

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

Listed below are the complete changes, additions, and deletions that have been made to the text of the Draft EIR as a result of public and staff review. Revisions herein do not result in new significant environmental impacts, do not constitute significant new information, nor do they alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis. Changes are provided in revision marks (underline for new text and ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

COVER AND TITLE PAGE OF DRAFT EIR

No changes were made to the cover and title page.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following change has been made to page 1.0-5, **Impact 4.2.1**:

<p>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.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p><u>MM 4.2.1 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>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
---	--------------------	---	--

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

The following change has been made to page 1.0-7, mitigation measure **MM 4.3.2**:

<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: 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: <u>The County shall request that the Tehama County Air Pollution Control District develop Indirect Source Guidelines for the potential air emissions from future development.</u></p> <p><u>The following list of items may be considered as potential project level measures to mitigate potential air quality impacts and be included in the Indirect Source Guidelines.</u></p>					<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
		<p><u>Agriculture</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support irrigation alternatives.</u> 	<p><u>Atmosphere & Climate</u></p> <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 government contributions to greenhouse gas emissions.</u> • <u>Encourage the planting of trees with urban forestry practices.</u> 	<p><u>Community Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Keep urban uses in the city-centered corridor.</u> • <u>Identify and plan mixed use sites.</u> 	<p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Define flexible-use building types.</u> • <u>Encourage mixed use projects.</u> 	<p><u>Economy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide assistance with green practices.</u> 	
		<p><u>Energy & Green Building</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Offer energy efficiency information, technical assistance, training</u> 	<p><u>Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Complete a non-residential job/housing linkage study.</u> • <u>Conduct a survey of</u> 	<p><u>Public Services and Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Divert construction waste.</u> • <u>Reduce waste at county landfills.</u> • <u>Offer</u> 	<p><u>Transportation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support alternate work schedules.</u> • <u>Promote transportation alternatives.</u> • <u>Adopt</u> 	<p><u>Water</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support water conservation efforts.</u> • <u>Support and integrate</u> 	

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

		<p>and incentives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use renewable energy in county facilities. • Facilitate renewable energy technologies and design. • Provide incentives for alternative energy production. • Divert construction waste. 	<p>potential mixed use sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish mixed use development standards and incentives. • Evaluate the feasibility of an "Affordable Housing Overlay Designation". 	<p>recycling education.</p>	<p>standards for pedestrian and bicycle access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider pedestrian needs. • Ensure safe routes to schools. • Promote transit-oriented development. • Support green fuels. 	<p>water district conservation efforts.</p>	<p>MM 4.3.2c The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	--	---	-----------------------------	---	---	--

The following change has been made to page 1.0-8, mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1b** and **MM 4.4.1c**:

<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, 	<p>Less than Significant</p>
---	--	--	------------------------------

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

		<p>NOAA Fisheries and the CDFG, and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent possible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <u>The County shall require that prior to any public or private development 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>	
--	--	--	--

The following change has been made to page 1.0-9, **Impacts 4.4.2** and **4.4.3**:

<p>Impact 4.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in impacts to sensitive biotic communities including jurisdictional waters.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>Implement MM 4.4.1a and MM 4.4.1b MM 4.4.2 <u>The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.</u> <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</p>	<p>Potentially</p>	<p>Implement MM 4.4.1a and MM 4.4.1b</p>	<p>Less than</p>

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

<p>the proposed General Plan could interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<p>MM 4.4.3 <u>The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.</u></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>Significant</p>
---	--------------------	---	--------------------

The following change has been made to page 1.0-14, mitigation measure **MM 4.8.7**:

<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.</p> <p><u>None feasible.</u></p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
--	----------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

The following change has been made to page 1.0-19, mitigation measure **MM 4.13.1a**:

<p>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.</p>	<p>Significant</p>	<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, <u>the State Highway System</u>, transit, and pedestrian systems. The County shall consider adoption of <u>adopt</u> a roadway impact fee and <u>transit impact fee to be required of</u> 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 <u>proportionate 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 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</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
--	--------------------	--	------------------------------------

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

		<u>shall be changed to include the following:</u> <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>	
--	--	--	--

2.0 INTRODUCTION

No changes were made to Section 1.0.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Implementation Measures OS-3.2a and OS-3.2b, page 3.0-38 have been changed as follows:

Implementation Measure OS-3.2a

Resource Lands shall be designated on zoning maps using the subcategories shown in Table 6-2. Resource Lands shall be designated on General Plan Land Use Diagram using the subcategories shown in Table 6-1.

Implementation Measure OS-3.2b

The natural habitat resources shall be designated on General Plan Land Use Diagram using the subcategories shown in Table 6-2. Lands designated with a Natural Resource Designation (Habitat Resources or Resource Lands) shall be zoned with the Natural Resources zoning designation.

4.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

No changes were made to Section 4.0.

4.1 AESTHETICS

No changes were made to Section 4.1.

4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The incorrect figure number (4.2-1) was used for the Williamson Act Contract lands, page 4.2-14. This figure number has been changed to Figure 4.2-2. See corrected figure number at the end of this Section 4.0.

The incorrect figure number (4.2-2) was used for the Important Farmland within Tehama County, page 4.2-16. This figure number has been changed to Figure 4.2-1. See corrected figure number at the end of this Section 4.0.

The following change has been made to page 4.2-23, 4th paragraph, Impact 4.2.3:

Implementation of the above 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures and the County's Right to Farm ordinance would assist in reducing agriculture/urban associated nuisance effects (dust, smoke, noise, odor), and restrictions on agricultural operations from interfaces with urban uses. However, despite the implementation of these policies, significant agriculture/urban interface conflicts would still result throughout the General Plan Planning Area,

especially in regards to farm equipment and vehicle conflicts on area roadways, potential trespassing and vandalism to active farmlands, competition for water resources (loss of irrigation water and the cost of groundwater extraction), and growth pressures on farmland in proximity to urban uses. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

The following mitigation measure and changes have been made to **Impact 4.2.1**, page 4.2-21:

Mitigation Measure

MM 4.2.1 The following mitigation measure shall be added as an implementation measure under Policy AG 1.2.

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.

While the policies, ~~and~~ implementation measures and mitigation measure MM 4.2.1 identified above would assist in the preservation of agricultural land in the County, the transfer of over 35,000 acres of agriculturally designated land uses to other land use designations (i.e. residential, commercial, etc.) is considered a significant impact as the project would still result in the direct loss of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

Page 4.3-15 has been changed to the following:

It is anticipated that implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would allow for the potential construction of approximately ~~28,242~~ 28,215 dwelling units and 657 acres of commercial, industrial, and office uses during the 2008-2028 planning period.

Page 4.3-19, 2nd paragraph has been changed to the following:

Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a states that all proposed development will mitigate its ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impacts on the County roadways, transit, and pedestrian systems. General Plan Policy CIR-5.1, Implementation Measure CIR-5.1a, and Implementation Measure CIR-5.1b requires the County to provide convenient and accessible transit facilities for the elderly, youth, commuters, and persons with disabilities, implement land use decisions that are consistent with the Transit Development Plan and Tehama County Bus Stop Standards Policies and Procedures and promote the use of car pools, van pools, and park and ride lots.

Table 5.05, page 5.0-47 has been changed to the following:

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

Input Assumptions						
Planning or Focus Area (Model Run) ¹	Residential		Commercial		Industrial	
	# Units	Trip Gen Rate ²	Acres	Trip Gen Rate ³	Acres	Trip Gen Rate ⁴
2008-2028 General Plan Lifespan ⁵						
Single Family Residential	27,668 27,641	11.52	439.0	41.29	520.0	4.96
Apartment Low Rise	574	6.90				

The following information was added to page 4.3-27:

Table 4.3-4 identifies the air emissions under buildout conditions. This table only represents the air emissions if the County were to achieve buildout within the 2008-2028 planning period. However, buildout has been determined to not be possible during the 2008-2028 General Plan planning period. The air emissions listed below are only an estimate of potential air emissions under buildout conditions and not a true representation of the buildout emissions, as buildout will occur well beyond the 2008-2028 planning period.

Mitigation measure **MM 4.3.2**, page 4.3-16, has been changed to the following:

MM 4.3.2a The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:

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.

The following mitigation measures have been added to page 4.3-16, **Impact 4.3.2**:

MM 4.3.2b The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:

The County shall request that the Tehama County Air Pollution Control District develop Indirect Source Guidelines for the potential air emissions from future development.

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.

<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Atmosphere & Climate</u>	<u>Community Development</u>	<u>Design</u>	<u>Economy</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support irrigation alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider model clean vehicle requirements. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy use in buildings. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep urban uses in the city-centered corridor. Identify and plan mixed use sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define flexible-use building types. Encourage mixed use projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide assistance with green practices.

	<u>transportation.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •<u>Reduce methane emissions released from waste disposal.</u> •<u>Reduce County government contributions to greenhouse gas emissions.</u> <u>Encourage the planting of trees with urban forestry practices</u>			
<u>Energy & Green Building</u>	<u>Housing</u>	<u>Public Services and Facilities</u>	<u>Transportation</u>	<u>Water</u>
<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>

MM 4.3.2c The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal OS-2:

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.

The 1st paragraph under **Impact 4.3.3** on page 4.3-16 has been changed to the following:

Implementation of the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan may result in increased employment growth, and an increase in population. These increases would introduce additional mobile and stationary sources of emissions, which would adversely affect regional air quality. The California Environmental Protection Agency has designated the TCAPCD Tehama County as an ozone and PM10 nonattainment area. The principal sources of the ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) are the combustion of fuels and the evaporation of solvents, paints, and fuels.

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

**TABLE 4.3-4
ESTIMATED UNMITIGATED GENERAL PLAN AIR QUALITY EMISSIONS - BUILDOUT**

Input Assumptions								
Planning or Focus Area (Model Run) ¹	Residential		Commercial		Industrial			
	# Units	Trip Gen Rate ²	Acres	Trip Gen Rate ³	Acres	Trip Gen Rate ⁴		
2008-2028 General Plan – Buildout Conditions ⁵								
Single Family Residential	155,744	11.52	2,872.1	41.29	3,400.9	4.96		
Apartment Low Rise	28,755	6.90						
Total Projected Annual Emissions								
Emission Source	Tons Per Year				Pounds Per Day			
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2008-2028 General Plan – Buildout Conditions								
Area Source Emissions (Tons/Yr)	3,502.30	503.36	1,662.00	1,599.74	10,709.58	1,715.22	16.80	16.64
Operational (vehicle) Emissions (Tons/Yr)	3,815.94	4,721.50	3,621.98	708.60	20,079.38	22,127.86	19,846.50	3,882.78
Total Emissions (Tons/Yr)	7,318.24	5,224.86	5,283.98	2,308.34	30,788.96	23,843.08	19,863.30	3,899.42

Notes: 1) TCAPCD does not provide EMFAC statistics for use with the Urbemis 2007 air emissions program.. Therefore emissions were calculated based on default assumptions provided in the model for California. Model default assumptions for pass-by and double-counting adjustments were included. Actual emissions will vary depending on how development occurs, the specific types of land uses developed, and emission control measures implemented.

2) Single family residential includes Suburban, Rural Small Lot and Rural Large Lot land use designations. Apartment Low rise includes the Urban land use designation.

3) Trip Generation Rate is based on the median for all commercial and retail categories identified in the Urbemis 2007 ver 9.2.4 model.

4) Trip Generation Rate is based on the median for all industrial categories identified in the Urbemis 2007 ver 9.2.4 model.

5) Acreages for Commercial and Industrial are total acreages.

6) Urbemis 2007 does not allow the input of number larger than 99,999, therefore total buildout units were divided by two for input into the Urbemis program and then the air emission output was double to represent the total buildout air emissions.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Table 4.4-1, page 4.4-2 has been changed as follows:

**TABLE 4.4-1
BIOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES OCCURRING IN TEHAMA COUNTY**

BIOLOGICAL COMMUNITY	ACRES
Agriculture (AGR)	
Cropland (CRP)	14,033 151,046
Irrigated row and field crops (IRF)	96 1,030
Orchard-vineyard (OVN)	1,780 19,155
Annual grassland (AGS)	18,193 195,831
Aquatic (AQU)	
Lacustrine (LAC)	149 1,605

BIOLOGICAL COMMUNITY	ACRES
Riverine (RIV)	164 1,760
Barren (BAR)	419 4,514
Chaparral (CHP)	
Chamise-redshank chaparral (CRC)	4,258 45,844
Mixed chaparral (MCH)	6,739 72,538
Montane chaparral (MCP)	484 5,205
Douglas-fir (DFR)	62 666
Eastside pine (EPN)	1,071 11,527
Jeffrey pine (JPN)	1,72 1,854
Klamath mixed conifer (KMC)	4933 53,099
Montane hardwood (MHW)	3,570 38,426
Montane hardwood-conifer (MHC)	2,711 29,181
Oak Woodlands (OAW)	
Blue oak – foothill pine (BOP)	38,855 418,229
Blue oak woodlands (BOW)	31,330 337,235
Valley oak woodland (VOW)	1,764 18,988
Ponderosa pine (PPN)	23,503 252,985
Red fir (RFR)	1,597 17,185
Sierran mixed conifer (SMC)	17,627 189,735
Valley foothill riparian (VRI)	1,487 16,006
Urban (URB)	666 7,172
Wet meadow (WTM)	261 2,810

The following is added to page 4.4-31 under the heading "Tehama County":

Land Development and Engineering Standards, Chapter 4 – Grading and Erosion Control

The purpose of Chapter 4 – Grading and Erosion Control, is to promote and protect the public safety, convenience, comfort, prosperity, protection of water quality, environmental health and watershed functions, general welfare and the County's natural resources by establishing minimum requirements for grading, excavation and filling. Discretionary grading permits are required for any grading which involves: 1) the movement of more than 2,000 cubic yards of earth, 2) the disturbance of more than five acres of earth material, or 3) is within 250 feet of any pre-existing watercourse. Notwithstanding the foregoing grading performed in connection with a detached single-family dwelling located on one parcel shall require a Ministerial Grading Permit. A Discretionary Grading Permit may be approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the Director, as provided in this Chapter. The issuance of all Discretionary grading permits is subject to CEQA review by the County. Ministerial Grading Permits are required for any grading not required a Discretionary Grading Permit. Grading permits require a grading plan as well as an erosion control plan.

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

Page 4.4-36, mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1b** has been revised and mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1c**, has been added as follows:

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~~ shall include the following:

- ~~• 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.

MM 4.4.1c The County shall require that prior to any public or private development 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.

Implementation of the above General Plan policies and implementation measures, applicable state and federal required permits, and MM 4.4.1a, ~~and~~ MM 4.4.1b, and MM 4.4.1c would ensure that direct impacts to special-status species in the Tehama County General Plan Planning Area would be less than significant.

The following changes have been made to page 4.4-37:

~~Implementation of the above 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures and **MM 4.4.1a and 4.4.1b**, along with full compliance with applicable state and federal required permits, would ensure that impacts to sensitive biotic communities in the General Plan Planning Area would be **less than significant**.~~

Mitigation Measures

~~None required.~~

MM 4.4.2 The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.

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.

Implementation of the above 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures and **MM 4.4.1a, MM 4.4.1b, and MM 4.4.2** along with full compliance with applicable state and federal required permits, would ensure that impacts to sensitive biotic communities in the General Plan Planning Area would be **less than significant**.

Page 4.4-39 has been changed as follows:

~~Implementation of the above 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures as well as **MM 4.4.1a and 4.4.1b** would ensure that impacts to wildlife corridors in the General Plan Planning Area would be less than significant.~~

Mitigation Measures

~~None required.~~

MM 4.4.3 The following measure shall be incorporated into the Open Space Element as an implementation measure under Policy OS-3.1.

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.

Implementation of the above 2008-2028 General Plan policies and implementation measures as well as **MM 4.4.1a, MM 4.4.1b, MM 4.4.1c, MM 4.4.2 and MM 4.4.3** would ensure that impacts to wildlife corridors in the General Plan Planning Area would be **less than significant**.

Attachment 4.4.1 has been changed to reflect the status of the bald eagle.

**LISTED AND SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES KNOWN TO OCCUR OR POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN
TEHAMA COUNTY AND VICINITY**

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
<i>Plants</i>					
pubescent needle grass (<i>Achnatherum lemmonii</i> ssp. <i>pubescens</i>)	--	--	3	CRC, MCH, MCP, MHC (serpentine)	Yes
Henderson's bent grass (<i>Agrostis hendersonii</i>)	--	--	3	AGS (vernal pools)	Yes
scabrid alpine tarplant (<i>Anisocarpus scabridus</i>)	--	--	1B	KMC	Yes
Dimorphic snapdragon (<i>Antirrhinum subcordatum</i>)	--	--	4	CRC, MCH, MCP, MHC (serpentine)	Yes
Sonoma manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos canescens</i> ssp. <i>Sonomensis</i>)	--	--	1B	MCH, MCP, PPN, KMC (serpentine)	Yes
Konocti manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i> ssp. <i>elegans</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, SMC, OAW	Yes
northern spleenwort (<i>Asplenium septentrionale</i>)	--	--	2	CRC, MCH, MCP, SMC, OAW, SCN, KMC	Yes
Jepson's milk-vetch (<i>Astragalus rattanii</i> var. <i>jepsonianus</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, AGS (serpentine)	Yes
big-scale balsamroot (<i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i> var. <i>macrolepis</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, AGS (serpentine)	Yes
Resin birch (<i>Betula pumila</i> var. <i>glandulifera</i>)	--	--	2	FEW, SMC, WTM, SCN	Yes
upswept moonwort (<i>Botrychium ascendens</i>)	--	--	2	SMC	Yes
scalloped moonwort (<i>Botrychium crenulatum</i>)	--	--	2	FEW, SMC	Yes
mingan moonwort (<i>Botrychium minganense</i>)	--	--	2	SMC, KMC	Yes
western goblin (<i>Botrychium montanum</i>)	--	--	2	SMC, KMC	Yes
Indian Valley brodiaea (<i>Brodiaea coronaria</i> ssp. <i>rosea</i>)	--	E	1B	CPC, CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, AGS	Yes
Bolander's bruchia (<i>Bruchia bolanderi</i>)	--	--	2	MHC, KMC	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
round-leaved filaree (<i>California macrophylla</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, AGS	Yes
Butte County morning-glory (<i>Calystegia atriplicifolia</i> spp. <i>buttensis</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP	Yes
Wilkin's harebell (<i>Campanula wilkinsiana</i>)	--	--	1B	WTM, SCN, KMC	Yes
dissected-leaved toothwort (<i>Cardamine pachystigma</i> var. <i>dissectifolia</i>)	--	--	3	CRC, MCH, MCP, MHC (serpentine)	Yes
fox sedge (<i>Carex vulpinoidea</i>)	--	--	2	VRI, FEW	Yes
Hoover's spurge (<i>Chamaesyce hooveri</i>)	T	--	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
Stony Creek spurge (<i>Chamaesyce ocellata</i> ssp. <i>rattanii</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, AGS	Yes
dwarf soaproot (<i>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</i> var. <i>minus</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP (serpentine)	Yes
Shasta clarkia (<i>Clarkia borealis</i> ssp. <i>arida</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, SMC, KMC	Yes
white-stemmed clarkia (<i>Clarkia gracilis</i> spp. <i>albicaulis</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW (serpentine)	Yes
talus collomia (<i>Collomia larsenii</i>)	--	--	2	ADS, CPC, SCN, KMC	Yes
clustered lady's-slipper (<i>Cypripedium fasciculatum</i>)	--	--	4	SMC (serpentine)	Yes
silky cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha crinita</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, SMC, VRI, AGS	Yes
Norris' beard-moss (<i>Downingia pusilla</i>)	--	--	2	MHC, OAW	Yes
dwarf downingia (<i>Downingia pusilla</i>)	--	--	2	AGS (vernal pools)	Yes
golden draba (<i>Draba aureola</i>)	--	--	1B	ADS, SCN (serpentine)	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
Oregon fireweed (<i>Epilobium oregonium</i>)	--	--	1B	WTM, SMC, KMC, FEW	Yes
Brandegee's eriastrum (<i>Eriastrum brandegeae</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW	Yes
Tracy's eriastrum (<i>Eriastrum tracyi</i>)	--	R	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW	Yes
Dubakella Mountain buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum libertini</i>)	--	--	4	CRC, MCH, MCP, SMC (serpentine)	Yes
pyrola-leaved buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum pyrolifolium</i> var. <i>pyrolifolium</i>)	--	--	2	ADS	Yes
coast fawn lily (<i>Erythronium revolutum</i>)	--	--	2	MHC, KMC, PPN	Yes
Butte County fritillary (<i>Fritillaria eastwoodiae</i>)	--	--	3	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, SMC	Yes
adobe-lily (<i>Fritillaria pluriflora</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, AGS	Yes
Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop (<i>Gratiola heterosepala</i>)	--	E	1B	WTM, FEW, (vernal pools)	Yes
Niles' harmonia (<i>Harmonia doris-nilesiae</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, MHC	Yes
Stebbins's harmonia (<i>Harmonia stebbinsii</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, SMC, (serpentine)	Yes
Tehama County western flax (<i>Hesperolinon tehamense</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, (serpentine)	Yes
Ahart's dwarf rush (<i>Juncus leiospermus</i> var. <i>ahartii</i>)	--	--	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes
little hulsea (<i>Hulsea nana</i>)	--	--	2	ADS, SCN	Yes
Baker's globe mallow (<i>Iliamna bakeri</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, JUN	Yes
Red Bluff dwarf rush (<i>Juncus leiospermus</i> var. <i>leiospermus</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, OAW, WTM, AGS	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
Dubious pea (<i>Lathyrus sulphureus</i> var. <i>argillaceus</i>)	--	--	3	OAW, MHC, KMC	Yes
Colusa layia (<i>Layia septentrionalis</i>)	--	--	1B	MCH MCP, CRC, AGS, OAW (serpentine)	Yes
Legenere (<i>Legenere limosa</i>)	--	--	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes
Mt. Tedoc leptosiphon (<i>Leptosiphon nuttallii</i> ssp. <i>howellii</i>)	--	--	1B	SMC, KMC (serpentine)	Yes
Butte County meadowfoam (<i>Limnanthes floccose</i> ssp. <i>californica</i>)	E	E	1B	AGS (vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
red-flowered lotus (<i>Lotus rubriflorus</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, AGS	Yes
Anthony Peak lupine (<i>Lupinus antoninus</i>)	--	--	1B	PPN, KMC, WFR, RFR	Yes
Three-ranked hump-moss (<i>Meesia triquetra</i>)	--	--	1B	KMC, MHC, PPN	Yes
Lassen Peak copper-moss (<i>Mielichhoferia tehamensis</i>)	--	--	1B	ADS	Yes
leafy-stemmed miterwort (<i>Mitella caulescens</i>)	--	--	2	MHW, SMC, WTM, KMC	Yes
Baker's navarretia (<i>Navarretia leucocephala</i> ssp. <i>bakeri</i>)	--	--	1B	PPN, OAW, MHW, AGS, FEW, SMC, FEW	Yes
northern adder's-tongue (<i>Ophioglossum pusillum</i>)	--	--	2	WTM, FEW, AGS	Yes
Hairy Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia pilosa</i>)	E	E	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
slender Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia tenuis</i>)	T	E	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
tall alpine-aster (<i>Oreostemma elatum</i>)	--	--	1B	WTM, FEW, SMC, KMC	Yes
rayless mountain ragwort (<i>Packera indecorus</i>)	--	--	2	WTM, FEW	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
Ahart's paronychia (<i>Paronychia ahartii</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, AGS (vernal pools)	Yes
moss phlox (<i>Phlox muscoides</i>)	--	--	2	ADS, SCN	Yes
brownish beaked-rush (<i>Rhynchospora capitellata</i>)	--	--	2	PPN, KMC, MHC	Yes
Hall's rupertia (<i>Rupertia hallii</i>)	--	--	1B	OAW, SMC	Yes
Sanford's arrowhead (<i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>)	--	--	1B	WTM, FEW	Yes
slender bulrush (<i>Scirpus heterochaetus</i>)	--	--	2	SMC, WTM, FEW	Yes
water bulrush (<i>Scirpus subterminalis</i>)	--	--	2	WTM, VRI, MRI, FEW	Yes
long-stiped campion (<i>Silene occidentalis</i> ssp. <i>longistipitata</i>)	--	--	1B	CRC, MCH, MCP, SMC, KMC, SCN	Yes
Cascade alpine campion (<i>Silene suksdorfii</i>)	--	--	2	ADS, SCN, KMC, SMC	Yes
Lassen Peak smelowskia (<i>Smelowskia ovalis</i> var. <i>congesta</i>)	--	--	1B	ADS	Yes
long-leaved starwort (<i>Stellaria longifolia</i>)	--	--	2	WTM, MRI	Yes
northern daisy (<i>Trimorpha acris</i> var. <i>debilis</i>)	--	--	2	ADS, WTM, SCN	Yes
Greene's tuctoria (<i>Tuctoria greenei</i>)	E	R	1B	(vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
Invertebrates					
Conservancy fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>)	E	--	N/A	LAC (vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>)	T	--	N/A	LAC (vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
valley elderberry longhorn beetle (<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>)	T	--	N/A	RIV, LAC	Yes
vernal pool tadpole shrimp (<i>Lepidurus packardii</i>)	E	--	N/A	(vernal pools)	Yes critical habitat
Amphibians and Reptiles					
western tailed frog (<i>Ascaphus truei</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	MHW, DFR, RDW, PPN	Yes
northwestern pond turtle (<i>Clemmys marmorata marmorata</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	RIV, LAC	Yes
California horned lizard (<i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, OAW, KMC, MHW, VRI, MRI, SMC, CPC,	Yes
California red-legged frog (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>)	T	CSC	N/A	RIV, LAC	Yes
foothill yellow-legged frog (<i>Rana boylei</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
cascades frog (<i>Rana cascadae</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
mountain yellow-legged frog (<i>Rana muscosa</i>)	C	CSC	N/A	LAC, RIV, WTM, MRI, SCN	Yes
western spadefoot toad (<i>Scaphiopus hammondi</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, OAW, MHW, CRP	Yes
giant garter snake (<i>Thamnophis gigas</i>)	T	--	N/A	WTM, LAC	No
Fish					
Green sturgeon southern DPS (<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>)	T	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
River lamprey (<i>Lampetra ayresi</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
Hardhead (<i>Mylopharodon conocephalus</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
Central Valley ESU steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>)	T	--	N/A	RIV	Yes critical habitat
Central Valley spring-run ESU Chinook salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>)	T	T	N/A	RIV	Yes critical habitat
Sacramento River winter-run ESU Chinook salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>)	E	E	N/A	RIV	Yes critical habitat
Central Valley fall/late fall-run ESU Chinook salmon	SC	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
Sacramento splittail (<i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>)	D	CSC	N/A	RIV	Yes
Birds					
northern goshawk (<i>Accipiter gentiles</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	SMC, KMC, SCN, CPC, MRI, (old growth)	Yes
tricolored blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, VRI, FEW	Yes
Bell's sage sparrow (<i>Amphispiza belli belli</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	SGB, CRC	Yes
Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)	--	CSC, FP	N/A	ADS, DFR, KMC, MCH, MHW, MHC, OAW, PPN, RFR, SCN	Yes
Western burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia hypugaea</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, PPN, SGB	Yes
Aleutian Canada goose (<i>Branta Canadensis leucopareia</i>)	D	--	N/A	LAC, AGS	Yes
Swainson's hawk (<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>)	--	T	N/A	OAW, AGS, CRP, VRI	Yes
Vaux's swift (<i>Chaetura vauxi</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	MHW, DFR, PPN, KMC, SMC	Yes
northern harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, CRP	Yes
western yellow-billed cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>)	C	E	N/A	VRI	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
black swift (<i>Cypseloides niger</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	OAW, DFR, CPC	Yes
yellow warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia brewsteri</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	MHW, DFR, PPN, KMC	Yes
white-tailed kite (<i>Elanus leucurus</i>)	--	FP	N/A	AGS, CRP	Yes
little willow flycatcher (<i>Empidonax traillii brewsteri</i>)	--	E	N/A	MHW, DFR, CPC, MCH, MCP, CRC	Yes
American peregrine falcon (<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>)	D	E, FP	N/A	MCH, AGS, BAR, MHW, CPC, DFR	Yes
greater sandhill crane (<i>Grus canadensis tabida</i>)	--	T, FP	N/A	LAC, AGS, CRP, FEW	Yes
bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	D	D, E, CSC, FP	N/A	LAC, MHW, DFR, KMC, PPN, WFR, SMC, (old	Yes
yellow-breasted chat (<i>Icteria virens</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	CPC, MHW, DFR, OAW	Yes
loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)	--	--	N/A	AGS, OAW, MHW, MCH, CRC	Yes
bank swallow (<i>Riparia riparia</i>)	--	T	N/A	MHW, DFR, CPC, OAW	Yes
northern spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis caurina</i>)	T	--	N/A	DFR, MHC	Yes critical habitat
California spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis occidentalis</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	DFR, KMC, MHW, SMC (old growth)	Yes
Mammals					
Pallid bat (<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	OAW, VRI, AGS, CRC, MCH	Yes
Ringtail (<i>Bassariscus astutus</i>)	--	FP	N/A	VRI	Yes
pale big-eared bat (<i>Corynorhinus townsendii pallescens</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	OAW, DFR, MCH	Yes

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

SPECIES	FEDERAL	STATE	CNPS ¹	Habitat	Potential For Occurrence
Pacific western big-eared bat (<i>Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii</i>)	--	--	N/A	WFR, MCP, RFR, KMC, MHW, DFR	Yes
spotted bat (<i>Euderma maculatum</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, SMC, KMC, SCN, ADS	Yes
western mastiff bat (<i>Eumops perotis</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, OAW, PPN, SMC, VRI	Yes
California wolverine (<i>Gulo gulo</i>)	--	T, FP	N/A	MCP, DFR, KMC, RFR, PPN	Yes
Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare (<i>Lepus americanus tahoensis</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	SMC, KMC, SCN, MRI, WTM	Yes
Pacific fisher (<i>Martes pennanti pacifica</i>)	C	CSC	N/A	MHW, DFR, DMC, PPN, WFR, RFR, CPC, SMC	Yes
American badger (<i>Taxidea taxus</i>)	--	CSC	N/A	AGS, SGB	Yes
Sierra Nevada red fox (<i>Vulpes vulpes nector</i>)	--	T	N/A	SCN, ADS, ASP, KMC, MHC, MRI	Yes
<p>Federal and State Designations: E=Endangered, T=Threatened, D=Delisted, SC=Federal Species of Concern, C=Candidate, CSC=California Special Species of Concern, R=Rare, FP=Fully Protected, N/A=Not Applicable</p> <p>CNPS (California Native Plant Society) Categories: 1A=Plants believed extinct; 1B=Plants rare, threatened or endangered in California and elsewhere; 2=Rare/Endangered in California, more common elsewhere; 3 = more information needed – a review list; 4=Plants of limited distribution-a watch list.</p> <p>Habitat Codes: ADS – Alpine Dwarf-Shrub, AGS – Grassland, ASP – Aspen, BAR – Barren, CPC – Closed-Cone Pine-Cypress, CRC, MCH, MCP – Chaparral, CRP – Agricultural, DFR – Douglas-Fir, EPN – Eastside Pine, FEW – Fresh Emergent Wetland, JUN – Juniper, KMC – Klamath Mixed Conifer, LAC – Lacustrine, MHC – Montane Hardwood-Conifer, MHW – Montane Hardwood, MRI – Montane Riparian, OAW – Oak Woodland, PPN – Ponderosa Pine, RFR – Red Fir, RIV – Riverine, SCN – Subalpine Conifer, SGB – Sagebrush, SMC – Sierran Mixed Conifer, URB – Urban, VRI – Valley Foothill Riparian, WTM – Wet Meadow</p> <p>Source: California department of Fish and Game-California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), US Fish and Wildlife Service, California Native Plant Society.</p>					

4.5 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 4.5.

4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

No changes were made to Section 4.6.

4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No changes were made to Section 4.7.

4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 4.8.

4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

No changes were made to Section 4.9.

4.10 NOISE

No changes were made to Section 4.10.

4.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

No changes were made to Section 4.11.

4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Page 4.12-25, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence has been changed as follows:

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (IWMA) of 1989 (SB AB 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

Page 4.12-26, 2nd paragraph has been changed as follows:

The Tehama County Sanitary Landfill ~~Association~~ Agency (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.

Page 4.12-26, 3rd paragraph has been changed as follows:

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)

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

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~~ 2006, the landfill diversion rate ~~only~~ reached ~~41~~ 48 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, page 4.12-26 has been changed as follows:

**TABLE 4.12-5
TEHAMA COUNTY LANDFILL DIVERSION (1998 ~~2006~~)**

DIVERSION	AMOUNT
Recycling and Composting	21,048 (Tons)
Source Reduction*	12,366 (Tons)
Total Waste Reduction	33,414 50,298 (Tons)
Disposal	43,697 53,665 (Tons)
Total Generation	77,111 103,963 (Tons)
Percent Reduction	43 48 %

Source: Tehama County Sanitary Landfill Agency, 1999. California Integrated Waste Management Board, Board Approved/Accepted Diversion Rate Report-2006

*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).

Page 4.12-26, last paragraph has been changed as follows:

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. Tehama County/Red Bluff Landfill Management Agency (TCRBLMA) is a joint powers authority (JPA) comprised of the County of Tehama and the City of Red Bluff. TCRBLMA contracts with Waste Connections for operation of the landfill.

Page 4.12-28, 2nd paragraph, last sentence has been changed as follows:

The City ~~County~~ 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.~~

Page 4.12-28, 3rd and 4th paragraphs have been changed as follows:

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~~ may be used by ~~the County~~ jurisdictions 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 singlefamily detached homes, recycling areas are required to serve only the needs of the home within that subdivision.

Page 4.12-29, 4th paragraph has been changed as follows:

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. According to the CIWMB, there was 48,204 tons of solid waste produced in the Tehama County in 2007. Tehama County population for 2007 was 61,709. (DOF, 2007). Dividing the number of tons of solid waste by the population gives a tons solid waste per person per year ratio of 0.78. Assuming that each person generates ~~0.36~~ 0.78 tons (1,560 pounds) 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~~ 17,748 tons of solid waste per year ($10,068 \times 2.26 \times \del{0.36} \u{0.78} = \del{8,191} \u{17,748}$). Assuming that each person generates ~~1.8~~ 4.3 pounds of solid waste per day, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in approximately ~~40,957~~ 97,249 additional pounds (48.6 tons) per day (TPD) of solid waste.

4.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The following change has been made to Table 4.13-3 on page 4.13-6 of the Draft EIR.

**Table 4.13-3
Roadway, Intersection and Freeway Ramp Junction
Level of Service Standards and Thresholds of Significance**

FACILITY TYPE	LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)	SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLD	MITIGATION REQUIRED
Intersections (Performance Measure: Average Vehicle Delay)	Acceptable LOS A – C or D during peak hour	Project degrades intersection to an unacceptable Level of Service.	Mitigation measure(s) to return the intersection to an acceptable LOS will be required.
	Unacceptable LOS D during non-peak hour or E or F	Traffic volume increase of 10 percent or more.	Mitigation measure(s) to return the intersection to the “no project” delay value (or fair share amount towards improvements to an acceptable LOS) will be required.

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

FACILITY TYPE	LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)	SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLD	MITIGATION REQUIRED
Freeway Ramp Junctions (Performance Measure: Density)	Acceptable LOS A – C or D during peak hour	Project degrades ramp junction to an unacceptable Level of Service LOS D.	Mitigation measure(s) to return the ramp junction to an acceptable LOS will be required.
	Unacceptable LOS D during non-peak hour or E or F	Traffic volume increase of 10 percent or more	Mitigation measure(s) to return the ramp junction to the “no project” density value (or fair share amount towards improvements to an acceptable LOS) will be required.
Roadway Segments ¹ (Performance Measure: Volume/Capacity Ratio)	Acceptable LOS A – C or D during peak hour	Project degrades roadway segment to an unacceptable Level of Service.	Mitigation measure(s) to return the roadway segment to an acceptable LOS will be required.
	Unacceptable LOS D during non-peak hour or E or F	Traffic volume increase of 10 percent or more.	Mitigation measure(s) to return the roadway segment to the “no project” volume/capacity (V/C) ratio (or fair share amount towards improvements to an acceptable LOS) will be required.

Source: Table 3-4, Tehama County General Plan

Note: ¹ The capacity of standard roadway classifications will be reduced based upon non-standard and/or substandard roadway features.

The following addition has been made as a note to Table 4.13-4 on page 4.13-7 of the Draft EIR.

3. The ADT's identified in this table are only achieved under ideal or perfect conditions which do not likely exist in these segments. Factors such as terrain, percent trucks, etc. must be considered in determining the actual LOS. The County Engineer may adjust the ADT based on the physical conditions of the roadway.

Page 4.13-22, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence has been changed as follows:

Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a states that all proposed development will mitigate its ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impacts on the County roadways, transit, and pedestrian systems. Implementation Measure CIR- 1.3a also states that the County will consider adoption of a roadway impact fee 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~~ reasonable share of impact associated with the proposed project.

Page 4.13-23, 5th paragraph has been changed as follows:

The policies and implementation measures listed assist in the reduction of impacts to roadways in the County, including state highways. Key policies and implementation measures include Implementation Measure CIR-1.2c which requires that new development complete traffic studies which address on- and off-site roadway conditions for both local and state routes and provide mitigation measures that address all identified issues, Policy CIR-1.3 which requires the County to maintain and upgrade existing roads to meet the needs of County residents, visitors, and through traffic and Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a which requires that all proposed

development mitigate its ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impacts on the County roadways, transit, and pedestrian systems. Additionally, Tehama County is participating in the FIX FIVE program which is for the determination of the I-5 improvements needed in the region, and will identify mechanisms for funding, including traffic impact fees for the improvement of I-5. Implementation Measure CIR 1.4a will ensure that the County continues to work with the regional transportation agencies to address cumulative impacts.

Page 4.13-23, 6th paragraph has been changed as follows:

While Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a requires that all new development mitigate its ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impacts to County roadways, it does not state how this ~~proportional~~ reasonable share will be determined other than to state that County Public Works Director may determine the value of ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impact associated with the proposed project. The cost of roadway improvements in the RTP includes all roadways, as well as a dollar amount for very low ADT roads. However, new development is not expected to occur along these roads. The roads that have existing ADT levels above 2000 should be considered first, and the cost of these should be included with a dollar amount so that the county has a way of mitigating by charging new development. These roads are the major collectors and they are the ones where most development will create the additional trips. Additionally, Caltrans has suggested in their NOP comment letter, that Implementation Measure CIR-1.1c should be changed to reference the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual for calculating roadway capacity as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual is generally referenced for trip generation rate not roadway capacity. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are required.

The following change has been made to mitigation measure **MM 4.13.1a**, page 4.13-24.

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~~ reasonable 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~~ reasonable share of impact associated with the proposed project.

The following mitigation measure **MM 4.13.1c** adapting General Plan Implementation Measure PS-6.1b has been added to page 4.13-24 of the Draft EIR. The actual change to the implementation measure is the inclusion of the words "including transfer stations" .

MM 4.13.1c Implementation Measure PS-6.1b shall be changed to include the following:

Implementation Measure PS-6.1b

Identify potential future sites for solid waste disposal, **including transfer stations**, consistent with the development patterns with an emphasis on centralization.

The 3rd paragraph under **Impact 4.13.5** on page 4.13-28 has been changed to the following:

4.0 ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

Implementation Measure CIR-1.3a states that all proposed development will mitigate its ~~proportionate~~ reasonable share of impacts on the County roadways, transit, and pedestrian systems. General Plan Policy CIR-5.1, Implementation Measure CIR-5.1a, and Implementation Measure CIR-5.1b requires the County to provide convenient and accessible transit facilities for the elderly, youth, commuters, and persons with disabilities, implement land use decisions that are consistent with the Transit Development Plan and Tehama County Bus Stop Standards Policies and Procedures and promote the use of car pools, van pools, and park and ride lots.

4.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

No changes were made to Section 4.14.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Page 5.0-13 has been changed to the following:

Water Supply and Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.3, 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.

While Alternative 1 would result in less population growth, this smaller growth would still require water and thus impact the water source in the County. However, because Alternative 1 would result in a buildout population of ~~95,387~~ 52,461 persons less than the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan, this alternative would be the better alternative when regarding water supply in the County.

Page 5.0-25 has been changed to the following:

Water Supply and Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.3, 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.

While Alternative 2 would result in less population growth, this smaller growth would still require water and thus impact the water source in the County. However, because Alternative 2 would result in a buildout population of ~~69,092~~ 59,058 persons less than the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan, this alternative would be the better alternative when regarding water supply in the County.

Table 5.05, page 5.0-47 has been changed to the following:

<p>Water Supply and Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.3, Impact 4.8.7)</p>	<p>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. (PS)</p>	<p>Alternative 1 would result in a buildout population of 95,387 <u>52,461</u> persons less than the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan, this alternative would be the better alternative when regarding water supply in the County. (PS)</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would result in a buildout population of 69,092 <u>59,058</u> persons less than the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan, this alternative would be the better alternative when regarding water supply in the County. (PS)</p>	<p>Alternative 3 would have the same population growth and therefore would have similar impacts to water supply. (PS)</p>
--	---	---	---	---

6.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

No changes were made to Section 6.0.

7.0 OTHER CEQA

No changes were made to Section 7.0.

8.0 REPORT PREPARERS

No changes were made to Section 8.0.

APPENDICES

The typographical error in Table 7 on page 12 of Appendix 4.13.1 referred to "Route 892." This has been changed to Route 892.

This page is intentionally left blank.