

This section provides an overview of the project and the environmental analysis. For detailed discussions of all project impacts and mitigation measures, the reader is referred to the topical environmental analysis contained in Section 4.1 through Section 4.14 of the Draft EIR.

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The following Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an analysis of the potential environmental effects that may result from the proposed project, which is adoption and implementation of revisions to the Tehama County General Plan. The County's last comprehensive revision of the General Plan was adopted in 1983.

The Tehama County General Plan includes goals, policies and implementation measures that provide performance standards and guidance for land use decisions by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The plan indicates land use designations for future land uses, the location of proposed roads, density and intensity standards for future development, and the policies and criteria by which land use and development proposals will be considered.

The Tehama County General Plan includes the seven mandatory General Plan elements: Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, Housing, and Noise. The General Plan exercises an option in combining the Open Space Element and the Conservation Element into one Open Space/Conservation Element. (Note: The Housing Element has been reviewed and updated separately from the other six elements and is, therefore, not part of the proposed project in consideration at this time.) The General Plan also includes the following optional elements: Agriculture and Timber, Public Services, and Economic Development.

The central focus of the General Plan is on the lands within the County, over which Tehama County has jurisdiction. To comply with legal requirements, the General Plan establishes development policies for all areas that are currently within the County, but outside of incorporated city limits.

In terms of the environmental process, this EIR evaluates the proposed revisions to the goals, policies and implementation measures of the General Plan. By preparing the Draft EIR at this stage of General Plan development, the County has the opportunity to consider environmental implications within the General Plan. As such, specific mitigation strategies identified through this process have been, or are proposed to be, incorporated as policy directives or implementation provisions in the General Plan. The result of this parallel process is a General Plan document that has considered and is consistent with relevant environmental findings.

The EIR prepared for the proposed General Plan Update and related actions is a "Program EIR." A program EIR evaluates the broad policy direction of a planning document, such as a general plan, and does not examine the potential site-specific impacts of the many individual projects that may be proposed in the future consistent with the plan. Upon approval of the General Plan and certification of this EIR, additional CEQA compliance including negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, or the preparation of project-level EIRs will be required for site-specific projects and other actions that may be proposed within the program area.

BACKGROUND OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS OF THE PROJECT

The following is an overview of the environmental review process for the 2008-2028 General Plan that have led to the preparation of this FEIR.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

The County of Tehama was identified as the Lead Agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County of Tehama prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an EIR on July 16, 2007. This Notice of Preparation was sent to twenty-four public agencies. The Office of Planning and Research assigned this NOP a State Clearinghouse number, #2007072062. The public comment period commenced on July 16, 2007 and ended on August 14, 2007. A notice was circulated to the public, local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed project. Eight public agencies provided comments. A public scoping meeting on the Notice of Preparation and Draft General Plan update was conducted on August 1, 2007 in the City of Red Bluff. A Notice of Availability and Public Hearing was published for this meeting on July 16, 2007 in the Red Bluff Daily News (see Appendix 2.1-1 of the Draft EIR).

Draft EIR

The Draft EIR (DEIR) was released for public and agency review on September 19, 2008. The DEIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives. The Draft EIR was provided interested public agencies and the public and was made available for review at Tehama County Planning Department and the County's website.

Final EIR

The County received 44 comment letters from agencies, interest groups and the public regarding the Draft EIR. Additionally, four persons provided comments during the October 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting. This document responds to the written and verbal comments received as required by CEQA. This document also contains minor edits to the Draft EIR, which are included in Section 4.0 (Errata). This document constitutes the FEIR.

1.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The 2008-2028 General Plan Update includes changes in land use designations for certain areas in the County. The Update introduces new land use designations, including Upland Agriculture and Valley Floor Agriculture, and the overlay designation of Special Plan.

The expressed objectives for updating the Tehama County General Plan are:

- Provide a legally adequate General Plan that reflects an updated vision for the County's future and provides a blueprint for future decisions regarding land use and development;
- Protect the County's rural character and maintain the total amount of land designated for agriculture in the community;
- Provide for the use and protection of the County's natural resources;
- Provide incentives to encourage good land stewardship such as a streamlined approval process for environmentally superior projects;
- Accommodate a reasonable amount of growth (i.e. housing and employment) principally within existing developed or urbanized areas;
- Avoid the reduction of allowable densities within exiting residential areas;

- Focus growth adjacent to the I-5 corridor in the northern portion of the County in order to facilitate circulation, reduce transportation-related air quality impacts, minimize agricultural conversion and reduce impacts to sensitive biological species along the Sacramento River corridor;
- Identify performance standards and desired improvements for roadways in the County, including areas that currently experience congestion;
- Increase access to public open spaces and publicly-owned recreation trails over the next 20 years; and
- Address other issues of concern to the community such as the need for moderate-priced workforce housing, the needs of an increasingly aging population, incentives for historic preservation, and the effects of global climate change.

1.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and reduce the degree of environmental impact. Section 5.0, Alternatives, provides a detailed description and comparison to the proposed project of the following:

Three alternatives to the proposed project have been analyzed in this EIR:

- **Alternative 1 - No Project.** Under Alternative 1, the proposed Tehama County General Plan and its associated Land Use Diagram would not be adopted. The existing Tehama County General Plan policy document and Land Use Diagram would remain in effect. The County would utilize its existing zoning and other regulations regarding development within the County's jurisdiction. Infrastructure would be installed under existing plans, if applicable. Existing General Plan objectives and policies would continue to be in affect.
- **Alternative 2 - Land Use Plan Option A – Majority Opinion Land Use Diagram.** The proposed General Plan Update included an alternative land use diagram entitled the Majority Opinion Land Use Diagram. This land use plan was an alternative initiated by the General Plan Revision Advisory Committee as a reduced density option which basically reduces the allowed housing unit density for certain areas within the County.

As with the proposed General Plan, Alternative 2 also introduces a new land use overlay designation of Special Plan. The Special Plan overlay designated area, approximately 17,863 acres, allows for residential, commercial, public facilities and other uses. The only difference between the proposed General Plan Update and Alternative 2 is the reduction of acreage in the Special Plan/Suburban land use designation from 14,113.3 acres to 5,680.0 acres and the increase of Special Plan/Rural Small Lot from 3,247.6 acres to 9,571.5 acres. While this change may seem fairly minimal, the changes result in a substantial reduction in buildout housing units, population and the infrastructure and services necessary to serve these uses.

The proposed General Plan Update projects a buildout population of 416,967 and housing unit count of 184,499. Alternative 2 has a project buildout population of 347,875 and 153,927 housing units. The lower projected population and housing units would then result in a lesser impact on the environment in many areas since less land would be needed for growth and fewer people will place a lesser impact on utilities, parks,

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

recreation, traffic, noise, etc. Other than having a lower population estimate, this alternate would have all the goals and programs of the Draft General Plan.

- **Alternative 3 - Two Urban Growth Areas.** Alternative 3 divides all future growth into two urban centers; the area surrounding the City of Red Bluff and the area surrounding the City of Corning. This alternative has the same projected growth at buildout as the proposed General Plan. However, this scenario does not confine the majority of anticipated growth to the north central portion of the County, but rather attempts to spread the growth between the two urban centers. This would result in two medium size municipalities of approximately 150,000 to 175,000 persons under buildout conditions (includes city populations) or more than a 775 percent increase in the greater Red Bluff urban area and 1,950 percent increase in the greater Corning urban area. All land use acreage totals would remain the same as the proposed General Plan, but the majority of urban land uses would be located in the two urban areas. This would result in placing urban uses on agricultural lands surrounding the cities of Corning and Red Bluff but reserving the lands in the northernmost portion of the County which have been identified for residential, commercial, industrial and other urban-type development in the proposed General Plan.

1.4 ASSOCIATED ACTIONS

In accordance with Section 15082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Tehama County prepared and distributed an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on July 16, 2007 (SCH# 2007072062). This notice was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies, the public, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed project. The IS/NOP is presented in **Appendix 2.1-1**. The Tehama County Planning Commission held a series of six public hearings for the purpose of taking input from County residents and interested parties on the Public Draft General Plan document.

The initial study determined that the project may have an impact on the following environmental factors: Population and Housing, Land Use, Cultural Resources, Visual Resources, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems, and Recreation. Therefore, impacts to these areas have been further studied in the EIR.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 1.0-1 presents a summary of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance of each environmental impact is indicated after the application of the recommended mitigation measure(s). Minor revisions to impacts and mitigation measures from comments received on the Draft EIR and minor County staff edits are indicated by revision marks (underline for new text and ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

For detailed discussions of all project impacts and mitigation measures, the reader is referred to the topical environmental analysis contained in Section 4.1 through Section 4.14 of the Draft EIR.

**TABLE 1.0-1
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
<p>Impact 4.1.1 Land use designation changes in the 2008-2028 General Plan have the potential to allow an urban type of development in areas that are currently reserved for a less intense type of development. This development has the potential to impact scenic vistas in the County.</p>	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.1.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan land use designation changes is not expected to result in damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.</p>	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.1.3 The potential increase of residential dwellings, commercial and industrial support facilities, as a result of land use changes in the 2008-2028 General Plan, could result in the degradation of existing visual character or quality of the County.</p>	Potentially Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.1.4 Adoption of the 2008-2028 General Plan would allow increased</p>	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
development that could potentially create new sources of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.			
Impact 4.1.5 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan will encourage new development activities that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the County and its communities.	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Cumulatively Considerable and Unavoidable
Agricultural Resources			
Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would result in the re-designation of agricultural land to urban uses. This may result in the conversion of important farmlands (prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance, etc.) as designated by the farmland mapping and monitoring program to non-agricultural uses or may involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.	Significant	<p>MM 4.2.1 <u>The following mitigation measure shall be added as an implementation measure under Policy AG 1.2.</u></p> <p><u>The County shall promote the protection of agricultural resources by encouraging new development protect one acre of existing farmland of equal or higher quality for each acre of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance that would be converted to non-agricultural uses. This protection may consist of the establishment of farmland conservation easement, farmland deed restriction, or other appropriate farmland conversion in perpetuity, but may also be utilized for compatible wildlife conservation efforts. The farmland to be preserved shall be located within Tehama County and must have adequate water supply to support agricultural use. As part of the consideration of land areas proposed to be protected, the County shall consider the benefits of preserving farmlands in proximity to other protected lands.</u></p>	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in a conflict with existing zoning for	Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.			
Impact 4.2.3 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in the placement of urban uses adjacent to agricultural uses within the County, which could impose new constraints on agricultural operations.	Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.2.4 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan Land Use Map, along with other proposed development in Tehama County and the cities of Red Bluff, Corning and Tehama, would contribute to the additional conversion of important farmlands to other uses and may increase agriculture/urban interface conflicts.	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Cumulatively Considerable and Unavoidable
Air Quality			
Impact 4.3.1 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2006 NSVAB Air Quality Attainment Plan.	Potentially Significant	MM 4.3.1 The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2: Tehama County shall work with the Tehama County Air Pollution Control District to assure that emissions from increased population and vehicle miles traveled in the county are included in subsequent Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin Air Quality Attainment Plans, and will assist the District in identification of additional control measures, as needed to offset emission increases.	Significant and Unavoidable

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation										
<p>Impact 4.3.2 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may contribute to an existing air quality violation or a projected air quality violation.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM 4.3.2a The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:</p> <p>The County, when implementing or approving projects that would result in considerable grading and/or excavation activities, shall require as a condition of project approval those mitigation measures recommended by the Tehama County Air Pollution Control District to reduce construction-related emissions.</p> <p>MM 4.3.2b The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:</p> <p>The County shall request that the Tehama County Air Pollution Control District develop Indirect Source Guidelines for the potential air emissions from future development.</p> <p>The following list of items may be considered as potential project level measures by the TCAPCD to mitigate potential air quality impacts and be included in the Indirect Source Guidelines.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="739 760 1728 1391"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="739 760 926 818"><u>Agriculture</u></th> <th data-bbox="926 760 1127 818"><u>Atmosphere & Climate</u></th> <th data-bbox="1127 760 1331 818"><u>Community Development</u></th> <th data-bbox="1331 760 1541 818"><u>Design</u></th> <th data-bbox="1541 760 1728 818"><u>Economy</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="739 818 926 1391"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support irrigation alternatives.</u> </td> <td data-bbox="926 818 1127 1391"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consider model clean vehicle requirements.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy use in buildings.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from transportation.</u> • <u>Reduce methane emissions released from waste disposal.</u> • <u>Reduce County</u> </td> <td data-bbox="1127 818 1331 1391"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Keep urban uses in the city-centered corridor.</u> • <u>Identify and plan mixed use sites.</u> </td> <td data-bbox="1331 818 1541 1391"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Define flexible-use building types.</u> • <u>Encourage mixed use projects.</u> </td> <td data-bbox="1541 818 1728 1391"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide assistance with green practices.</u> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Atmosphere & Climate</u>	<u>Community Development</u>	<u>Design</u>	<u>Economy</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support irrigation alternatives.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consider model clean vehicle requirements.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy use in buildings.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from transportation.</u> • <u>Reduce methane emissions released from waste disposal.</u> • <u>Reduce County</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Keep urban uses in the city-centered corridor.</u> • <u>Identify and plan mixed use sites.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Define flexible-use building types.</u> • <u>Encourage mixed use projects.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide assistance with green practices.</u> 	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Atmosphere & Climate</u>	<u>Community Development</u>	<u>Design</u>	<u>Economy</u>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support irrigation alternatives.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consider model clean vehicle requirements.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy use in buildings.</u> • <u>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from transportation.</u> • <u>Reduce methane emissions released from waste disposal.</u> • <u>Reduce County</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Keep urban uses in the city-centered corridor.</u> • <u>Identify and plan mixed use sites.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Define flexible-use building types.</u> • <u>Encourage mixed use projects.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide assistance with green practices.</u> 									

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure					Significance After Mitigation
			<p><u>government contributions to greenhouse gas emissions.</u> <u>Encourage the planting of trees with urban forestry practices</u></p>				
		<p><u>Energy & Green Building</u></p>	<p><u>Housing</u></p>	<p><u>Public Services and Facilities</u></p>	<p><u>Transportation</u></p>	<p><u>Water</u></p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Offer energy efficiency information, technical assistance, training and incentives.</u> • <u>Use renewable energy in county facilities.</u> • <u>Facilitate renewable energy technologies and design.</u> • <u>Provide incentives for alternative energy production.</u> • <u>Divert construction waste.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Complete a non-residential job/housing linkage study.</u> • <u>Conduct a survey of potential mixed use sites.</u> • <u>Establish mixed use development standards and incentives.</u> • <u>Evaluate the feasibility of an "Affordable Housing Overlay Designation".</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Divert construction waste.</u> • <u>Reduce waste at county landfills.</u> • <u>Offer recycling education.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support alternate work schedules.</u> • <u>Promote transportation alternatives.</u> • <u>Adopt standards for pedestrian and bicycle access.</u> • <u>Consider pedestrian needs.</u> • <u>Ensure safe routes to schools.</u> • <u>Promote transit-oriented development.</u> • <u>Support green fuels.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support water conservation efforts.</u> • <u>Support and integrate water district conservation efforts.</u> 	
		<p>MM 4.3.2c The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:</p>					

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<u>The County shall strongly consider the adoption of an Air Quality Impact Fee to assist in the reduction of air quality impacts in the County.</u>	
<p>Impact 4.3.3 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutant emissions for which the region is currently in non-attainment.</p>	Potentially Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.3.4 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may result in sources of toxic air contaminants. These sources may in turn affect surrounding land uses. Sensitive land uses may also be developed near existing sources of toxic air contaminants.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM 4.3.4a The following change shall be made to General Plan Implementation Measure OS-2.6k The County shall consider adoption of <u>adopt</u> an ordinance that limits the amount of time diesel-powered trucks, buses, and other heavy vehicles may idle <u>in accordance with California Air Resources Board rules for mobile Toxic Air Contaminant sources.</u></p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.3.5 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to construction and/or long-term odorous emissions.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM 4.3.5 The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS 2: Require odor impact analyses be conducted for evaluating new development requests that either could generate objectionable odors that may violate TCAPCD Rule 4:4 or any subsequent rules and regulations regarding objectionable odors near sensitive receptors or locate new sensitive receptors near existing sources of objectionable odors. Should objectionable odor impacts be identified, odor mitigation shall be required in the form of setbacks, facility improvements or other appropriate measures.</p>	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.3.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan along with potential development of the Planning Area would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter.</p>	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources			
<p>Impact 4.4.1 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan could result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species, or may have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.</p>	<p>Significant for listed species Potentially Significant for other special-status species</p>	<p>The following measures shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.</p> <p>MM 4.4.1a The County shall encourage creation of habitat preserves that are immediately adjacent to one another in order to provide interconnected open space areas for animal movement.</p> <p>MM 4.4.1b In order to clarify and improve the effectiveness of the County procedures by which it will address potentially significant impacts to biological resources, and to mitigate such impacts as practicable, the County will work with responsible agencies, including CDFG, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries and the USACOE, to create Biological Resources Mitigation Guidelines (Biological Guidelines). The Biological Guidelines will focus and streamline project analysis and mitigation with respect to biological impacts. The Guidelines may <u>shall</u> include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard analysis techniques to determine if the project is located within an area that may contain special status species; • For those areas in which special-status species are found or are likely to occur, or where species presence is inferred, the County shall require mitigation of impacts to those species. Mitigation shall be designed in consultation with the USFWS, NOAA Fisheries and the CDFG, and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent possible; • Standard mitigation measures, designed in consultation with USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, and CDFG, to be used when appropriate to direct special status species surveys, including survey timing and protocols; • Standard mitigation measures, designed in consultation with USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, CDFG, and the USACOE to direct actions related to roadside ditches; • Measures designed to preserve areas identified in the General Plan EIR and the General Plan Land Use Diagram as containing sensitive habitat, or in which special status species are known to be present or likely to occur; • Project or roadway design features to allow for wildlife movement, especially in such cases where habitat preserves are crossed by a roadway, or where two adjacent preserves are separated by a roadway; • Methodology to encourage the preservation of existing waterways and discourage extensive or absolute relocation or channelization of creeks, rivers and waterways. <p>MM 4.4.1c The County shall require that prior to any public or private development</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><u>project in areas identified to contain or possibly contain special-status species – based on the Land Use Map, data provided in the Biological Resource section of the General Plan EIR or other suitable technical material available at the time – a biological survey be conducted by the project applicant to identify potentially occurring special-status species or their habitat using protocol acceptable to the regulatory agencies with authority over these species, or species presence shall be inferred. The results of the survey shall be documented in a Biological Resources Report.</u></p>	
<p>Impact 4.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in impacts to sensitive biotic communities including jurisdictional waters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant 	<p>Implement MM 4.4.1a and MM 4.4.1b</p> <p>MM 4.4.2 The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.</p> <p><u>For each project in which unavoidable removal of wetland habitat or other waters of the U.S. will occur, the County shall require the project proponent to develop a compensation plan prior to construction.</u></p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially Significant 	<p>Implement MM 4.4.1a and MM 4.4.1b</p> <p>MM 4.4.3 The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.</p> <p><u>In such cases where habitat preserves are crossed by a roadway, or where two adjacent preserves are separated by a roadway, the roadway shall be designed or upgraded with wildlife passable fencing separating the roadway from the preserve and/or shall incorporate design features that allow for the movement of wildlife across or beneath the road without causing a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians on the roadway.</u></p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could potentially conflict with locally adopted polices or ordinances that concern biological resources or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan..</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.4.5 Buildout of the 2008-2028 General Plan may</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively</p>	<p>Implement MM 4.4.1a through MM 4.4.3.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
result in potential cumulative loss of natural habitats and associated biological resources.	Considerable		Considerable
Cultural Resources			
Impact 4.5.1 Adoption of the Tehama County General Plan could result in adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or an historical resource	Potentially Significant	The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-6.2. MM 4.5.1 The County shall impose the following conditions on all discretionary projects: “The Planning Division shall be notified immediately if any prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontologic artifact is uncovered during construction. All construction must stop and an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate action.”	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.5.2 Adoption of the Tehama County General Plan could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations) or unique geological features.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.5.3 A project constructed as a result of the General Plan update could disturb human remains, especially those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.5.4 Adoption of the Tehama County General Plan along with foreseeable development in the region could result in the disturbance of historic and archaeological resources.	Cumulatively Considerable	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Geology and Soils			

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 4.6.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may result in the placement of structures and development in areas of seismic sensitivity which may expose structures or people to adverse effects including risk of loss, injury or death as a result of the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure (including liquefaction) or landslides.</p>	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.6.2 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may result in substantial construction and site preparation activities which may result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.6.3 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may allow for development on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life and property.</p>	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 4.6.4 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may allow for development in areas where soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan update could result in changes to land use designations that would result in a reduction in the availability of locally important or known mineral resources or loss of locally important mineral resource recovery site..</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.6 Cumulative development in the County has the potential to locate buildings and persons in areas considered to have geologic hazards.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.7 Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may result in substantial construction and site preparation activities. These activities increase soil erosion, wind and water erosion, and siltation of local drainages during construction, excavation and grading activities.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>
<p>Impact 4.6.8 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Plan may allow for development in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater, or where soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	Considerable		Considerable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact 4.7.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in safety hazards associated with residential development in the wildland-urban interface.	Potentially Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.7.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in safety hazards associated with operations at public airports and private airstrips adjacent to areas proposed for development.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.7.3 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would allow for uses that transport hazardous materials on Planning Area roadways as well as the use and disposal of hazardous materials within the Tehama County General Plan Planning Area.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.7.4 Although there are federal, state, and local laws in place to minimize the accidental release of hazardous materials, there	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
are land uses within the Planning Area that could release hazardous materials into the environment should an accident occur.			
Impact 4.7.5 Hazardous materials would be used during construction and operational activities throughout the Planning Area, which may expose nearby students, faculty, and staff at local schools to toxic emissions.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.7.6 New construction may be proposed on a site which is included on the list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5, and would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.7.7 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may interfere with adopted emergency response and evacuation plans in the Planning Area.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would allow for of an increase in development, which in turn could result in an increase in impervious surfaces and the alteration of drainage conditions and stormwater runoff rates, all of	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
which could result in potential flooding in the General Plan Planning Area.			
Impact 4.7.9 Implementation of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan could expose persons to general hazards throughout the life of the 2008-2028 General Plan, with the exception of wildland fire hazards.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.7.10 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in cumulative safety hazards associated with wildland fires in residential areas adjacent to open space and natural areas.	Potentially Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 4.8.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan update could result in a substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, and/or environmental harm on, or may provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that may degrade surface water quality or results in a violation of a water quality standard or waste discharge requirement.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 4.8.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from future land uses.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.8.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would potentially result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level increase the demand for water from both surface and groundwater sources throughout Tehama County.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>None feasible.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 4.8.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a substantial alteration of an existing drainage pattern, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, which may substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or could result in the creation or contribution of runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Implementation of the proposed General Plan may result in the placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map and may impede or redirect flood flows or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam or result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM 4.8.4 Require the establishment of maintenance districts or similar mechanisms for significant new drainage facilities to promote the maintenance and operation of such facilities and actively engage in assuring the maintenance of existing drainage facilities to ensure their proper operation during storm events.</p>	Less than Significant
<p>Impact 4.8.5 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan and potential development of the</p>	Potentially Cumulatively Considerable	Implementation of the General Plan policies and implementation measures and mitigation measures MM 4.8.1 and MM 4.8.2 .	Less than Cumulatively Considerable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p>unincorporated regions of the County would include substantial grading, site preparation, and an increase in urbanized development. Increased development may contribute to cumulative water quality impacts.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.8.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan update would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Planning Area, which could contribute to cumulative flood conditions along the Sacramento River, and other local waterways. However, the General Plan contains adequate General Plan policies and action items that address drainage and flooding issues.</p>	<p>Less Than Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>
<p>Impact 4.8.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would potentially increase the demand for water from both surface and groundwater sources throughout Tehama County, which could result in water shortages or reduce recharge to aquifers.</p>	<p>Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation. <u>None feasible.</u></p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Land Use Planning</p>			
<p>Impact 4.9.1 Land use designation changes in the General Plan have the</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
potential to physically divide or impact an established community.			
Impact 4.9.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan has the potential to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over parts of the Planning Area that provide for environmental protection.	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures and/or state and federal laws provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.9.3 The proposed General Plan update would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the area.	No Impact.	None required.	No Impact.
Impact 4.9.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in Tehama County, would contribute to cumulative land conflicts.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Noise			
Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in the creation of new noise-sensitive land uses within noise-impacted areas.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in the creation of new noise	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
producing land uses near existing or proposed noise-sensitive areas.			
Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.10.4 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels within the project, especially along major transportation routes.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.10.5 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels due to construction-related activities.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.10.6 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may result in an increased exposure of individuals to noise associated with airport operations.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.10.7 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan, in combination with development occurring within the incorporated cities of Red Bluff, Corning, and Tehama would potentially increase	Potentially Cumulatively Considerable	MM 4.10.7 The County shall work to develop a County-wide traffic noise abatement program for the express purpose of reducing traffic noise exposure at existing residential uses which are affected by traffic noise levels in excess of the County's noise level standards. The program shall include the following specific aspects for noise abatement consideration where reasonable and feasible: 1. Noise barrier retrofits.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
traffic levels in the planning area.		2. Truck usage restrictions. 3. Reduction of speed limits. 4. Use of quieter paving materials. 5. Building façade sound insulation. 6. Traffic calming. 7. Additional enforcement of speed limits and exhaust noise laws. 8. Signal timing.	
Population and Housing			
Impact 4.11.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan Update would include an increase in land uses that promote the increase in population and housing to the area.	Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.11.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan may result in the displacement of housing and/or persons due to the construction of infrastructure necessary to serve new development or revitalization efforts.	No Impact	None required.	No impact
Impact 4.11.3 Implementation of the 200-2028 General Plan Update could result in a cumulative increase in population and housing growth in the incorporated areas of Tehama County as well as surrounding counties and associated environmental impacts.	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services			
<p>Impact 4.12.1.1 Subsequent development under the proposed 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.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.12.1.2 Implementation of the 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.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>
<p>Impact 4.12.2.1 Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased demand for law enforcement services. As a result additional law enforcement services and related facilities would be required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.12.2.2 Implementation of the General Plan Update in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Cumulatively Considerable</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
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.			
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.	Less Than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
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.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.12.4.1 Implementation of the project would increase student enrollment in the General Plan Area and require the construction of new schools and related facilities to serve the	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
anticipated demand. As a result additional public schools and related facilities would be required.			
Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementat ion of the 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.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.12.5.1 Implementat ion of the General Plan Update would increase the demand for existing facilities and require additional parks and recreational facilities to accommodate the anticipated growth associated with the General Plan.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.12.5.2 Implementat ion of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would require additional park and recreation facilities within the Planning Area boundaries and Tehama County Parks and Recreation District's service area boundaries.	Less Than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.12.6.1	Less Than	None required.	Less than

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Implementation of the General Plan would increase solid waste generation and the demand for related services.	Significant		Significant
Impact 4.12.6.2 Implementation of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would generate solid waste that would require expanded collection and disposal services.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.12.7.1 Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase the demand for community facilities and services.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Traffic and Circulation			
Impact 4.13.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would result in an increase in traffic volumes that would result in deficient level of service conditions in year 2030.	Significant	<p>MM 4.13.1a Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a shall be changed to include the following: Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a All proposed development shall mitigate its proportionate share of impacts on the County roadways, the State Highway System, transit, and pedestrian systems. The County shall consider adoption of adopt a roadway impact fee and transit impact fee to be required of on all new development, through fee adoption by ordinance, development agreements, conditions of approval, and other project entitlements. In the absence of an impact fee the County Public Works Director may determine the value of proportionate <u>reasonable</u> share of impact associated with the proposed project.</p> <p>MM 4.13.1b Implementation Measure CIR-1.1c shall be changed to include the following: Implementation Measure CIR-1.1c In the absence of an adopted Tehama County traffic model, the County shall utilize the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Transportation Research Board's Highway</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Capacity Manual standards as a baseline when calculating roadway capacity thresholds and when calculating Average Daily Trip (ADT) thresholds.</p> <p>MM 4.13.1c Implementation Measure PS-6.1b shall be changed to include the following: <u>Implementation Measure PS-6.1b</u> <u>Identify potential future sites for solid waste disposal, including transfer stations, consistent with the development patterns with an emphasis on centralization.</u></p>	
<p>Impact 4.13.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may result in potential conflicts with operations at Red Bluff and Corning municipal airports, and potential exposure to hazards associated with airport operations.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.13.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses as well as potentially adversely affect emergency access needs.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact 4.13.4 New development will generate increased demands for parking in residential, commercial and industrial areas, and if not adequately accommodated, increase on-street parking could affect</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
traffic circulation.			
Impact 4.13.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan and its resultant increase in population and employment would escalate the demand for public transit services.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.13.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in the demand for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.	Less than Significant	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact 4.13.7 When considered with existing, proposed, planned and approved development in the region, implementation of the Tehama County General Plan Update would contribute to cumulative traffic volumes in the region that result in significant impacts to level of service and operations.	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.13.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would contribute to the cumulative demand for public transit service (e.g., bus and light rail service).	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less than Cumulatively Considerable
Impact 4.13.9 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would contribute to cumulative demands for pedestrian and bicycle	Less than Cumulatively Considerable	None required.	Less Than Cumulatively Considerable

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
infrastructure.			
Utilities and Service Systems			
Impact 4.14.1.1 Implementation the General Plan would result in the need for additional treatment capacity, storage capacity, and other conveyance facilities to meet the projected water demands.	Potentially Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.14.1.2 Implementation of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would increase the population within the County contributing to the cumulative demand for water resources and associated facilities. As a result additional water supply resources would be required.	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.14.2.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would substantially increase wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and may require additional treatment capacity to accommodate anticipated demands that would result in a physical effect on the environment.	Significant	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.14.2.2 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan, in addition	Cumulatively Considerable	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
to other reasonably foreseeable development in the Cities of Red Bluff and Corning, would substantially increase wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity that would result in a physical effect on the environment.			
<p>Impact 4.14.3.1 Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would substantially increase demand for electrical, natural gas, telephone and related infrastructure.</p>	Potentially Significant	General Plan policies and implementation measures provide sufficient mitigation.	Less than Significant