

This section describes the public facilities and services that would serve the Tehama County General Plan Planning Area. Each service includes descriptions of existing conditions, service standards and potential impacts on each service resulting from policy implementation of the proposed General Plan. This section of the EIR addresses comments received by the Tehama County Resource Conservation District in response to the Notice of Preparation.

**4.12.1 FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

**4.12.1.1 EXISTING SETTING**

Fire protection in Tehama County is provided by local districts, local volunteer fire departments, the cities of Red Bluff and Corning, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal-Fire) and the U.S. Forest Service. Fire agencies have mutual aid agreements to assist each other in handling fire and other emergency calls. These fire agencies provide fire protection services, fire suppression, inspection, plan checking, emergency transportation, and medical services, public education, advanced life support and rescue services to the unincorporated portions of the County.

**LOCAL FIRE SERVICE AGENCIES**

Local fire service districts and City fire departments have primary responsibility for all fire protection on *local responsibility areas (LRA)* and structure protection on *state responsibility areas (SRA)* within their district boundaries. Twelve local fire departments are located throughout Tehama County, including, Corning, Bend, Gerber, Los Molinos, Manton, Mineral, Paskenta, Paynes Creek, Richfield, Red Bluff, Cottonwood, and Vina. All local fire service agencies in the County are volunteer fire departments with the exception of the Red Bluff Fire Department. **Table 4.12-1** displays the location of the current local fire departments throughout Tehama County.

The Tehama County Emergency Command Center (ECC) coordinates emergency response in the County. The ability of the ECC to manage efficient emergency response to all portions of the County was greatly enhanced in 2004 with the addition of key technological improvements to the operating system. By interfacing a new state of the art computer aided dispatch (CAD) system with an improved 911 answering system, a dispatcher has the ability to receive a 9-1-1 emergency call, identify equipment to respond, quickly send alert tones to the appropriate response station, and identify unexpected situations while units are responding to an incident such as sudden road closures. The technological improvements have combined for a more efficient and more prompt processing of incidents that consequently improve the quality of services provided to the citizens of Tehama County.

**TABLE 4.12-1  
EXISTING TEHAMA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT FACILITIES AND LOCATION**

Name of Facility	Address	Location
Tehama County Fire Department Administrative Office	604 Antelope Blvd	Red Bluff
Red Bluff/Antelope Station 1	604 Antelope Blvd	Red Bluff
Lake California Station 2	22133 Riverview Dr	Cottonwood
Bowman Station 3	18355 Bowman Rd	Cottonwood
Ridgeway Station 4	19691 Ridgeway Rd	Red Bluff
Bend Station 5	22310 Bend Ferry Rd	Bend
El Camino Station 9	9580 Hwy 99W	Gerber

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

Name of Facility	Address	Location
Los Molinos Station 10	7930 Sherwood Blvd	Los Molinos
Richfield Station 11	23613 Richfield Rd	Richfield
Dibble Creek Station 14	20230 Hwy 36W	Red Bluff
Vina Station 16	4560 Rowles Rd	Vina
Manton Station 18	31291 Manton Rd	Manton
Mineral Station 20	P.O. Box 3	Mineral
Paynes Creek Station 21	29960 Plum Creek Rd	Paynes Creek
Corning Fire Department	814 5 <sup>th</sup> Street	Corning

### CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal-Fire) has primary responsibility for wildland fire suppression and providing mutual aid to local fire agencies during the *declared fire season* (typically May 1 to December) in all *state responsibility areas* (SRA). This includes SRA lands within local fire service agency boundaries. Lands in local fire agency boundaries outside SRAs are called *local responsibility areas* (LRA).

### U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Three national forests are located within Tehama County, including all or parts of the Mendocino, Shasta-Trinity and Lassen National Forests. One USFS fire station, at Mineral, is located within Tehama County. A number of USFS fire stations are located in adjacent counties with close proximity to and are readily accessible to public Forest Service lands that lie within Tehama County.

### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Within Lassen Volcanic National Park the National Park Service provides fire protection services. One engine and one fuels reduction hand crew are located at the National Park Headquarters in Mineral. Within the park there is extensive utilization of prescribed burning in an effort to manage vegetation and reduce the risk of fire.

#### 4.12.1.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

##### STATE

##### Office of Emergency Services

The Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) coordinates overall state agency response to major disasters in support of local government. The office is responsible for assuring the state's readiness to respond to and recover from natural, manmade, and war-caused emergencies, and for assisting local governments in their emergency preparedness, response and recovery efforts. OES is the "grantee" for federal disaster assistance, principally from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). During the recovery phase of a disaster, OES helps local governments assess damages and assists them with federal and state grant and loan applications to repair damaged public property.

### **Certified Unified Program Agency**

In 1993, California legislators passed SB 1082, creating the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) system in order to simplify the process of regulating and managing hazardous materials and hazardous wastes. Rather than having numerous state and local agencies regulating a single business, SB 1082 consolidates the enforcement of several different environmental regulations under the administration of one local agency called a CUPA.

The CUPA is implemented at the local level by 85 government agencies certified by the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA). These CUPAs have typically been established as a function of a local environmental health or fire department. Some CUPAs also have contractual agreements with one or more other local agencies, which implement one or more program elements under the oversight of the CUPA. In Colusa County, the CUPA for the area is the Colusa County Department of Environmental Health.

### **LOCAL**

#### **County of Tehama General Plan**

The County of Tehama General Plan is currently undergoing an update. The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan Safety and Seismic Safety Element was adopted in 1974. Key programs found with this General Plan Element that relate to fire protection and emergency medical services include periodic review of all local emergency operation plans and programs by the County to reflect changing hazards, to include active programs for more effective operations in emergency or disaster situations, and to provide representation of fire and emergency response agencies whenever safety factors are involved in the planning process.

#### **County Emergency Response / Evacuation Plans**

The Tehama County Sheriff's Department Office of Emergency Services (TESA) is responsible for the disaster planning, assistance and coordination of all jurisdictions within Tehama County.

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster. The County of Tehama is currently coordinating with the Office of Emergency Services to develop and implement an Emergency Disaster Plan.

#### **Fire Codes and Guidelines**

The availability of sufficient water flows and pressure are a basic requirement of the Tehama County Fire Department, which coordinates fire response in the County. The Fire Department will require all new developments within the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Planning Area to design public facility improvements to ensure that water volume and hydrant spacing are adequate to support efficient and effective fire suppression without disruption to community water supplies. Fire Department requirements are determined for specific development projects at the design stage and are based on the California Building Code (CBC). In addition to meeting minimum fire flow requirements, all development projects in the unincorporated areas

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

of the County would be required to meet other various, fire protection requirements identified in the plan check and review process. The County shall also require new developments and redevelopment projects provide approved access for all emergency vehicles including: fire trucks, and firefighting equipment.

### 4.12.1.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on fire protection and emergency medical services if it would result in the following:

- 1) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire related facilities, need for new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency services.

#### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential fire service impacts was based on consultation with Tehama County Fire Department staff and review of the Tehama County General Plan, applicable emergency response and evacuation plans, and other relevant documents. The analysis for the 2008-2028 General Plan considered both projected growth in unincorporated portions of the County by year 2030 and growth under buildout conditions.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

**Impact 4.12.1.1** Subsequent development under the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical service. As a result, additional fire and emergency medical services and related facilities would be required. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would include development of new residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, and recreation facilities, which would generate the need for new and physically altered fire protection and emergency medical facilities. Additional staff would be added and facilities developed in response to population growth and as funding allows. In order to meet established response time goals additional equipment would also be required. Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would contribute to the increased demand for public services.

The Tehama County Fire Department reviews all development project proposals for compliance with state and local requirements prior to approval and construction. The County has fire protection requirements and standards for new development projects, including hydrant spacing, fire flow, access and roadway requirements, and limitations on materials used. All residential, commercial, and industrial developments are subject to California Building Code (CBC) requirements and Fire Department fire codes, which would decrease the likeliness of structure related fires.

Typical environmental effects regarding the construction and operation of a fire facility may involve issues with noise (sirens), air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources (depending on location), cultural resources (depending on location), public utilities (demand for electric, water and wastewater service) and traffic on a local level due to the interruption of traffic light timing by fire engines.

### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures contained in the General Plan Safety Element assist in reducing any potential impacts associated with fire protection and emergency medical services.

Safety: SAF-3.1, SAF-3.1a, SAF-3.1b, SAF-3.1c, SAF-3.1d, SAF-3.1e, SAF-3.1f, SAF-3.2, SAF-3.2a, SAF-3.3, SAF-3.3a, SAF-3.3b, SAF-3.4, SAF-3.4a, SAF-3.5, SAF-3.5c, SAF-3.5f, SAF-3.5g, SAF-3.5h, SAF-3.5i, SAF-3.5j

Policy SAF-3.1 and Implementation Measures SAF-3.1a, SAF-3.1b, and SAF-3.1d enforce fire-resistive construction practices and local, state, and federal fire and safety codes. These include the project- or land-use dependent installation of automatic fire sprinklers in certain types of new development, adherence to fire and life safety regulations with the California Government Code, Code of Regulations, and California Building Code's *Material and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure*, as well as unobstructed access to new developments for emergency equipment. Implementation of SAF-3.1c and SAF-3.1e would require that sufficient and adequate water flows and pressure is maintained to meet all domestic, commercial, and industrial firefighting and protection requirements. Implementation Measure SAF-3.1f requires on-site fire suppression systems for new commercial and industrial development, as well as multi-family residential development with five or more units.

Policy SAF-3.2 and Implementation Measure SAF-3.2a identifies new developments in fire prone areas (usually defined as areas in the State Responsibility Area) and requires mitigation to minimize hazards. Policy SAF-3.3 and associated Implementation Measures SAF-3.3a and SAF-3.3b requires that new development funds its fair share portion of its impacts to all fire related services and facilities. Policy SAF-3.4 and Implementation Measure SAF-3.4a requires coordination between Tehama County and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal-Fire) to reduce fire related hazards, assist in fire suppression through mutual aid agreements and continued collaboration.

General Plan Policy SAF-3.5 and Implementation Measures SAF-3.5c, SAF-3.5f, SAF-3.5g, SAF-3.5h, SAF-3.5i, and SAF-3.5j requires the County to ensure sufficient capacity in fire protection and emergency medical services and ensure that facilities are available on time to maintain the desired service levels, avoid capacity shortages, and to protect the citizens' quality of life and safety. Strategies for accomplishing this include strategic road placement, maintenance of firebreaks, installation of home smoke detectors, and requirements for legible, lighted, and/or reflective address signs.

Policies and implementation measures in the 2008-2028 General Plan provide for future fire protection in the unincorporated portions of Tehama County and complements the existing County Fire Department standards and guidelines. Compliance with Tehama County Fire Department standards and regulations and implementation of the General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan's fire protection and emergency medical service impacts to **less than significant**.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### Mitigation Measures:

None required.

### 4.12.1.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for fire protection and emergency medical services includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. Potential future development of these areas would further increase cumulative demand for fire protection, emergency medical services, and related facilities requiring the necessity of new fire stations which could result in environmental impacts

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### **Cumulative Increase in Demand for Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services**

**Impact 4.12.1.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would increase the population within the unincorporated areas of Tehama County contributing to the cumulative demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. As a result additional fire and emergency medical services and related facilities would be required. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional fire related services, equipment, and facilities to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from property taxes, developer fees, impact fees and other alternative sources of funding would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County Fire Department and fire districts. Subsequently, future development proposed in association with the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase revenues for the County Fire Department and fire districts and provide funding to accommodate the additional growth. Individual development projects would be subject to CEQA review on a project-by-project basis, ensuring that impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

On a cumulative basis, future development of residential units in natural areas that support a variety of trees, shrubs, and native grasses have the potential to provide a substantial source of fuel and a potential to ignite and pose safety risks to adjacent and surrounding developments. Development in these areas has the potential to expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires.

Implementation of Safety Element policies and implementation measures would reduce the General Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts on fire protection and emergency medical service related impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

### Mitigation Measures:

None required.

**4.12.2 LAW ENFORCEMENT****4.12.2.1 EXISTING SETTING****TEHAMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT**

The Tehama County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement in the unincorporated areas of Tehama County and the City of Tehama. The Sheriff is the chief law enforcement officer of the County, with jurisdiction throughout the unincorporated County, the incorporated cities, and state owned property. In Tehama County the Sheriff's Department and the Office of Emergency Services are combined. The Sheriff's Department patrol services operate community resources and service centers, special tactical operations, criminal investigations, emergency operations, and specialized patrol units. Additional functions include prisoner transportation, narcotics enforcement, search and rescue, court security and boating enforcement. The Tehama County Sheriff's Department has a paid staff of 119, consisting of 78 officers, 13 Sheriff service officers, eight dispatch personnel, and 20 support personnel. The Sheriff's Department headquarters is located at 502 Oak Street in the City of Red Bluff (Sheriff's Department, 2006).

**Tehama County Jail**

The Jail is the largest division of Tehama County's Sheriff's Department, comprising about half of the Department's personnel and budget. The jail division includes the main jail, transportation unit, medical unit, and food services.

The Tehama County Main Jail is located at 502 Oak Street, at the corner of Oak and Madison, in Red Bluff. It was constructed in 1974 with additions completed in 1994. The main jail has a capacity for 209 inmates and houses sentenced and pre-sentenced inmates (Sheriff's Department, 2006).

**Service Standards**

Level of Service may be measured by the ratio of Sheriff's deputies to residents. The Tehama County Sheriff's Department attempts to maintain a minimum of one officer per 1,000 residents in the unincorporated areas of the County. The Tehama County Sheriff's Department currently employs 119 personnel, including 78 sworn deputies. The existing staffing ratio provides a higher level of service with approximately two deputies per 1,000 residents (Sheriff's Department, 2006).

**CITIES OF RED BLUFF AND CORNING POLICE DEPARTMENTS**

The Cities of Red Bluff and Corning operate police departments with jurisdiction throughout these incorporated cities. These patrol services operate towing and parking enforcement, community resources, and service centers, emergency operations, and specialized patrol units. The Red Bluff Police Department (RBPD) has personnel totaling 46 people, consisting of 31 officers, six dispatchers, and nine support staff (RBPD, 2007). The Corning Police Department (CPD) has personnel totaling 30 paid positions and three citizen volunteers. This includes 30 officers, seven dispatchers, and three support staff (CPD, 2007).

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) provides traffic regulation enforcement, emergency management, and assistance on State roadways and other major roadways in unincorporated

## **4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES**

---

portions of Tehama County. The only CHP office in Tehama County is located at 2550 Main Street in Red Bluff.

### **4.12.2.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

#### STATE

##### **Emergency Response/Evacuation Plans**

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster.

#### LOCAL

##### **County of Tehama General Plan**

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan Safety and Seismic Safety Element was adopted in 1974. Key programs found with this General Plan Element that relate to police protection services include active programs for more effective operations in emergency or disaster situations, and to provide representation of law enforcement agencies whenever safety factors are involved in the planning process.

##### **County Emergency Response / Evacuation Plans**

The Tehama County Sheriff's Department Office of Emergency Services (TESA) is responsible for the disaster planning, assistance and coordination of all jurisdictions within Tehama County. The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster. The County of Tehama is currently coordinating with the Office of Emergency Services to develop and implement an Emergency Disaster Plan.

### **4.12.2.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on police protection services if it would result in the following:

- 1) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.

## METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential law enforcement impacts was based on consultation with the staff from the Tehama County Sheriff's Department, as well as review of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan, applicable emergency response and evacuation plans, and other relevant documents. The following evaluation focuses on the General Plan's specific police protection and law enforcement related impacts and whether these impacts would have a significant effect on the physical environment. The analysis for the 2008-2028 General Plan considered both projected growth in unincorporated portions of the County by year 2028 and growth under buildout conditions.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### Law Enforcement

**Impact 4.12.2.1** Subsequent development under the Tehama County General Plan update would result in increased demand for law enforcement services. As a result additional law enforcement services and related facilities would be required. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would include new residential, commercial, industrial, and recreation development, which would contribute to an increased demand for law enforcement and related services. The growth in the 2008-2028 General Plan Planning Area may result in the need for a new police station and "service center" style police facilities. The number and location for these facilities would be determined at a future date based on the development of the unincorporated portion of Tehama County.

Typical environmental effects regarding the construction and operation of a sheriff's facility may involve issues with noise (sirens), air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources (depending on location), cultural resources (depending on location), and public utilities (demand for electric, water and wastewater service). The environmental effects of construction of such facilities in the planning area have been considered in the technical analyses of this EIR as part of overall development of the planning area.

### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures assist in reducing any potential impacts associated with law enforcement services or the safety of the citizens of Tehama County.

Safety: SAF-1.2, SAF-1.2a, SAF-2.1, SAF-2.1a, SAF-2.1b, SAF-2.1c, SAF-2.2, SAF-2.3, SAF-2.3a, SAF-2.4

Implementation of the General Plan Safety Element policies and associated Implementation Measures SAF-1.2 and SAF-1.2a ensure that adequate resources are allocated towards the preparation and training of County emergency personnel to handle all emergencies and disasters. County fire departments/protection districts, the sheriff's department, County Departments such as Public Works and the Office of Emergency Services shall conduct at least one emergency preparedness drill per year. SAF-2.1, SAF-2.1a, SAF-2.3, and SAF-2.3a requires the County to regularly monitor and review the level of police staffing to ensure sufficient staffing and resources are available to serve the anticipated needs as well as require new development to pay their fair-share for necessary law enforcement improvements through the implementation of Development Impact Fees. Additionally, Safety Element Policy SAF-2.2 and SAF-2.4 require

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

that the County encourage plan and develop law enforcement programs with a perspective toward community involvement and the use of education, which is critical to the successful practice of law enforcement. Furthermore, SAF-2.1b attempts to establish a minimum officer to population ratio of 1 officer to 1,000 County residents and SAF-2.1c establishes funding mechanisms to pay for both capital and operation costs of police services to serve the new development resulting from the 2008-2028 General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would result in law enforcement related impacts that are considered less than significant.

### Mitigation Measure

None required.

### 4.12.2.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for law enforcement includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. The development associated with the proposed Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan and growth in the Tehama County planning area (based on land use projections identified in the Tehama County General Plan) would result in population increases contributing to incremental cumulative increase in demand for law enforcement resulting in additional environmental impacts associated with the development of new facilities.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### **Cumulative Increase in Demand for Law Enforcement Services**

**Impact 4.12.2.2** Implementation of the General Plan update in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would increase the population within the unincorporated areas of the County contributing to the cumulative demand for law enforcement services and facilities. As a result additional law enforcement services and related facilities would be required. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional law enforcement related services, equipment, and facilities to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from property taxes, and other alternative sources of funding would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County Sheriff's Office. Subsequently, future development proposed in association with the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase revenues for the County Sheriff's Office and provide funding to accommodate the additional growth. Individual development projects would be subject to CEQA review on a project-by-project basis, ensuring that impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of the General Plan Safety Element policies and associated implementation measures listed under **Impact 4.12.2.1** would ensure that the General Plan's cumulative law enforcement related impacts are **less than cumulatively considerable**.

### Mitigation Measure

None required.

### 4.12.3 LIBRARY SERVICES AND HISTORICAL RESOURCE CENTERS

#### 4.12.3.1 EXISTING SETTING

##### TEHAMA COUNTY LIBRARY

The Tehama County Library system has three branches to serve the residents of the County with locations in Red Bluff, Los Molinos and Corning. The Tehama County library system has developed collections, resources and services that reflect the cultural, informational, recreational and educational diversity of the residents. In addition, the Tehama County Library system is affiliated with the North State Cooperative Library System (NSCLS), which serves 13 Northern California Counties. NCSLA facilitates an extensive inter library loan program between independent city and county libraries in cooperation with academic library affiliates to provide services to the north state.

Local history collections are preserved at county libraries as well as at the Tehama County Museum located in the town of Tehama. Museum exhibits include artifacts that represent the cultural heritage of Tehama County and the genealogy of northern California. Other historical resource centers are listed in **Table 4.12-2** and include the Red Bluff Round Up Museum, Tehama County Genealogical and Historical Society and the Corning Museum.

**TABLE 4.12-2  
TEHAMA COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCE CENTERS**

FACILITY	LOCATION	RESOURCES
Tehama County Museum	Tehama	Owned by Tehama County Museum Foundation, local artifacts.
Red Bluff Round Up Museum	City of Red Bluff	Photograph collection of Tehama County round-up events.
Tehama County Genealogical and Historical Society	City of Red Bluff	Genealogical records.
Corning Museum	City of Corning	Local artifacts, photograph collection.
Kelly Griggs House Museum	City of Red Bluff	Victorian home, guided tours, local artifacts, photograph collection.
Ide Adobe State Historical Site	City of Red Bluff	Visitors center, historic buildings and artifacts.

Source: Tehama County Museum Foundation, 2005.

#### 4.12.3.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

##### LOCAL

##### County of Tehama General Plan

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan was adopted in 1983. The Tehama County General Plan of 1983 states one policy that relates to library services and historical resource centers. Policy SLR-c, which requires the County to monitor the need for additional library services at existing branches and seek to establish new branch facilities in response to growth.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### 4.12.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on Tehama County Library Services and Historical Resource Centers if it would result in the following:

- 1) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service objectives for any of the libraries or historic resource centers public services.

#### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential library services and historical resource centers impacts was based on consultation with the staff from the Tehama County Library, as well as review of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan. The following evaluation focuses on the General Plan's specific library and historical resource center service related impacts and whether these impacts would have a significant effect on the physical environment. The analysis for the 2008-2028 General Plan considered both projected growth in unincorporated portions of the County by year 2030 and growth under buildout conditions.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Library Services and Historical Resource Centers

**Impact 4.12.3.1** Subsequent development under the Tehama County General Plan update would result in increased demand for library and historical resource center services. As a result, additional library services and related facilities would be required. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would include development of new residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, and recreation facilities, which would generate the need for new and physically altered libraries and historic resource centers. Additional staff would be added and facilities developed in response to population growth and as funding allows. Implementation of the General Plan update would contribute to the increased demand for these services.

Typical environmental effects regarding the construction and operation of a library and/or historic resource center may involve issues with air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources (depending on location), cultural resources (depending on location), public utilities (demand for electric, water and wastewater service) and traffic on a local level due to the interruption of traffic light timing by fire engines.

#### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures are in the General Plan Public Services Element, so as to reduce impacts library services and historic resource centers.

Public Services: PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1b, PS-1.1c, PS-1.2, PS-1.2a, PS-1.2b, PS-2.2, PS-2.2c

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1b, and PS-1.1c requires the County to ensure sufficient availability in library services and historic resource centers and that the facilities are available on time to maintain the desired service levels. PS-1.1c and PS-2.2 establish funding mechanisms that support library services and PS-2.2c requires that new development funds its fair share portion of its impacts to all library related services and facilities. Policy PS-1.2 and Implementation Measures PS-1.2a, PS-1.2b provide financial support to the existing library system and mandates that the County shall monitor the need for additional library services at existing branches and seek to establish new branch facilities in response to growth. Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan's library and historic resource center services impacts to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

#### 4.12.3.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for library services and historical resource centers includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. Potential future development of these areas would also result in cumulative demand for library services and historical resource centers.

##### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Cumulative Increase in Demand for Library Services

**Impact 4.12.3.2** Implementation of the General Plan update in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would increase the population within the unincorporated areas of Tehama County contributing to the cumulative demand for library services and facilities. As a result, additional library services and historic resource centers would be required. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional library services and facilities to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from property taxes, and other alternative sources of funding such as grants, would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County libraries and historic resource centers.

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures PS-1, PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1b, PS-1.1c, PS-1.2, PS-1.2a, PS-1.2b, PS-2, PS-2.2, PS-2.2c ensure that the General Plan's cumulative library services and historic resource centers related impacts are **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measure

None required

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### 4.12.4 EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

#### 4.12.4.1 EXISTING SETTING

##### TEHAMA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The public school system in Tehama County is comprised of services provided by public elementary and high school districts and the Tehama County Department of Education. Higher education in the County is limited to "distance learning" programs from Shasta College and California State University, Chico. A proposed extension of Shasta College to be located within Tehama County is currently in the planning phase. In addition to the education curriculum, public school facilities offer opportunities for community recreation and leisure activities. Facilities and services provided by private educational interests are briefly summarized.

Tehama County public schools include 21 elementary schools, four middle schools and five high schools. Additionally, there are three private elementary schools and one private Catholic high school in the county. There are also two charter schools in operation.

The total enrollment for Tehama County public schools, K-12, in 2004 was 10,274 (**Table 4.12-3**) with an average class size of 24 students. Information from the California Department of Education indicates that enrollment in all Tehama County schools has been fairly consistent over the last five years.

Technology resources in schools include computers and associated technology. Within the county the student-to-computer ratio is between 2.8 and 4.2 for elementary, middle and high schools. Tehama County schools student-to-technology ratio is lower than the state average of 5.5, offering a greater exposure of Tehama County students to technology.

The *Tehama County Report Card, 2003*, published by the Tehama County Health Partnership, includes references to several social indicators related to educational facilities, challenges and education attainment. For example, in looking at the 2001-02 school year, the average pupil/teacher ratio was 19, and the number of students per computer was 3.7. The ratio of high school career counselors to students was one counselor to 463 high school students. Almost 11 percent of the students in Tehama County were designated as English language learners.

Information from the U.S. Census, as analyzed by the Social Science Data Analysis Network, indicates that, of the Tehama County population over the age of 25, 8.19 percent had less than a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education and 75.66 percent had graduated from high school.

**TABLE 4.12-3**  
**TEHAMA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, FALL, 2004**

School District	2004 Enrollment
Antelope School, (K-8)	570
Bend Elementary, (K-8), Red Bluff	82
Corning Union Elementary, (K-8)	1,980
Corning Union High, (9-12)	1,065
Elkins Elementary, (K-8), Paskenta	16
Evergreen Union Elementary, (K-8), Cottonwood	949
Flournoy Union Elementary, (K-8), Flournoy	29
Gerber Union Elementary, (K-8), Gerber	438
Kirkwood Elementary, (K-8), Corning	49
Lassen View Union Elementary, (K-8), Los Molinos	293

School District	2004 Enrollment
Antelope School, (K-8)	570
Los Molinos Unified, (K-12), Los Molinos	575
Manton Joint Union Elementary, (K-8), Manton	37
Mineral Elementary, (K-8), Mineral	108
Plum Valley Elementary, (K-8), Paynes Creek	33
Red Bluff Union Elementary, (K-8)	2,175
Red Bluff Joint Union High, (9-12)	2,037
Reeds Creek Elementary, (K-8), Red Bluff	144
Richfield Elementary, (K-8), Corning	217
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,797</b>

Source: California Department of Education, 2007

### SERVICE STANDARDS

All school districts in California are required to prepare a facilities master plan (FMP), which include service standards based on student generation rates and school capacities to determine a particular District's needs through its current plan period. FMPs typically have a planning horizon of ten years (i.e., 2000 through 2010) and provide a detailed forecast of the district's needs and identify strategic plans and actions to fulfill those needs. The FMP addresses how many classrooms are needed, at which grade levels, and the cost and timing of identified improvements. The identified improvements are balanced against the available District resources, existing and ultimate capacity constraints, current and projected revenue sources, and outside funding options. FMPs are influenced by market pressures such as commercial expansion, the phasing and timing of housing developments, availability of state funds, changes in state laws, and the viability and local bond elections. The district selects school sites in accordance with criteria developed by the California Department of Education. The Department of Education must review and approve all sites considered for selection and use by each district.

### HIGHER EDUCATION

There are no colleges or universities located in Tehama County. Shasta College (located approximately 35 miles north of Red Bluff in Redding, CA) and California State University, Chico (located approximately 45 miles south of Red Bluff in Chico, CA) offer education programs including distance-learning options, to residents of Tehama County.

Shasta College is a comprehensive community college offering academic programs in vocational-technical, university transfer and community services. The college is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. It offers a wide range of programs and services including counseling, tutoring, student activities, veteran affairs, cultural events, lecture series, workshops and art exhibits. The main campus is located two miles northeast of Redding and has an enrollment of approximately 11,000 students.

Approximately 2,200 college students are served by Shasta College at various locations in Tehama County. The college leases property on Lincoln Street from the City of Red Bluff as well as property located in adjacent communities. The college also has an extensive Distance Learning network available via the Internet. Shasta College offers its educational, cultural and recreational facilities and services to residents of Shasta, Tehama and Trinity Counties through the administration of the Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Community College District.

California State University, Chico offers several Bachelors Degrees, Masters Degrees, and certificate programs through distance learning. Courses available through distance learning via

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

internet-based classes allow Tehama County residents to take classes from Chico State without commuting.

In March of 2002, a \$35 million bond measure was passed by the voters of the County that provides for funds to acquire property and construct a new campus in Tehama County. The building would consist of 65,000 square feet of classrooms, offices, technology laboratories and ancillary facilities. A request for proposals (RFP) was released in the summer of 2002 to identify and acquire a suitable site for construction of the facility and a Site Selection Advisory Committee was formed to review proposals and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees of the college district, who have final authority for site selection and acquisition.

In April of 2006, Tehama County and Shasta College identified the former Diamond Sawmill site in Red Bluff as an appropriate location within the County to construct a new campus to replace the rented and temporary facilities, and purchased the parcel. The new college, called the Tehama College Center, will be located on 40 acres along the north side of Diamond Avenue, east of Interstate Highway 5 in the City of Red Bluff.

The development of a new college facility has a variety of land use planning and traffic factors that need to be considered, not only for the facility itself, but also for development that can be expected to be stimulated by the campus. Expected amounts of traffic will typically require improvements to streets and sometimes freeway interchanges. Sites that are located a distance away from population centers require more travel time and impacts from increased vehicle use. The provision of other infrastructure systems such as water and sewer is necessary, and proposed development sites may have site-specific environmental issues such as wetlands.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Tehama College Center project was filed with the State Clearinghouse on November 16, 2007 (SCH# 2006022010). The project would replace temporary and leased facilities in Red Bluff and provide classrooms and labs for new curriculum in agriculture, telecommunications, transportation, and other technical fields. The anticipated year of opening the proposed Tehama College Center is Fall 2009. It is anticipated that the facility would have the capacity to accommodate approximately 378 students and staff during peak hours upon opening and would operate as a satellite campus of Shasta College. Project-related impacts identified in the DEIR include Agricultural Land, Air Quality, Archaeological-Historic, Biological Resources, Cumulative Effects, Drainage/Absorption, Flood Plain/Flooding, Geologic/Seismic, Growth Inducing, Land Use, Noise, Population/Housing Balance, Public Services, Sewer Capacity, Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading, Solid Waste, Toxic/Hazardous, Traffic/Circulation, Vegetation, Water Quality, Water Supply, Wetland/Riparian, Wildlife, Aesthetic/Visual.

### 4.12.4.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

#### STATE

##### **Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50)**

The "Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998," also known as Senate Bill No. 50 or SB 50 (Stats. 1998, Ch.407), governs a school district's authority to levy school impact fees. This comprehensive legislation, together with the \$9.2 billion education bond act approved by the voters in November 1998 as "Proposition 1A", reforms methods of school construction financing in California. SB 50 instituted a new school facility program by which school districts can apply for state construction and modernization funds. It imposed limitations on the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development and provided the authority for school districts to levy fees at three different levels:

- Level I fees are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code 17620. This code section provides the basic authority for school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial construction for the purpose of funding school construction or reconstruction of facilities. These fees vary by district for residential construction and commercial construction and are increased biannually.
- Level II developer fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5, allowing school districts to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. These conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multi-track year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15–30 percent of the district's bonding capacity (percentage is based on revenue sources for repayment), having at least 20 percent of the district's teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms, and having placed a local bond on the ballot in the past four years which received at least 50 percent plus one of the votes cast. A Facility Needs Assessment must demonstrate the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next 5 years.
- Level III developer fees are outlined in Government Code Section 655995.7. If State funding becomes unavailable, this code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives State funding, this excess fee may be reimbursed to the developers or subtracted from the amount of state funding.

### **The Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (Prop 47)**

This act was approved by voters in November 2002 and provides for a bond issue of \$13.05 billion to fund necessary education facilities to relieve overcrowding and to repair older schools. Funds will be targeted at areas of greatest need and must be spent according to strict accountability measures. Funds will also be used to upgrade and build new classrooms in the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in order to provide adequate higher education facilities to accommodate growing student enrollment.

### **California Department of Education**

The California Department of Education (CDE) School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD) has prepared a School Site Selection and Approval Guide that provides criteria for locating appropriate school sites in the State of California. School site and size recommendations were changed by the CDE in 2000 to reflect various changes in educational conditions, such as lowering of class sizes and use of advanced technology. The expanded use of school buildings and grounds for community and agency joint use and concern for the safety of the students and staff members also influenced the modification of the CDE recommendations.

Specific recommendations for school size are provided in the publication *School Site Analysis and Development*. This document suggests a ratio of 1:2 between buildings and land. CDE is aware that in a number of cases, primarily in urban settings, smaller sites cannot accommodate this ratio. In such cases, the SFPD may approve an amount of acreage less than the recommended gross site size and building-to-ground ratio.

Certain health and safety requirements for school site selection are governed by state regulations and the policies of the SFPD relating to:

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

- Proximity to airports, high-voltage power transmission lines, railroads, and major roadways;
- Presence of toxic and hazardous substances;
- Hazardous facilities and hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile;
- Proximity to high-pressure natural gas lines, propane storage facilities, gasoline lines, pressurized sewer lines, or high-pressure water pipelines;
- Noise;
- Results of geological studies or soil analyses;
- Traffic and school bus safety issues.

### LOCAL

#### County of Tehama General Plan

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan was adopted in 1983. The Tehama County General Plan of 1983 states a number of policies that relate to public schools. Key policies that relate to public schools include Policy SLR-a, which requires the County to enter into cooperative planning agreements with school district officials for the exchange of data, the preparation of student enrollment projections, and the development of facility plans responsive to growth funding permitting. SLR-b states that the County should establish a subdivision review procedure to obtain written verification from potentially affected school districts that adequate school capacity is available for students generated by proposed development.

#### 4.12.4.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on public schools if it would result in the following:

- 1) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for public school services.

##### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential public school impacts associated with the implementation of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan is based on review of the Facilities Master Plans for each district serving the area and from consultation with school district planning staff.

##### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Public School Facilities

**Impact 4.12.4.1** Implementation of the project would increase student enrollment in the General Plan Planning Area and require the construction of new schools and related facilities to serve the anticipated demand. As a result additional

public schools and related facilities would be required. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

According to 2008 Department of Finance estimates, there were 18,174 housing units in the Tehama County General Plan Planning Area. Implementation of the Tehama County General Plan update would result in the theoretical construction of approximately 10,068 new residential dwelling units in the Planning Area during the 2008-2028 planning horizon.

While the buildout potential for the 2008-2028 General Plan land use designations would be approximately 184,499 dwelling units, it is very unlikely for this potential to be met by the 2028 planning period of the 2008-2028 General Plan. This principle is exemplified by a review of the historical data and projected growth for the County, as described in section 3.0 Project Description. This analysis indicates a worst-case scenario of approximately 63,647 persons and 28,215 housing units for the Planning Area by 2028.

Typical environmental effects as a result of the construction and operation of new school facilities include, air quality (during construction and operation), noise (during construction and operation), biological and cultural resources (depending on location), public services (electric, water and wastewater), and traffic (during construction and operation). Such school development would occur within the development areas evaluated in the technical analysis of this EIR.

Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures are in the General Plan Public Services Element, so as to reduce impacts to public schools.

Public Services: PS-1, PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1b, PS-1.1c, PS-1.1d, PS-2, PS-2.1, PS-2.1a, PS-2.2, PS-2.2a, PS-2.2c

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element Policies and associated Implementation Measure PS-1, PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-2, PS-2.1, and PS-2.1a would ensure coordination between the County and County school districts to develop service and financial planning strategies. Implementation Measures PS-1.1b and PS-1.1c requires the County to ensure sufficient funding for, and availability of public school facilities and that the facilities are available on time to maintain the desired service levels. Policy PS-2.2 and associated Implementation Measures PS-2.2a and PS-2.2c would assist in maintaining a sufficient amount of funds which are available for school infrastructure and facilities by requiring that new development funds its fair share portion of its impacts to public school facilities. PS-1.1d examines fund saving strategies by encouraging mixed-use sites such as school/park facilities. Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan's County educational system impacts to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure

None required

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### 4.12.4.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for the educational system includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. The development associated with the Tehama County General Plan and growth in the planning area would result in population increases contributing to incremental cumulative increase in demand for schools resulting in additional environmental impacts associated with the development of new facilities.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Cumulative Public School Impacts

**Impact 4.12.4.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would result in a cumulative increase in student enrollment and require additional schools and related facilities to accommodate the growth. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional educational services and facilities to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from property taxes, and other alternative sources of funding such as grants, would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County schools.

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures listed under **Impact 4.12.4.1** ensure that the General Plan's cumulative educational system related impacts are **less than cumulatively considerable**.

#### Mitigation Measures:

None required.

## 4.12.5 PARKS AND RECREATION

### 4.12.5.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### TEHAMA COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

The Tehama County Parks and Recreation Department (TCPRD) has the primary responsibility for providing and maintaining recreation facilities and services within the General Plan Planning Area. TCPRD owns and maintains nine parks and two public access areas, all of which are maintained by County Parks and Recreation staff. **Table 4.12-4** includes the name, location, and short description of existing TCPRD facilities. All of these facilities are within the County General Plan Planning Area.

**TABLE 4.12-4  
TEHAMA COUNTY PARKS AND PUBLIC ACCESS AREAS**

<b>County Parks</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Facilities</b>
Tehama County River Park	Six miles east of Corning.	Restrooms, picnic areas, paved walkways, trails, and boat launch.
Mill Creek Park/Boat Launch	Tehama-Vina Road. Across from town of Tehama.	Restrooms, boat launch, picnic areas, and field area.
Antelope Park	Community of Antelope, adjacent to Berrendos Junior High.	Children's playground, bike trails, picnic areas, and two tennis courts.
Brokenshire Meadow County Park	Community of Mineral along Mill Creek.	Picnic areas.
Camp Tehama	Community of Mineral.	Hiking trails, campsites, and washroom.
Cone Grove County Park	South of Red Bluff on Cone Grove Road.	Picnic areas, open sports field, and children's play equipment.
Gerber Park	Community of Gerber.	Children's play equipment, open sports field, baseball field, swimming pool, and picnic area.
Ridgeway Park	West of Red Bluff.	Recreation hall, basketball and volleyball courts, library, kitchen facilities, dining area, children's play equipment, open sports field, baseball field, horse arena, and motor cross track.
Simpson-Finnell Park	Community of Paskenta.	Picnic areas, horse trails, tennis court, and children's play equipment.
North Mill Creek Fishing Access	Just north of Los Molinos.	Hiking trails, restrooms, and kayak/canoe launch.
Bend Bridge Park Public Access	North of Red Bluff on Jelly's Ferry Road.	Picnic areas and boat launch.

Source: County of Tehama Background Report, 2006

**Park and Recreation Standards**

Park and recreation standards have been used by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) in cities, counties, and states throughout the U.S. for nearly 100 years. In 1906, the NRPA issued a report outlining recreation space and facility standards to aid local governments in their recreation and open space planning. Since that time, the NRPA has spearheaded the movement and tradition of setting these area and facility standards.

As applied to public parks and recreation resources, standards provide a measurement of recreation space and facilities that should be provided for specific population numbers. They were established to help determine if an area has sufficient park area, facilities, etc. Standards are also used to establish the space and other requirements for recreation facilities in order to know what improvements a site may accommodate. Recreation area, facility and open space standards are used in the planning, design, and decision-making process.

Standards are needed to: (1) encourage appropriate area, number and location of facilities, thus establishing minimum area or acres to allow for per type of park and; (2) establish a comprehensive and sound fiscal approach for an orderly acquisition and development program. Standards can be used:

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

- 1) To determine areas, number and types of facilities that are needed to best serve a particular population or planning area as well as to determine where they should generally be provided.
- 2) To develop a sound, fiscal acquisition and development program.
- 3) To justify to state and local political bodies, for grants and funding purposes, the acquisition and development of parks and recreation areas and facilities and for the determination of priorities in acquisition and development.
- 4) To help measure the effectiveness of public jurisdictions in providing needed recreation areas and facilities.
- 5) To reasonably use as a forecaster, in the case of tourism, as a means to plan to bring increased revenue into the planning area.
- 6) To help attract and retain desired residents in general or specific areas.

### **California Government Code Section 66477**

California Government Code Section 66477, often referred to as the Quimby Act, permits local jurisdictions to require the dedication of land and/or the payment of in-lieu fees for park and recreation purposes. The required dedication and/or fees are based upon the residential density, parkland cost and other factors. Land dedicated and fees collected pursuant to the Quimby Act may only be used for the purpose of developing new or rehabilitating existing park or recreational facilities. The Quimby Act allows for local recreation and park districts to ask for a dedication of parkland up to 5 acres per 1,000 of projected population.

### FUNDING

#### **Tehama County Parks and Recreation Department**

The recreation needs of Tehama County residents and the role of recreation activities varies widely throughout the County, depending upon place of residence and type of activity desired. Needs within unincorporated urban and suburban areas adjacent to the cities of Red Bluff and Corning for instance, vary from the needs of people living in rural service centers and isolated rural communities. In an effort to enhance the recreational opportunities within the County, the Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan was completed in 1977. The Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan presented methods of funding for recreational facility acquisition, development, and maintenance. The General Fund, which is an allocation of County taxes accounts for a portion of the Parks and Recreation Department revenues as does the transient tax, which is a common, nominal tax applied to hotels and motels and used to develop and improve recreational facilities that are attractions to County residents and visitors. Furthermore, Tehama County has adopted a dedication program whereby developers dedicate money, property, or both to provide for recreation facilities to be used by new residents.

#### 4.12.5.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

##### STATE

The Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) states that “the legislative body of a city or county may, by ordinance, require the dedication of land or impose a requirement of the payment of fees in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for park or recreational purposes as a condition to the approval of a tentative or parcel map.” It should be noted that the Quimby Act only applies to the acquisition of new parkland and does not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs. The Quimby Act effectively preserves open space needed to develop parkland and recreational facilities; however, the actual development of parks and other recreational facilities is subject to discretionary approval and is evaluated on a case-by-case basis with new residential development.

##### LOCAL

###### County of Tehama General Plan

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan was adopted in 1983. The Tehama County General Plan of 1983 states one policy that relate to parks and recreation. Policy SLR-f requires the County to determine the appropriate levels of recreation services to meet the various needs of residents.

###### Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan

The Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan of 1977 (Master Plan) evaluated County recreational resources. The Master Plan set standards for parks (neighborhood, community, and regional) and for site selection of parks, addresses recreational resource needs, and states recommendations for meeting countywide recreational needs. The primary focus of the Master Plan is to develop more recreation activities and facilities throughout the County, improve maintenance of existing facilities, and develop an on-going source of revenue.

#### 4.12.5.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on recreation facilities if it would result in the following:

- 1) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for park services.
- 2) An increase in 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.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

- 3) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential parks and recreation impacts was based on consultation with the staff from the Tehama County Parks and Recreation Department, as well as review of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan, and the Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The following evaluation focuses on the General Plan's specific parks and recreation related impacts and whether these impacts would have a significant effect on the physical environment. The analysis for the 2008-2028 General Plan considered both projected growth in unincorporated portions of the County by year 2028 and growth under buildout conditions.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Parks and Recreation Facilities

**Impact 4.12.5.1** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase the demand for existing facilities and require additional parks and recreational facilities to accommodate the anticipated growth associated with the General Plan. This would be a **less than significant** impact.

Potential development proposed in association with the General Plan update may require additional parkland, facilities, and personnel to accommodate the demand, depending on the size and location of future development projects. The staffing and administrative needs for the T CPRD will increase as a result of the population and additional park and recreational facilities associated with implementing the 2008-2028 General Plan. However, new parks and facilities would be developed in response to population growth and as funding allows. Park site and facilities may require land use permits in some case, depending on the anticipated uses and character or adjacent developments. As the Tehama County Parks and Recreation Master Plan has adopted a dedication program, whereby developers dedicate money, property, or both to provide for recreation facilities to be used by new residents, provide funding and/or property for future park facilities.

Typical environmental effects regarding the construction and operation of a parks and recreational facilities may involve issues with noise (during construction and playfields and playgrounds), air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources (depending on location), historic/cultural resources (depending on location), public services and utilities (demand for police and fire protection, electric, water and wastewater service) and traffic on a local neighborhood level. The environmental effects of construction of such facilities in the planning area been considered in the technical analyses of this EIR as part of overall development of the planning area.

#### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures are contained in the General Plan Public Services Element to ensure that proposed land uses associated with the General Plan do not adversely affect parks and recreational facilities.

Public Services: PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1b, PS-1.1c, PS-1.1d, PS-1.3, PS-1.3b, PS-2.1, PS-2.1a, PS-2.2, PS-2.2b, PS-2.2c

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element Policy PS-1.1 and associated Implementation Measures PS-1.1a and PS-1.1b would enable the County to effectively determine the appropriate levels of recreation services to meet the needs of County residents. Implementation Measures PS-1.1c and PS-1.1d would allow the County to meet these local recreational needs in a cost effective manner through the pursuit of grants and other funding opportunities to create new services or expand existing services and by encouraging the co-location of public service providers into mixed-use sites. PS-2.1 and PS-2.1a ensure coordination between the County and the Parks and Recreation Department with the creation of a Review Committee. PS-2.2 and associated Implementation Measures PS-2.2b and PS-2.2c would assist in maintaining a sufficient amount of funds available for parks and recreational facilities by requiring that new development funds its fair share portion of its impacts to these facilities. The proposed Tehama County General Plan contains provisions that allow the County to require new developments to provide either parkland dedication or in-lieu fees to the TCRPD to construct new parks and related facilities. Other sources of revenue include state and federal revenues and facility user fees.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan's parks and recreation impacts to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure

None required

**4.12.5.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for parks and recreation services includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. Potential future development of these areas would also result in cumulative demand for parks and recreation services.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Cumulative Park and Recreation Demands**

**Impact 4.12.5.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would require additional park and recreation facilities within the Planning Area boundaries and TCRPD's service area boundaries. This would be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional parks and recreational facilities to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from development in-lieu fees, and other alternative sources of funding such as grants, would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County parks and recreational facilities. Further, implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element goals, policies and associated implementation measures listed under **Impact 4.12.5.1** ensure that the General Plan's cumulative parks and recreation related impacts are **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

### 4.12.6 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

#### 4.12.6.1 EXISTING SETTING

Solid waste management in Tehama County includes one landfill, several transfer stations, and an extensive waste stream diversion program including recycling and composting programs.

The Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Association (TCSLA) was formed in 1989 when four Tehama County solid waste jurisdictions entered into a joint powers agreement. The agency serves as the planning and reporting agency for the entire county under the California Integrated Waste Management Act (IWMA). The TCSLA oversees private waste management services for all areas of Tehama County except for the Cities of Red Bluff and Corning. The TCSLA has contracted with Green Waste of Tehama, a private franchise of Green Waste Recovery Inc., to oversee the waste management services for the county. Waste management services include operation of the county landfill and three transfer stations as well as curbside waste pickup that include an extensive recycling effort.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (IWMA) of 1989 (SB 939) required cities and counties to divert 50 percent of their waste stream from landfill disposal by the year 2000 through source reduction, recycling, composting and transformation programs. Green Waste of Tehama has implemented a "pay-as-you-throw" trash fee program, which has helped increase waste diversion in Tehama County. Within the first year of implementation of the fee program (1998) waste generation was reduced by 43 percent (**Table 4.12-5**). In 1999 and 2001, waste generation was further reduced as the landfill diversion rate reached 47 percent. These two years represent the highest landfill diversion rate in the County as waste generation reduction has declined since 2001. As of 2005, the landfill diversion rate only reached 41 percent. The TCSLA has also implemented household hazardous waste collection, an illegal dumping cleanup and prevention program, and a buy-recycled procurement policy as part of its integrated waste management program.

**TABLE 4.12-5  
TEHAMA COUNTY LANDFILL DIVERSION (1998)**

DIVERSION	AMOUNT
Recycling and Composting	21,048 (Tons)
Source Reduction*	12,366 (Tons)
Total Waste Reduction	33,414 (Tons)
Disposal	43,697 (Tons)
Total Generation	77,111 (Tons)
Percent Reduction	43%

Source: Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Agency, 1999.

\*Paper use reduction in City of Corning offices, wood waste reused by local industries, grass cycling of lawns at schools and parks, and reusable goods discarded by a local school and sold through thrift stores and garage sales.

Note: Data represents total waste generation (residential, commercial, and construction and demolition debris) as reported in the TCSLA's New Base Year Study (1998).

#### LANDFILLS

Tehama County and the City of Red Bluff jointly own the Tehama County/Red Bluff Sanitary Landfill, a 159-acre site located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the City of Red Bluff. The TCRBLMA contracts with Waste Connections for operation of the landfill. The Tehama

County/Red Bluff Sanitary Landfill provides extensive services for waste diversion and offers recycling services. The County achieves additional landfill diversion through salvage operations at the landfill such as appliances, scrap metal, and construction and demolition debris. Yard waste and wood waste are sent to a waste to energy facility. The landfill has a maximum permitted daily capacity of 400 tons per day (TPD), with an average daily loading of 216 TPD. The permit to operate allows for a maximum of 200 vehicle trips per day and, as of 2006, the landfill receives an average of 162 vehicle trips per day. Increases in population and development will require permit revision to expand the landfill and infrastructure improvements (i.e. traffic, scale house, etc.). Phase I of the landfill is expected to close in 2008. Phase II of the landfill will remain open with an estimated closing date of 2025. (Background Report, 2007, page 7-9). According to Integrated Waste Management Board statistics from 1999, small amounts of waste generated in Tehama County are diverted to other counties. These counties include Shasta, Yuba, Sutter, Solano, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin and each receives less than one percent of waste generated in Tehama County (Management Board, 1999).

**Transfer Stations**

Transfer stations are located in three rural areas of the county and receive waste for transfer to the Tehama County/Red Bluff Sanitary Landfill. Transfer stations, located at Manton, Mineral, and Paynes Creek are operated by Waste Connections. A transfer station in Rancho Tehama operates privately.

**Composting and Recycling Facilities**

Tehama County's landfill and three transfer stations also serve as drop-off stations for recyclables and yard debris. The sites accept metal cans, juice boxes, milk cartons, plastic bags, plastic containers (No.1 - No.7), scrap metal, glass, mixed paper, newspaper, and corrugated cardboard. Recycling opportunities at the Tehama County-Red Bluff Landfill also offer an antifreeze, batteries, oil and paint (ABOP) collection program. Curbside recycling service includes metal cans, milk cartons, plastic bags, plastic containers (No.1 – No.7), scrap metal, glass, mixed paper, corrugated cardboard, used motor oil and lawn wastes.

Composting efforts include an active yard waste-composting program at the Tehama County-Red Bluff landfill as well as promotion of a backyard-composting program. The Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Association (TCSLA) has partnered with local newspapers to promote home composting and offer composting resources. Besides county reuse programs, many independent thrift stores offer Tehama County residents the opportunity to reuse clothing, furniture, books and other household items.

**4.12.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING**

FEDERAL

**Resource Conservation and Recovery Act**

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) was enacted in 1976 to address the huge volumes of municipal and industrial solid waste generated nationwide. After several amendments, the Act as it stands today governs the management of solid and hazardous waste and underground storage tanks (USTs). RCRA, enacted in 1976, is an amendment to the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. RCRA has been amended several times, most significantly by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

RCRA is a combination of the first solid waste statutes and all subsequent amendments. RCRA authorizes EPA to regulate waste management activities. RCRA authorizes states to develop and enforce their own waste management programs, in lieu of the federal program, if a state's waste management program is substantially equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the federal program.

### STATE

#### **California Integrated Waste Management Act**

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) requires every city and county in the State to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to its Solid Waste Management Plan that identifies how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory State waste diversion goals of 25 percent by 1995 and 50 percent by 2000. The purpose of AB 939 is to "reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the State to the maximum extent feasible." The term "integrated waste management" refers to the use of a variety of waste management practices to safely and effectively handle the municipal solid waste stream with the least adverse impact on human health and the environment. The Act has established a waste management hierarchy, as follows: Source Reduction; Recycling; Composting; Transformation; and Disposal. The City provides for the source reduction through the collection of greenwaste and recycling as part of the waste disposal program, which is provided by BFI Waste Disposal of Sacramento.

#### **California Integrated Waste Management Board Model Ordinance**

Subsequent to the Integrated Waste Management Act, additional legislation was passed to assist local jurisdictions in accomplishing the goals of AB 939. The California Solid Waste Re-use and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (§42900-42911 of the Public Resources Code) directs the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to draft a "model ordinance" (which Sacramento County has adopted) relating to adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials in development projects.

The model ordinance is used by the County as the basis for imposing recycling conditions on new development projects and on existing projects that add 30 percent or more to their existing floor area. The model ordinance requires that any new development project, for which an application is submitted on or after September 1, 1994, include "adequate, accessible, and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials." For subdivisions of single-family detached homes, recycling areas are required to serve only the needs of the home within that subdivision.

### LOCAL

#### **County of Tehama General Plan**

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan was adopted in 1983. The Tehama County General Plan of 1983 states a few objectives and policies that relate to solid wastes. Objective SW-1 requires the development of a solid waste program that equitably relates revenues to operational expenses for all County residents and Policy SW-a states that the County shall study the feasibility and availability of future sites for solid waste disposal consistent with County development patterns.

### 4.12.6.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have significant impacts associated with solid waste if it would result in the following:

- 1) Result in the need for new systems or supplies, or a substantial expansion or alteration to the solid waste materials recovery or disposal.
- 2) Substantially affect the ability to comply with solid waste source reduction programs.

#### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential impacts on solid waste facilities and services was based on consultation with staff from the Tehama County Sanitary Landfill, review of the 2008-2028 General Plan, as well as other pertinent literature.

#### Solid Waste Service

**Impact 4.12.6.1** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase solid waste generation and the demand for related services. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

The land uses associated with the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan include residential, commercial, and industrial designations, which would substantially increase solid waste generation over existing conditions. Implementation of the General Plan could result in the construction of 10,068 new dwelling units within the unincorporated areas of the County by the year 2028 based upon the worst-case population and housing units projections discussed in Section 3.0 Project Description. Assuming that each person generates 0.36 tons of solid waste each year, as established by CIWMB, and assuming the County has an average of 2.26 persons per housing unit as established by the 2000 Census, implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan would create an additional 8,191 tons of solid waste per year ( $10,068 \times 2.26 \times 0.36 = 8,191$ ). Assuming that each person generates 1.8 pounds of solid waste per day, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in approximately 40,957 additional pounds per day (TPD) of solid waste.

As discussed previously, growth as a result of implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would increase the amount of solid waste generated in the Planning Area. Without adequate waste diversion programs, the increase in solid waste has the potential to being non-compliance with AB 939 and potentially RCRA, that of a reduction of solid waste.

#### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following General Plan Public Services Element associated policies and implementation measures are applicable to the Tehama County General Plan Area and ensure that proposed land uses associated with the General Plan do not adversely affect solid waste services in the Planning Area.

Public Services: PS-6.1, PS-6.1a, PS-6.2, PS-6.2a, PS-6.3, PS-6.3a

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures PS-6.1 and PS-6.1a ensure that solid waste management services would be maintained in a cost effective manner by contracting for garbage and recycling collection services. PS-6.2 and PS-6.2a support a sustainable solid waste service by implementing a disposal fee system while also encouraging recycling. PS-6.3 and PS-6.3a achieves landfill diversion by providing recycling education to the public. Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan's solid waste management impacts to **less than significant**.

### Mitigation Measures

None required

### 4.12.6.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for solid waste management services includes all of the unincorporated areas of Tehama County. Potential future development of these areas would also result in cumulative demand for landfill services.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### **Cumulative Solid Waste Service**

**Impact 4.12.6.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would generate solid waste that would require expanded collection and disposal services. The project's contribution would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional solid waste management demands to adequately serve the projected development within the unincorporated areas of the County. Funding from collection, handling, transfer and disposal fees would provide sufficient resources to serve the projected needs of the County solid waste facilities.

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures listed under **Impact 4.12.6.1** ensure that the General Plan's cumulative solid waste management related impacts are **less than cumulatively considerable**.

### Mitigation Measure

None required

## 4.12.7 COUNTY BUILDINGS AND SPACES

### 4.12.7.1 EXISTING SETTING

County facilities are largely concentrated within the City of Red Bluff. Most facilities are located within the centralized downtown area of Red Bluff (Courts, District Attorney, Health services and Agricultural Extension Services). A complete list of County offices and departments is included in

**Table 4.12-6.** Animal control officers are an active force with the Police Departments of the City of Red Bluff and the City of Corning. The Tehama County Animal Shelter is located within the City of Red Bluff on Walnut Street.

**TABLE 4.12-6  
TEHAMA COUNTY PUBLIC BUILDINGS**

Office/Service	Address
Tehama Co. Administrative Building	332 Pine Street, Red Bluff
Tehama Co. Agriculture Department	760 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Air Pollution Control	1750 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Agricultural Extension	1754 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County Animal Shelter	1830 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Assessor	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Auditor	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Building and Safety	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Child support services	740 Diamond Avenue, Red Bluff
County Clerk and recorder	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Coroner-public administrator	1740 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
District Attorney	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Environmental Health	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County Fair Grounds	650 Antelope Blvd, Red Bluff
Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	9380 San Benito, Gerber
Tehama County Health Center	1850 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Health Services Agency	818 Main Street, Red Bluff
In home supportive services	1311 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Planning	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Road Department/ Public Works	9380 San Benito, Gerber
Sheriff	502 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Social Services	22840 Antelope Blvd, Red Bluff
Superior Court	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County/ Red Bluff Landfill Management Agency	19995 Plymire Road, Red Bluff
Treasurer/ Tax Collector	444 Oak Street
Tehama Co. Administrative Building	332 Pine Street, Red Bluff
Tehama Co. Agriculture Department	760 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Air Pollution Control	1750 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Agricultural Extension	1754 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County Animal Shelter	1830 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Assessor	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Auditor	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Building and Safety	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Child support services	740 Diamond Avenue, Red Bluff
County Clerk and recorder	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Coroner-public administrator	1740 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
District Attorney	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Environmental Health	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County Fair Grounds	650 Antelope Blvd, Red Bluff
Tehama County Health Center	1850 Walnut Street, Red Bluff
Health Services Agency	818 Main Street, Red Bluff
In home supportive services	1311 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Planning	444 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Road Department/ Public Works	9380 San Benito, Gerber

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

Office/Service	Address
Sheriff	502 Oak Street, Red Bluff
Social Services	22840 Antelope Blvd, Red Bluff
Superior Court	633 Washington Street, Red Bluff
Tehama County/ Red Bluff Landfill Management Agency	19995 Plymire Road, Red Bluff
Treasurer/ Tax Collector	444 Oak Street

Source: Tehama County Administration Webpage (<http://co.tehama.ca.us/>)

### Other Community Facilities and Services

Public, private and nonprofit services and facilities that provide for the safety and well being of the people of the unincorporated County are diverse and numerous. Health, agriculture, safety, natural resource, communications, utilities and transportation services are provided throughout the County. Public health facilities are discussed briefly, while the full extent of services is far too broad to be mentioned here.

The Tehama County Health Partnership and the Tehama County Health Agency (Mental health, drug and alcohol, public health) focus on health care and public health throughout the county. St. Elizabeth Community Hospital and the Tehama County Health Center are both located within the City of Red Bluff. Many other medical facilities and organizations support the health care network. Cemeteries are located throughout the county and include locations in Red Bluff, Los Molinos, Corning, Tehama and Vina.

#### 4.12.7.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Land use planning and decision-making conducted by Tehama County must comply with applicable state and federal laws that affect public facilities and services.

Solid waste management, for example, is mandated by a number of federal and state laws that regulate hazardous waste, underground storage tanks, environmental problems associated with non-hazardous solid waste and describe provisions on resource recovery, used oil management and recycling. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939, California Public Resources Code) required stricter requirements for landfill development, source reduction and recycling efforts. In cooperation with the County and cities in the County, the Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Association (TCSLA) is responsible for maintaining the Integrated Waste Management Plan.

#### 4.12.7.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have a significant impact on County services and facilities if it would result in the following:

- 1) Result in the need for an increase in community facilities and services or substantially affect the ability of existing facilities to provide services.

## METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential impacts on county buildings and spaces was based on consultation with staff from Tehama County, review of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan, as well as other pertinent literature.

### County Buildings and Spaces

**Impact 4.12.7.1** Implementation of the General Plan update would increase the demand for community facilities and services. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

Counties should plan for the equitable distribution of new public facilities and services throughout the community. The equitable distribution of facilities and services has two primary components. The first component is the number and size of facilities. The second component is access, which can be measured as the distance or travel time from each residential area to the facility or service.

Potential development proposed in association with the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional County facilities and personnel to accommodate the demand. The staffing and administrative needs for County facilities will increase as a result of the population and additional facilities associated with implementing the 2008-2028 General Plan. New County buildings would be developed in response to population growth and as funding allows. New County buildings may require land use permits in some case, depending on the anticipated uses and character or adjacent developments.

Typical environmental effects regarding the construction and operation of new County buildings may involve issues with noise (during construction), air quality (during the construction of the facility), biological resources (depending on location), historic/cultural resources (depending on location), public services and utilities (demand for police and fire protection, electric, water and wastewater service) and traffic on a local neighborhood level. The environmental effects of construction of such facilities in the planning area been considered in the technical analyses of this EIR as part of overall development of the planning area.

### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following 2008-2028 General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures contained in the General Plan Public Services Element assist in reducing any potential impacts associated with the development of new County buildings.

Public Services: PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1d, PS-2.2, PS-2.2c

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures PS-1.1 and PS-1.1a would require that the County develops service and financial planning strategies in order to ensure the accommodation of County facility needs. PS-1.1d examines fund saving strategies by encouraging mixed-use sites. PS-2.2 and associated Implementation Measure PS-2.2c would assist in maintaining a sufficient amount of funds which are available for County infrastructure and facilities by requiring new development to fund its fair share portion of its impacts to all public infrastructure and facilities.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan policies and associated implementation measures identified above would reduce the General Plan impacts associated with the need for County facilities to **less than significant**.

## 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### Mitigation Measures

None required

### 4.12.7.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for County buildings and related land includes all such facilities in the unincorporated areas of Tehama County, as well as County buildings that are, or which may in the future be, located in the cities of Red Bluff or Corning. Potential future development would result in cumulative demand for use of County buildings and land, expansion of existing facilities, and/or development of new facilities.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Impact 4.12.7.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would generate increased cumulative demand for use of County facilities and land. The project's contribution would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Potential development proposed in association with the 2008-2028 General Plan would require additional County facilities and personnel to accommodate the demand. The staffing and administrative needs for County facilities will increase as a result of the population and additional facilities associated with implementing the Tehama County General Plan. New County buildings would be developed in response to population growth and as funding allows. New County buildings may require land use permits in some case, depending on the anticipated uses and character or adjacent developments.

Implementation of the General Plan Public Services Element policies and associated implementation measures PS-1.1, PS-1.1a, PS-1.1d, PS-2.2, PS-2.2c would ensure that the General Plan's cumulative impacts related to county buildings and land are **less than cumulatively considerable**. This conclusion is applicable to both the potential for impacts that may be caused by cumulative conditions and the project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts related to County buildings and space.

### Mitigation Measures:

None required.

## 4.12.8 REFERENCES

California Department of Finance. 2006. *E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2006*. <http://www.dof.ca.gov>

California Department of Education. 2007. *California Public School Directory, 2007*. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/sd/results.asp?Nocache=7%2F27%2F2007+10%3A40%3A10+AM>

City of Red Bluff. Red Bluff Police Department (RBPD). 2007. <http://www.rbpd.org/>

City of Corning. Corning Police Department (CPD). 2007. [http://www.corning.org/police\\_dep.html](http://www.corning.org/police_dep.html)

- County of Tehama. 2006. *Draft Background Report for the County of Tehama General Plan update*. April 2006. Tehama County, California.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2000. *Fire Hazard Zoning Field Guide*. 2000. Sacramento, California.
- County of Tehama. 1977. *Tehama County Parks and Recreation Masterplan*. December 1977. Tehama County, California.
- Integrated Waste Management Board. *Jurisdiction Profile for Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Regional Agency*. 2007.  
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/Default.asp>
- Integrated Waste Management Board. *Tehama County Disposal Outflow Destination*. 1999.  
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/Summaries/52/1999/Outflow.htm>
- Tehama County, Official Website, 2006 <http://www.tehamacounty.com/>
- Tehama County Sheriff's Department, Official website, 2006. <http://www.tehamaso.org/>
- Tehama County/Red Bluff Landfill, Official website, 2006.  
<http://www.tehamacounty/landfill.com/>
- Tehama County Department of Education, Official website, 2006.  
<http://www.tcde.tehama.k12.ca.us/>
- Shasta – Tehama – Trinity Joint Community College District. Project Planning and Development Approvals. March 2006. Found at  
<http://www3.shastacollege.edu/exted/TehamaMasterDRAFT.pdf>