes a listing of public agencies from which approvals and permits for the project, other than those from the County Planning Commission, may be required.

Section 4.0 - Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section analyzes the significant environmental issues associated with the project. For each of the environmental issues for which potentially significant impacts were identified (see Section 1.3 above), a description of existing conditions is first presented, followed by discussion of the applicable regulations. Then, a thorough analysis of potentially significant impacts associated with the project is provided, and measures to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level are identified. Finally, a conclusion is reached as to whether these impacts would remain significant, even after mitigation measures are applied.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 5.0 - Project Alternatives

As required by CEQA, this section presents a description and analysis of reasonable alternatives to the project, including a “no project” alternative.

Section 6.0 - Other Evaluations Required by CEQA

This section presents an evaluation of cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes. All of these evaluations are required by CEQA Guidelines.

Section 7.0 - EIR Preparers and Persons Consulted

This section provides a listing of EIR preparers and contributors. It also lists the individuals and agencies consulted for information during the preparation of this document.

1.5 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

The County intends to use this EIR to determine if the project, as proposed, would create significant environmental impacts, and whether these impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level. As the Lead Agency, the County must review and consider the final version of an EIR (the Final EIR) before approving a project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090).

In addition, this EIR will be used by other agencies with authority to grant approvals or permits that the project may require. Some of the agencies that may have permitting or approval authority over the project are as follows:

*Shasta County
Department of Public Works
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001*

A grading permit must be obtained from the Public Works Department before any grading or construction activities may commence. The permit is typically granted by the Department without the need for approval by the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

*Shasta County
Department of Resource Management
Environmental Health Division
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001*

The Environmental Health Division is the primary agency responsible for overseeing the commercial

use and storage of hazardous materials within the Project Area. Among its activities is the review, approval and monitoring of "business plans", which must be filed by every business that utilizes hazardous materials. Included in each plan is a listing of materials, storage facilities and any particular handling requirements.

*Shasta County Air Quality Management District
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001*

The Shasta County Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for the implementation of both State and Federal ambient air quality standards at the County level. Since the project proposes the construction and operation of an asphalt plant, a concrete batch plant and a crushing and screening operation, an "Authority to Construct" and a "Permit to Operate" would be required from SCAQMD for these facilities.

*Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
415 Knollcrest Drive
Redding, CA 96002*

The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates industrial wastewater disposal and storm water discharges through issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs).

*California Department of Transportation
District 2
1657 Riverside Drive
Redding, CA 96001*

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for the construction and maintenance of State highways. The project Initial Study stated that the existing driveway road approach from SR 89 would need to be upgraded to Caltrans' "Type C" standards, with a typical deceleration lane and acceleration lane, for which a Caltrans encroachment permit would be required.

1.6 IMPACT CLASSIFICATIONS

Determining the severity of project impacts is fundamental to achieving the objectives of CEQA. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires that decision makers make findings that significant impacts identified in the Final EIR have been mitigated as completely as feasible. If the EIR identifies any significant impacts that cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 requires decision makers to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which explains why the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse environmental

1.0 INTRODUCTION

consequences identified by the EIR.

The level of significance for each impact examined in this EIR was determined by considering the predicted magnitude of the impact against a threshold. Thresholds were developed using criteria from the CEQA Guidelines, local/regional plans and ordinances, accepted practice, and/or consultation with recognized experts. Four levels of impact significance are recognized by this EIR:

- **Significant and unavoidable impacts** are adverse project impacts which cannot be avoided or mitigated to a level that is less than significant. A significant and unavoidable impact is a problem for which a solution has not been formulated, either because of limited technical and/or scientific knowledge, or because solutions are infeasible for technical, economic or social reasons.
- **Significant but mitigable impacts** are significant adverse project impacts for which sufficient mitigation has been formulated to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Without implementation of the identified mitigation, these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Less than significant impacts** are project impacts which are not disruptive enough to the physical environment to require mitigation. The determination that an impact is less than significant is made by comparing the impact to an associated threshold.
- In some circumstances, the classification **potentially significant** is applied. A potentially significant impact is one whose significance cannot be determined for certain, but is reasonably considered to be significant. Potentially significant impacts are not based upon speculation, but are impacts that can be reasonably inferred from available facts.