

3. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the project. There are 17 Environmental Issues evaluated in Section 3.0, including CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance.

The **Checklist Discussion/Analysis** provides a detailed discussion of each of the environmental issue checklist questions. The level of significance for each topic is determined by considering the predicted magnitude of the impact. Four levels of impact significance are described in this initial study:

No Impact: No project-related impact to the environment would occur with project development.

Less Than Significant Impact: The impact would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that is “potentially significant” as described below; the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project related impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that may have a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project; however, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts are reduced to less than significant level by the project” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382).

	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources	X	Geology/Soils
X	Hazards	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population & Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/ Traffic
	Utilities/Service Systems	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

3.1 AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Setting:

The proposed project site is located in an industrial/agricultural-residential area southeast of Chico, California within County Jurisdiction. The area surrounding the project site includes: a golf course, church, asphalt company, few residences and primarily, undeveloped land. The proposed project activities would extend approximately 334 feet to the northwest, 830 feet to the southeast, 815 feet to the east and 215 feet to the west. Currently, there are no existing signalization, curb, gutter, tie-in or crosswalk facilities in the project area. Open drainage ditches and gravel shoulders line the majority of the roadway alignments in the project area.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Aesthetics:

a-b) No Impact. There are no significant scenic vistas, or other scenic resources within a state scenic highway in the area that will be affected by the proposed project.

Mitigation: None Required

c) Less Than Significant. Visual impacts are anticipated only during the construction periods, when heavy equipment and construction materials will be present. Currently there are no existing pedestrian facilities within the project site. Upon completion of the proposed project the intersection and road shoulders will be physically and visually continuous, with full curb, gutter, signage, advance warning signs, drainage facilities and tie-in pavement providing connections for future need. There would not be substantial long term visual impacts. Other than changes made improving the intersection, no significant change in the appearance of the existing site is proposed. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

d) Less Than Significant Impact. The improvements associated with this project would include the installation of lighting and reflective surfaces. However, they would not contribute to sources of light or glare uncommon to standard roadway facilities. There would be no adverse affect to day or nighttime views in the area. There would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to aesthetics would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Setting:

The project is located approximately 0.25 miles southeast of Chico, California within County Jurisdiction. The project site lies within the “Grazing and Open Lands” classification of the Farmland Mitigation and Monitoring Program (FMMP) (California Department of Conservation, 2004).

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Agricultural Resources:

a) No Impact. The FMMP developed by the California Department of Conservation identifies the project site as “Grazing and Open Lands”. There were no areas of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Local Importance in the project area.

Mitigation: None Required

b) No Impact. There is no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. It is not expected that this project would require a temporary construction easement on the land designated as Williamson Act Land. According to the FMMP, the site and surrounding parcels are not listed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmlands of Statewide or Local Importance.

Mitigation: None Required

c) No Impact. The project will not change the existing environment so that farmland could be converted to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

There would be no impacts to agricultural resources and no mitigation is required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Setting:

California Air Resource Board listed the California designated status of Butte County for meeting the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) as:

Table 1: Attainment Status for Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Classification
Carbon monoxide	Attainment
Sulfates	Attainment
Ozone	Non-attainment
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5} /PM ₁₀)	Non- attainment
Nitrogen dioxide	Attainment
Sulfur dioxide	Attainment
Lead	Attainment
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified
Hydrogen sulfide	Unclassified

An evaluation of the project’s potential impacts must consider the short-term increase in emissions generated by construction activities.

Construction-related activities would create a temporary increase in fugitive dust emissions on the project site and within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The County requires the inclusion of dust suppression measures in all grading plans and appropriate measures intended to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions. Butte County’s General Plan and County Code, Chapter 13 (Grading and Minerals), identify the need to reduce fugitive dust and other air quality impacts generated by construction activities. The County utilizes the Butte County Air Quality Management District’s (BCAQMD) Indirect Source Review (ISR) guidelines as a means of assessing potentially significant impacts and identifying appropriate mitigation measures in order to reduce the potential impacts to levels that are less than significant. The ISRG identify indirect sources as “on-road” and “other” mobile sources. The project would not contribute “on-road” indirect sources, as project would not result in

dwellings, businesses or other land uses that increase daily vehicle trips. Furthermore, the proposed project would not generate direct, or stationary, sources of criteria pollutants.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Air Quality:

a) No Impact. This project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans in Butte County.

Mitigation: None Required

b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Roadways, intersections and sidewalks are simply conduits that enable vehicular and pedestrian traffic to move from one point to another. A project such as the one proposed does not generate traffic, thereby generating more emissions, as would new development (i.e., new businesses or apartment buildings).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the generation of short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions. Exhaust emissions from construction equipment would contain reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), CO and PM₁₀. PM₁₀ emissions would also result from windblown dust (fugitive dust) generated during grading activities.

The County's General Plan and Code (Chapter 13) require the contractor to minimize generation of dust and other air quality impacts, including development of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, where applicable. Furthermore, the Public Works Department requires contractors to implement all applicable BCAQMD Best Available Mitigation Measures (BAMM) to comply with the ISR guidelines.

The proposed project's construction-generated emissions were estimated using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's program Road Construction Emissions Model (Version 5.2). Construction-related emissions would have the potential to exceed the County's "Level B" threshold of 25 lbs/day for NO_x. Projects that are likely to exceed the Level "B" threshold are required to implement all feasible BAMM.

While the implementation of BAMM and the development of an erosion and sediment control plan are standard conditions of grading permit acquisition, County Public Works projects are exempt from the grading permit process. In lieu thereof, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to ensure compliance with applicable air quality standards:

MM 3.3.1 To comply with Chapter 13 of the County Code and BCAQMD Rules 200 and 205 (Air Quality Nuisances and Fugitive Dust respectively), the Public Works Department shall require implementation of all applicable BAMM in project plans and specifications. As part of this requirement, the contractor shall submit a Pollution Control Plan that shall include, at a minimum, all applicable dust mitigation measures below:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. The frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil conditions and wind exposure.
- Apply chemical soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (disturbed areas that are unused for at least four consecutive days, unless wind conditions dictate application in less than four days) to control dust emissions. Dust emissions should be controlled at the site for both active and inactive construction areas throughout the entire construction period (including holidays).
- Limit vehicle speeds to 15 mph on unpaved roads.
- Suspend land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

- If applicable, apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut and fill operation and hydro-seed the area.
- Cover inactive storage piles.
- Provide paved (or dust palliative treated) apron onto the project site.
- Following daily construction activities sweep or wash paved streets adjacent to the site where visible silt or mud deposits have accumulated due to construction activities.
- Upon completion of construction activities all exposed ground surfaces shall be treated sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust emissions (dust clouds caused by wind, traffic, or other disturbances to exposed ground surfaces).

Timing & Implementation: Contractor to prepare Pollution Control Plan for Public Works Department approval prior to notice to proceed. Implement plan actions during and post construction.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works and contractor through ongoing site inspections

MM 3.3.2 The following shall be implemented to reduce NOx emissions from construction equipment, and represent a level of reasonable control that would reduce these emissions to a less than significant level.

- Prior to commencement of any grading or construction, a NOx reduction plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the Public Works Department demonstrating that heavy-duty (> 50 horse-power) off-road vehicles to be used during construction, including owned, leased and subcontracted vehicles, will achieve a project-wide, fleet average 20 percent NOx reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at the time of construction.
- Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.
- The NOx reduction plan shall include a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that would be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory should include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment.

Timing & Implementation: Contractor to prepare NOx reduction plan prior to commencement of grading activities and implement plan actions during construction

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works and contractor through ongoing site inspections

c) Less Than Significant. Since the project will not contribute to an increase in vehicle traffic, a cumulative increase in air emissions is not expected. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

d) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. There are not any sensitive receptors, such as schools or hospitals, near the project site. However, there is a church approximately 250 feet from the edge of the project site. As there will be no new source of hazardous air emissions (construction related activities are not considered a new source of hazardous air emissions by the BCAQMD) noticing per Section 42301.6 does not need to take place. However, since sensitive receptors could be exposed to

pollutant concentrations during construction activities there is a potential for significant impacts. Through implementation of **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2** the potential impacts to receptors in the project area would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. No new odor producing activities are proposed, other than that associated with equipment exhaust during construction activities. Diesel fumes may be noticeable in the vicinity of the site; however, diesel fumes will be a short-term effect and are mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of **MM 3.3.2**.

Conclusion:

Potential air quality impacts as a result of the project would be construction-related and temporary in nature. Adherence to **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2**, which ensure the control of construction related dust, and emissions, would reduce these potential temporary impacts to levels that are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Setting:

A Biological Resource Assessment (BRA) was conducted for the proposed project in May of 2007. The purpose of the BRA was to identify special status biological resources within the project site. Data from the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), National Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) were consulted to ascertain the likelihood of special status biological resources occurring within the vicinity of the project site. Once a list of biological resources was established, field surveys were conducted to identify whether these resources were likely to occur within the project site.

The project site, located approximately 0.25 miles southeast of the Chico city limits, is in an area of mostly industrial and agricultural-residential uses. The site consists of approximately 1164 feet of the Skyway alignment and approximately 1030 feet of the Honey Run Road/ Longest Drive transect. All roadway alignments are currently paved with existing roadside ditches. The intersection is not equipped with curb, gutter or sidewalk facilities. The Biological Survey Area (BSA) includes existing right-of-way, culverts, and roadside ditches; as well as, the areas of proposed extensions to the right-of-way, culverts, and realignment of roadside ditches. The site's elevation ranges from approximately 250 to 280 feet above sea level. The mean annual precipitation is approximately 24.4 inches, and the mean annual temperature is approximately 60° F. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 2006 *Soil Survey of Butte Area, California Parts of Butte and Plumas Counties* identified two soil map unit complexes in the BSA including the Redtough-Redswale complex (0-2% slopes) and the Doemill-Jokerst complex (3-8% slopes). Both soils are listed by the NRCS as hydric, shallow and poorly drained.

The existing level of development precludes most special-status biological species, natural communities or habitats. Thus, the BRA concludes that no sensitive natural communities occur within the BSA. Based on the literature review and biological field surveys, the BRA concludes the project site presents no suitable habitat for the following types of special-status biological resources:

- plants
- invertebrates
- reptiles/amphibians
- fish
- mammals

The BRA identifies potential raptor nesting habitat along Crouch Ditch, potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat adjacent to portions of the existing roadway alignments and potential silver-haired bat habitat south of the BSA. The valley oak riparian forest along Crouch Ditch is listed as a sensitive natural community. However, this riparian habitat is located outside the BSA and would not be impacted.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Biological Resources:

a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. No candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species were observed during the biological field surveys of the BSA. The potential for special status species to occur within a 5-mile radius of the project site was identified via the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB identified numerous documented special-status species occurrences in the surrounding area. However, as described above, the project site lacks the habitat necessary to support most of the special-status species that are likely to occur in the broader area.

Birds

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712) prohibits the take, sale, and harassment of migratory birds, including raptors. Additionally, nesting raptors are protected from take by CA Fish and Game Code (§3500). The riparian trees along Crouch Ditch adjacent to the southern portion of the BSA provide suitable nesting habitat for special status migratory birds and/or raptors.

The proposed project could result in potential impacts to special-status birds per the MBTA and Fish and Game Code § 3500. Therefore, the following measure shall be implemented:

MM 3.4.1 If grading, construction or vegetation removal are proposed between March 1st and September 15th, a protocol-level, preconstruction field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or ornithologist to identify whether special status birds are nesting in or adjacent to, the project site. The survey shall take place in April-May, or 30 days prior to construction activities, to determine the presence and location of nesting raptors/migratory birds in the project area. Should nesting special-status birds be observed and potentially impacted, appropriate mitigation or avoidance measures will be required in consultation with DFG. Direct take of active nests, eggs or birds is prohibited by the Fish and Game Code. Construction activities should not occur within 300 feet of active nests. If nesting special-status birds are not identified during the protocol-level field survey(s), no further action would be required relative to this mitigation measure. Relative to this mitigation measure, activities proposed between September 16th and February 29th do not require pre-construction surveys.

Timing & Implementation: Prior to construction activities, Public Works Department shall ensure all necessary field surveys are conducted. If no nesting raptors are identified during the field surveys, construction activities may proceed unconstrained, relative to this mitigation measure.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Public Works Department staff and a qualified biologist or ornithologist, if necessary, shall monitor construction activities to ensure implementation of the above measures.

The BRA identifies the potential for Swainson's hawks (*Buteo swainsoni*) to occur within the BSA. This species is listed as "threatened" by the CA Fish and Game Commission. Potential impacts to nesting Swainson's hawks would be avoided through implementation of **MM 3.4.1**. The BRA identifies approximately 0.19 acres of potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in the northeastern and southeastern portion of the BSA combined (north of Honey Run Road and east of Skyway). A Swainson's hawk nest was identified through the CNDDDB approximately 3 miles southwest of the proposed project site. The DFG *Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley* identifies appropriate mitigation for potential impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat:

- Projects within one mile of an active nest must mitigate lost foraging habitat at a ratio of 1:1.
- Projects located more than 1 mile, but less than 5 miles of an active nest must mitigate impacted foraging habitat at a ratio of 0.75 to 1.
- Projects located more than 5 miles, but less than 10 miles of an active nest must mitigate impacted foraging habitat at a ratio of 0.5 to 1.

As there is potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat within the project site, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

MM 3.4.2 The County shall consult with the DFG in order to identify whether the project would generate potential impacts to potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The project site is located between 1 and 5 miles of a nest (as identified in the CNDDDB). Through consultation with the DFG, the total area of impacted foraging habitat and the necessary mitigation (if any) shall be identified. If necessary, the county shall mitigate potential impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in a manner that is consistent with the DFG *Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley*. Mitigation may include the provision of habitat management lands, habitat enhancement or payment to an in-lieu fund, as determined appropriate by the DFG.

Timing & Implementation: Prior to construction activities, the Public Works Department shall ensure that the DFG is consulted relative to potential impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. DFG approval will be contingent on project consistency with the *Staff Report*.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Public Works Department staff shall ensure that the requirements set forth in the *Staff Report*, as identified through consultation with the DFG, are incorporated in to the proposed project.

b) Less Than Significant. Through an evaluation of the CNDDDB and site surveys, the BRA identified "no" potential for sensitive natural communities to occur within the BSA. A remnant valley oak riparian forest does occur adjacent to the BSA along Crouch Ditch; however, impacts to this sensitive natural community would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

c) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. A draft Delineation of Waters of the US was conducted by Gallaway Consulting, Inc. for the BSA and a total of 0.046 acres of pre-jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. were delineated within the BSA. The features are identified as Other Waters of the US. The pre-jurisdictional Other Waters delineated on the project site are identified as ephemeral roadside ditches and intermittent drainages. The acreages described in the draft Delineation of Waters of the US should be considered preliminary, subject to review and modification by the USACE during the wetland delineation verification process. The following table summarizes the type and area of jurisdictional water features identified in the draft Delineation:

Table 2: Pre-Jurisdictional Waters

Feature Type	Length (ft)	Area (ft ²)	Acres
Ephemeral Roadside Ditches	298.578	298.578	0.007
Intermittent Drainages	399.176	1718.494	0.04
Total Other Waters =	697.754	2017.072	0.046

Acres rounded for presentation purposes.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. “Waters of the U.S.” include a range of wet environments such as lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands (including vernal pools and swales), sloughs, and wet meadows.

Furthermore, the Clean Water Act (§401) requires water quality certification and authorization for placement of dredged or fill material in wetlands and Other Waters of the United States. In accordance with the Clean Water Act (§401), criteria for allowable discharges into surface waters have been developed by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality. Therefore, prior to acquisition of a §404 permit from the USACE, the project would be required to obtain water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

The DFG is a trustee agency that has jurisdiction under the California Fish and Game Code (CFG, §1600 et seq.). The CFG (§1602), requires that a state or local government agency, public utility, or private entity must notify DFG if a proposed project will *substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the department, or use any material from the streambeds... except when the department has been notified pursuant to Section 1601.*

As the project may generate potential impacts to jurisdictional waters of the state and waters of the US, the following measure shall be implemented:

MM 3.4.3 All jurisdictional waters, which may be impacted by the project, shall be avoided during construction activities to the extent practicable through implementation of construction activity setbacks. Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through restoration of area and function of all impacted water features in the project site. To accomplish this, the following shall be required:

- The proponent shall enter into consultation with the USACE. If necessary, a Clean Water Act §404 permit will be obtained from the USACE before any filling, dredging, or modification of jurisdictional waters can occur. The permit will be conditional and will contain minimization and mitigation measures developed through consultation with the USACE.
- If a §404 permit will be required by the USACE, the county shall obtain necessary certification/approval from the RWQCB pursuant to §401 of the Clean Water Act.
- The applicant shall enter into consultation with the DFG. If necessary, a Streambed Alteration Agreement will be obtained before in-stream construction activities commence. If required, the agreement would contain site-specific minimization and mitigation measures identified through consultation with the DFG.

Timing & Implementation: Consultation agreements and permitting to occur prior to commencement of construction activities. Avoidance will occur during project construction. If identified through consultation with the regulatory agencies, mitigation will be conducted prior to project completion.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works, DFG, USACE and the RWQCB.

d) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The MBTA (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and Fish and Game Code (§3500) prohibit the take, sale, and harassment of migratory birds and/or raptors. No special-status species were observed during the course of field surveys for the preparation of the BRA. There is a Swainson's hawk nest within 1 to 5 miles of the project site. There is potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat within the BSA and potential nesting habitat for special status bird species within, and adjacent to, the project site. As described in this section, **MM 3.4.1** and **MM 3.4.2** shall be implemented by the proposed project. As such, potential impacts to migratory wildlife would occur at levels considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

To reduce potential impacts to any Swainson's hawk foraging habitat and nesting and foraging habitat for migratory birds and raptors, **MM 3.4.1** and **MM 3.4.2** shall be implemented.

e) No Impact. The County has no policies, ordinances or plans which explicitly protect biological resources to which the proposed project would be held. However, ordinances identified in the County Code and policies set forth in the General Plan do establish County standards pertaining to biological resources. For example, Chapter 13 of the County Code (Grading and Mining) identifies the purpose of the Grading Article:

...is noted for its scenic natural beauty, for its streams, creeks, and vernal pools ...vegetation including rare and endangered plant species...fish and other wildlife, and for its sources of water... The purpose of this article is the control of erosion and siltation, the enhancement of slope stability, the protection of said resources and the prevention of related environmental damage by establishing standards and requiring permits for grading.

Policies 6.5.a through 6.5.d (Biological Habitat) in the Land Use Element of the General Plan further identify the County's standards with regard to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any local plans or policies that protect biological resources. The project would be required to adhere to the mitigation measures and standards/permitting requirements of regulatory agencies, as set forth in this study. With regard to local plans, policies and ordinances, the proposed project would result in no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

f) No Impact. No habitat conservation plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or similar plans have been adopted that apply to the project area.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project could have potentially significant impacts on a state listed bird species, special status migratory birds and raptors, potential Swainson's hawk and silver-haired bat foraging habitat and jurisdictional waters of the State and waters of the US. However, the mitigation measures presented in this section of the Initial Study would ensure these potential impacts occur at levels that are less than significant.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Setting:

The project site is approximately 0.25-miles southeast of the Chico City Limits, at the Skyway/Honey Run Road Intersection. Ethnographic information indicates the project area was once occupied by the Northwestern Konkow-Maidu.

Cultural Research Associates (CRA) conducted an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) of the project site to evaluate the likelihood of cultural resources occurring on the project site. The ASR included a records search at the Northeast Information Center at CSU, Chico, consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local Tribal representatives and a field survey.

Records Search: The records search produced the following results:

- No known historic or prehistoric resources occur on the project site or in its vicinity.
- The project area has been previously surveyed by professional archaeologists.

Consultation with Interested Parties: CRA contacted the NAHC in May of 2007 to identify sacred lands in the project area. The NAHC identified no sacred lands within the project area. Native American parties of interest were contacted via letter and phone. None of the parties have raised concerns regarding the project's potential to impact cultural resources.

Field Survey: CRA conducted an extensive field survey of the site May 2, 2007. The field survey identified no prehistoric or historic cultural resources.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources:

a and c) No Impact. As identified in the ASR, there are no known historic resources within the project site. No known prehistoric, archaeological, paleontological or protohistoric resources occur within or immediately adjacent to the project site. These findings are based on a records search, consultation with interested parties and a field survey, conducted by a professional archaeologist.

Mitigation: None Required

b and d) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. It is not anticipated that the implementation of the proposed project would result in any significant adverse impact to archaeological resources or human remains. However, there is the potential for unknown/undocumented cultural resources, including human remains, to be uncovered during work activities. Pursuant to Health and

Safety Code (§7050.5), the Coroner must be contacted if previously unidentified human remains are uncovered during construction activities. Previously unidentified human remains are subject to the regulations set forth in Public Resources Code (§5097.98). The project may result in potentially significant impacts to undocumented archaeological resources and/or human remains. As such, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- MM 3.5.1** A note shall be placed on the final construction plans stating:
“Should cultural resources be encountered, the supervising contractor will stop all work within 100-feet of the find. The supervising contractor shall be responsible for reporting any such findings to the Public Works Department, and a qualified archaeologist will be contacted to conduct meetings with on-site employee, determine appropriate mitigation measures, and monitor the referenced mitigation measures.”
All mitigation measures determined by the Public Works Department to be appropriate for this project shall be implemented pursuant to the terms of the archaeologist’s report.

Timing & Implementation: Prior to final construction plan approval, Public Works staff shall ensure that the above language is incorporated into project plans and specifications. Contractor shall ensure compliance during work on site.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works, supervising contractor

- MM 3.5.2** A note shall be placed on final plans stating:
“Pursuant to State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, if human remains are unearthed during construction, the construction contractor must cease work within 100-feet of the discovery and notify the County Coroner. No further disturbance may occur until the Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origins and disposition pursuant to Public Resource Code section 5097.98.”

Timing & Implementation: Prior to final construction plan approval, Public Works staff shall ensure that the above language is incorporated into project plans and specifications. Contractor shall ensure compliance during work on site.

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works, supervising contractor

Implementation of these measures would ensure less than significant potential impacts to previously unidentified cultural resources and/or human remains.

Conclusion:

There are no known historic, paleontological or cultural resources or human remains in the project area. Projects that uncover previously unidentified cultural resources or human remains must adhere to applicable regulations, including State Public Resources and Health and Safety Codes. In the event that construction activities uncover previously unknown or undocumented cultural resources and/or human remains, **MM 3.5.1** and **3.5.2** will ensure potential impacts are maintained at levels that are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Setting:

Topography in the project area is relatively flat with an approximate elevation range of 250-feet to 280-feet. The project area generally slopes from northeast to southwest. The Hazards and Safety Element of the county General Plan describes the site as having low potential for expansive soils, low liquefaction potential and moderate erosion potential. The project site has low landslide potential, is not within a subsidence zone or an earthquake aftershock epicenter region.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Geology and Soils:

a.i – a.iv) Less Than Significant.

The only designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone in Butte County is the Cleveland Hills Fault, located southeast of Lake Oroville. The 1994 Fault Activity Map has classified the fault as inactive (Bryant, W. A., 2005). The site is in proximity to an inferred, but undocumented fault zone. As such, potential impacts from known faults would not include rupture at the project site.

The project site is subject to potential ground shaking, generated by earthquakes both within and outside of Butte County. Ground shaking has the potential to impact bridges and roadways. The project will be required to adhere to the design standards of the California Building Code (CBC), as adopted in Chapter 26 (Buildings) of the County Code. The design criteria specifically address appropriate standards for facilities that may be subjected to seismic events. By adhering to the required design criteria of the CBC,

as adopted by County Code, there will be a less than significant impact with regards to seismic ground shaking.

Soils containing a significant amount of clay tend to change in volume as moisture levels fluctuate. Structures built on these soils can suffer structural damage from differential movement. The Butte County General Plan's Expansive Soils Map identifies the project site as having a "generally low" potential for expansive soils. The project site is located southwest of Doe Mill Ridge. The substrate in the area of the proposed project is not believed to be prone to liquefaction during seismic events. Furthermore, the project would be required to adhere to County and CBC design standards. As such, potential impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is not within a landslide area and would not cause, or contribute to, landslides.

Mitigation: None Required

b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Since the ground surface will be disturbed by grading and construction equipment, there is an increased potential for erosion during the construction process. The erosion potential of the soils on the project site is identified as "moderate" in the County's General Plan. Erosion impacts arising from construction activities will be temporary, and will cease once work is completed. Construction activity may result in potentially significant soil erosion impacts. Therefore, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

MM 3.6.1 As part of the construction plans for the project; the contractor shall prepare a Pollution Control Plan to include all storm water pollution and erosion control BMPs to be implemented during construction. As part of the project plans and specifications, the Public Works Department shall prepare Final Erosion Control specifications and plans to be implemented by the contractor for post-construction conditions.

Timing & Implementation: Prior to, during, and after construction

Enforcement & Monitoring: Butte County Department of Public Works, Contractor

Implementation of **MM 3.6.1**, along with **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.4.3**, would reduce the potential impacts of soil erosion to levels that are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c-d) Less Than Significant. The potential for liquefaction is generally moderate and locally high as described on the Butte County Safety Element, Liquefaction Potential Map. Adhering to standards set forth in the CBC, as adopted by the County Code, would ensure less than significant impacts resulting from landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Mitigation: None Required

e) No Impact. No on-site wastewater disposal systems are proposed with this project.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project could result in impacts stemming from expansive soils and erosion potential on the project site. By adhering to CBC standard construction protocols, as adopted by Chapter 26 of the County Code, and the mitigation measures presented in this section, the potential for impacts will be maintained at a level that is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Setting:

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A hazardous material is defined in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as:

...a substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either (1) cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of or otherwise managed (§66260.10).

Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous, including the properties of toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity. Toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity are defined in the CCR, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24. Factors that influence the health effects of

exposure to hazardous materials include the dose to which the person is exposed, the frequency of exposure, the exposure pathway, and individual susceptibility.

Transport of hazardous materials is regulated by both federal and state agencies. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) has the regulatory responsibility for the safe transportation of hazardous materials between states. DOT regulations (Code of Federal Regulations Title 49 [49 CFR] govern all means of transportation.

State regulations concerning the transport of hazardous materials are contained in CCR, Title 22, Chapter 13. Two state agencies, the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans, have primary responsibility for enforcing federal and state regulations and responding to hazardous materials transportation emergencies.

Discussion of Potential Impacts from Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

a) Less Than Significant. The hazardous material typically used during the construction of a roadway and related facilities is hot mix asphalt, a mixture of aggregate and asphalt cement, which is a viscous petroleum product. Hot mix asphalt cools rapidly and hardens once applied. The low potential for fire hazard associated with this material is eliminated once it hardens. Other potentially hazardous materials that would be used during project construction include motor vehicle fuels and oils.

Existing federal and state laws address accidental release, emergency response and hazardous material containment. Butte County has the Butte County Interagency Hazardous Materials Team that would respond to any emergencies or accidents in the area. Furthermore, the construction activities associated with the proposed project would be temporary. There would be no increased likelihood of the “routine” transport of toxic materials or substances once the project is completed. According to the Safety Element of the Butte County General Plan, “nearly all” of the hazardous waste that is transported in the County is carried by truck on the state highway system.

Mitigation: None Required

b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities associated with the project would include refueling and minor onsite maintenance of construction equipment, which could lead to minor fuel and oil spills. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction activities would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOSHA) requirements. If any fuel spills occur, they would take place in areas that are largely undeveloped, and spills would be minor. Nevertheless, such spills are considered potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2**, as described in Section 3.3 above and **MM 3.6.1**, as described in Section 3.6 above, require the development of a Pollution Control Plan to be submitted by the contractor for Public Works review and approval. If a §404 permit is required, project approval from the RWQCB would be necessary per §401 of the Clean Water Act. By implementing **Mitigation Measures 3.3.1, 3.3.2** and **3.6.1** there will be a less than significant impact resulting from accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measures 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and **3.6.1**

c) No Impact. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed project site.

d) No Impact. There are no properties or sites listed on the Cortese list within or near the project location. The nearest listed site, as identified by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), is over 1 mile west of the proposed project site.

Mitigation: None Required

e) No Impact. The project is not located near a public airport, public use airport, or airport land-use plan. The Chico Municipal Airport is over 7 miles northwest of the proposed project site. Therefore, there

would be no safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area that is associated with airports.

Mitigation: None Required

f) No Impact. The project is not located near a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be no safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area that is associated with airstrips.

Mitigation: None Required

g) Less Than Significant Impact. The Skyway is used as an evacuation route for those traveling from both Paradise and Honey Run Road. However, the proposed project will not block or restrict a designated evacuation route or access to an emergency facility. Once completed the project would provide an intersection that promotes a more efficient flow of traffic. The proposed project is intended to reduce the number of traffic related accidents and disruptions on the project site.

Mitigation: None Required

h) Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is listed as “moderate” on the Butte County wildland fire hazard map, as identified in the County’s General Plan Safety Element. The proposed project would not construct inhabited structures or dwelling units. There would not be an increase in human populations, either transient or resident, within the project site upon project completion. Through the improvements proposed, emergency response conditions will likely be improved in the project area.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

There are no potentially significant impacts resulting from hazards or hazardous materials, with the exception of the potential for spillage of materials related to refueling of equipment and maintenance activities. **Mitigation Measures 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.6.1** will ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated.

3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		X		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place 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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Setting:

Butte County is part of the Sacramento River Basin Watershed. Numerous streams and rivers drain the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada and Cascades, emptying into the Sacramento River. Surface water quality is good to excellent, except for local degradation as streams pass through urbanized areas. Large quantities of high quality ground water exist in the recent alluvial and Tuscan Formation strata of the valley floor. In the foothill and mountain areas, ground water is generally not abundant and occurs mostly in fracture zones. Various areas of the Sacramento Valley have flooding potential, depending on elevation and proximity to streams and floodplains. Most streams and rivers of substantial flow have been controlled by the construction of levee and diversion systems.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) identifies lands southeast and west of the Skyway/Honey Run Road intersection have been identified as flood zones “inundated by 100-year flood” (Flood Insurance Rate Map 06007C0510D). The project site itself is not in an identified flood zone. There are over 594 linear feet of other waters, consisting of ephemeral and intermittent drainage, culverts and roadside ditches within the project site. Flow along the Skyway alignment is south towards Crouch Ditch. The proposed improvements to realign existing roadside ditches and extend existing cross culverts will further improve drainage in the area.

As first described in the Biological Resources Section of this document, the project will be required to adhere to the applicable requirements of §404 and §401 of the Clean Water Act and §1600 of the State’s Fish and Game Code. A §404 permit is contingent on sufficient evidence that a project would not pose a threat to water quality or quantity leaving the proposed project’s site. Additionally, the County has adopted the California Building Code (CBC) as part of the development standards set forth in the County Code. Adherence to the building and grading standards of the County Code is indicative of adherence to the standards of the CBC. Adherence to these permitting requirements and building/grading standards would include incorporation of appropriate, site-specific BMPs.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality:

a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB would be required as a condition of §404 permit acquisition. Obtaining certification or an agreement would ensure less than significant water quality and waste discharge impacts. **MM 3.4.3** and **3.6.1** require the project to obtain necessary permits and project approval from the RWQCB, where required. Additionally, these measures require application of appropriate BMPs, which would be included in project plans and specifications. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure potential impacts are maintained at less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measures 3.4.3 and 3.6.1

b) No Impact. The project will not require connection to any existing or new water facilities. The project would not result in the construction of new dwellings, structures or water extraction facilities. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the area’s impervious surfaces.

Mitigation: None Required

c) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project will require grading, roadway improvements and the construction of related infrastructure, including sidewalks and curb/drainage facilities. These proposed activities have the potential to result in erosion and water quality impacts.

The increased impermeable surface resulting from the additional paved areas may cause a slight increase in peak flows. This increase is not substantial when compared to the size of the total watershed.

Metals, oils, greases, and other contaminants from construction activities may run off-site into surface waters. To limit any sediments and pollutants from impacting drainages in the area, project-specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) pursuant to CBC, County and RWQCB standards and standard specifications will be implemented. Long term soil stability and erosion control will be obtained through mechanical and re-vegetation methods.

There is the potential for erosion of soils and siltation of waterways as a result of the construction activities and the nature of the proposed project. Construction activities will be performed in accordance with Appendix 33 (Excavation and Grading) of the CBC, as required by Chapter 26 of the County Code, to ensure that development incorporates appropriate design provisions and BMPs. Additionally, the project would be required to implement **MM 3.4.3** and **MM 3.6.1**. As a result, there would be less than significant erosion and siltation impacts with mitigation incorporated.

d) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Drainage patterns and surface runoff amounts are the result of a number of factors including slope, soil permeability, vegetation, and surface type. Changes to these factors that occur as the result of new development can result in a substantial increase in runoff amounts. Substantial increases in runoff can cause flooding, contribute to flooding in a flood-prone area, exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water or create new sources of polluted runoff. Pursuant to §13-11 of the County Code (Grading and Mining), the project would require a grading and drainage plan. Pursuant to Chapter 26 of the County Code, the plan must incorporate site-specific BMPs consistent with CBC grading standards. As Public Works projects are exempt from the grading permit processes, **MM 3.3.1**, **MM 3.4.3** and **MM 3.6.1** are required to ensure that proper design, grading, and water quality/quantity mitigation practices are implemented. Therefore, the proposed project would generate potential impacts considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project could result in runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. **MM 3.3.1**, **MM 3.4.3**, and **MM 3.6.1**, as identified in the Air Quality, Biological Resources and Hydrology/Water Quality Sections of this document, would ensure that proper design, grading and water quality mitigation practices are implemented. As such, the proposed project would generate potential impacts considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

f) Less Than Significant Impact. Please see the above discussion of permits and requirements related to water quality. The permitting requirements of the USACE and the RWQCB are intended to ensure projects do not generate impacts to water quality or quantity. Adherence to the additional standards set forth, the CBC and the County Code would further ensure the avoidance of potentially significant impacts.

Mitigation: None Required

g) No Impact. The proposed project includes roadway and intersection improvements. It would not place any housing within a 100-year flood zone.

Mitigation: None Required

h) Less Than Significant Impact. A portion of the project site is within an area delineated with an “AE” prefix on the corresponding Flood Insurance Rate Map. This area of the project site includes approximately 250 feet of the Skyway alignment along the easterly roadside ditch. No structures are proposed as part of the project. The proposed facilities include roadway, sidewalk, and intersection improvements and related infrastructure. The project would be required to adhere to the Flood Hazard Prevention section of the County Code (Ch. 26, Article IV) as a standard condition of approval. The project would be required to provide certification from a registered engineer that the proposed facilities would not impact flood waters through increasing flood levels, diverting flood waters or other means. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to provide certification that the proposed facilities could withstand likely flows (both hydrostatic and hydrodynamic). Acquisition of the necessary permits, certifications and agreements, as described in this section of the Initial Study, would ensure less than significant impacts by impeding or redirecting floodwaters.

Mitigation: None Required

i) No Impact. The proposed project includes improvements to the existing roadway, intersection and related facilities. The Safety Element of the County’s General Plan does not identify the failure of water detention facilities as a hazard in the vicinity of the project site. It would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss of property, injury or death from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Mitigation: None Required

j) No Impact. Seiche, tsunami and mudflow effects have not been recorded in any Butte County reservoirs within the jurisdiction of the California Division of Safety of Dams. Additionally there are no reservoirs or other large bodies of water in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project has the potential to impact hydrology and water quality. However, the mitigation measures identified in this study (**MM 3.3.1, MM 3.4.3 and MM 3.6.1**), and adherence to applicable county, Caltrans and CBC design standards, would ensure that potential impacts to hydrology and water quality are less than significant.

3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Setting:

The proposed project site is approximately 0.25-miles southeast of the Chico City Limits within County jurisdiction. The predominant land use designations in the area are Grazing and Open Land (GOL), Agricultural Residential (AR) and Industrial (I). The project site is bordered by all three of these designations. The project site is, for the most part, within the existing alignments of Skyway and Honey Run Road.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Land Use and Planning:

a) No Impact. As it proposes intersection and roadway improvements, this project will not physically divide an established community. Indeed, it is likely to increase connectivity between surrounding residents and businesses, while improving the safety conditions within the project area. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

b) No Impact. This proposed project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed project is consistent with the Butte County General Plan, with regard to avoiding or mitigating potential environmental impacts. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

c) No Impact. No adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans would be impacted by the proposed project. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project would not generate potential impacts relative to land use and planning.

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Setting:

There are no mineral resource sites within the project area. The California Geological Survey’s (Department of Conservation) map “Fifty-Year Aggregate Demand Compared to Permitted Aggregate Resources” (2006) does not identify extraction facilities in the vicinity of the project site. The project area is not identified in the county General Plan as an important mineral resource site.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Mineral Resources:

a-b) No Impact. No mineral resources or resource recovery sites are known to exist on the project site. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project would not result in potential impacts to mineral resources.

3.11 NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Setting:

Noise is traditionally defined as “unwanted” sound. The magnitude of sound, whether wanted or unwanted, is usually described by sound pressure (a dynamic variation in atmospheric pressure). The human auditory system is sensitive to fluctuations in air pressure above and below the barometric static pressure. These fluctuations are defined as sound when the human ear is able to detect pressure changes within the audible frequency range.

The sound level at a particular instant is not likely to be a good measure of noise levels that vary in both time and space, such as noise generated by a mobile source. To better accommodate and assess the time varying noise levels typically associated with traffic patterns, a time-averaged, single-number descriptor known as the “Level equivalent” (L_{eq}) is frequently employed. The L_{eq} is expressed in decibels (dBA) and represents the average energy content of sounds over a specified time period. It includes both steady background sounds and transient, short-term sounds. It represents the level of a steady sound which, when averaged over the sampling period, is equivalent in energy to the time-varying (fluctuating) sound level over the same period of time. The ambient noise in the project area is generated primarily by traffic on the Skyway.

Discussion of Potential Impacts related to Noise:

a) Less Than Significant. During the construction phases of the project, noise from construction activities will temporarily and intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Construction noise is regulated by state and county regulations, which include CBC standards for construction-generated noise attenuation. Noise levels generated during construction shall comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations and all equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

Table 3 summarizes typical noise levels produced by construction equipment commonly used on roadway construction projects. As indicated, equipment involved in construction is expected to generate noise levels ranging from 70 to 90dBA at a distance of 15 meters (50 feet). Noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced over distance at a rate of 6dBA per doubling of distance.

Table 3: Maximum Decibels at 50 feet

Equipment	Maximum dBA at 15m (50 ft)
Scrapers	89 dBA
Bulldozers	85 dBA
Heavy Trucks	88 dBA
Backhoes	80 dBA
Pneumatic tools	85 dBA
Concrete pump	82 dBA

Source: Federal Transit Administration, 1995

By adhering to existing noise attenuation standards, a standard requirement for projects carried out in the county, there would be a less than significant impact resulting from construction related noise.

Mitigation: None Required

b) Less Than Significant. Significant noise levels would be primarily generated by surface grading and leveling. There are not expected to be any pile driving activities. Construction groundborne noise or vibration would be temporary. There is not expected to be any excessive groundborne noise or vibrations as a result of the construction activities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

c) Less Than Significant. Substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project are not expected to occur. Noise impacts from construction related activities would end once the project is complete. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

d) Less Than Significant. Noise from construction activities are primarily concerned with new development. Temporary or periodic noise levels could increase in the area as a result of the project. Construction activities would be required to adhere to construction activity noise standards, such as proper equipment maintenance and limiting the hours of noise-generating activities. The proposed signalization could increase the amount of periodic noise generated by vehicles accelerating and decelerating along the skyway. However, it would not increase traffic volumes or alter trip distributions in the project area. There would be less than significant impact resulting from temporary and periodic related noise.

Mitigation: None Required

e) No Impact. The site is not located within two (2) miles of an airport. People working on the project site will not be exposed to excessive noise impacts from airport activities.

Mitigation: None Required

f) No Impact. The site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. People working on the project site will not be exposed to excessive noise levels from private airstrips.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

Potential impacts resulting from construction activities would be temporary and intermittent in nature. Potential impacts from acceleration and deceleration of vehicles approaching the proposed signalization would be periodic and intermittent in nature. The project would result in less than significant increases in noise levels. It would not create structures or residences subject to indoor and outdoor decibel thresholds. By adhering to standard specifications set forth in the CBC and County Code, the potential impacts related to temporary and periodic noise would be maintained at a less than significant level.

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Setting:

The project involves improvements to an intersection and roadways in an industrial/agricultural-residential part of Butte County. The primary purpose of the project is to alleviate automobile safety issues. It would also improve the site’s drainage conditions. The proposed project will not increase access to undeveloped land, which would result in increased growth patterns.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Populations and Housing:

a) No Impact. The project would involve intersection, sidewalk, curb/gutter and roadway improvements. There are no new homes, structures, or extensions of roadways associated with this project. Therefore there will be no impact by inducing population growth.

Mitigation: None Required

b) No Impact. The proposed project will not displace any homes.

Mitigation: None Required

c) No Impact. The proposed project will not displace any people, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

There would be no impacts to population and housing as a result of the project.

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?			X	

Setting:

The project is located in an industrial/agricultural-residential area southeast of Chico, California in an area of County jurisdiction. There are several utilities, both overhead and underground within the project area. The project proposes curb, gutter, sidewalk and roadway improvements, which would include installation of traffic signals. The improvements may require the relocation of overhead utilities, including power and telephone lines. Underground utilities may require relocation to accommodate the proposed drainage improvements and beacon and signal conduits. Construction activities, including signage, traffic control and emergency access, would be conducted pursuant to applicable CBC and County standards. Chapter 10 of the County Code (Highways and Streets) identifies emergency vehicle access standards for construction sites. Once completed, the project is expected to improve level of service, safety and general traffic/pedestrian conditions within the project area.

The proposed project would not construct dwelling units, buildings, businesses, or other similar facilities that would result in an increased human population in the project area. Thus, the project is not expected to result in increased demand on public, solid waste, stormwater, wastewater or other similar services.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Public Services:

a - e) Less Than Significant Impact. Temporary delays to roadway traffic from construction may occur; however, emergency vehicles will be given the right of way in the event of their presence at the project site. No changes in fire protection are proposed as part of this project. When completed, the project is expected to improve the safety of the intersection and emergency response conditions.

Temporary delays to roadway traffic from construction may occur; however, emergency vehicles will be given the right of way in the event of their presence at the project site. No changes in police protection are proposed as part of this project. When completed, the project is expected to improve the safety of the intersection and emergency response conditions.

To the extent that the intersection may be used by school buses, the proposed project would improve the safety and reliability of this intersection. The project would not result in any new population or otherwise affect schools.

The proposed project would not add to the population in the region, nor would it result in the construction of recreational facilities; nor will it affect the need for parks in the area.

Many utilities exist within the project area. It is anticipated that primary location of underground utilities would be relocated to accommodate the improved drainage facilities and traffic signal conduits.

Overhead power and telephone utilities would be relocated for the project to provide safety clearances between proposed signal poles and arms and existing power lines.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

Modifications and improvements to the roadways and the intersection at the project site will require acquisition of the appropriate permits and agreements, pursuant to §404 and §401 of the Clean Water Act and §1600 of the CA Fish and Game Code, as required by **MM 3.4.3**. There may be the need to relocate utilities. However, impacts on these facilities, and any potential environmental effects for relocating them, would be less than significant.

3.14 RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Setting:

The project site is located in an industrial/agricultural-residential area southeast of Chico, California within county jurisdiction. The project does not propose dwelling units, businesses or other structures that might increase the area’s human population. The demand for recreational facilities in the area would not change upon project completion.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Recreation:

a) No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the construction of residences or other structures that would be inhabited, occupied or used by people. Therefore, it would not generate an additional demand for parks and recreational facilities.

Mitigation: None Required

b) No Impact. The project does not include the development of recreational facilities, or other structures that would necessitate the development of additional recreational facilities.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The project would have no impact relative to recreation issues.

3.15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, which results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Setting:

The project site is located in an industrial/agricultural-residential area southeast of Chico, California within County Jurisdiction. Approaches to the intersection on the Skyway are bi-directional two-lane roadways. Traffic volume has steadily increased in the Skyway/Honey Run intersection in recent years. The Skyway is a major east-west arterial. It connects the City of Paradise and others with the City of Chico. Honey Run Road, a two-lane roadway and the only arterial entering and exiting Butte Creek Canyon, approaches the intersection east of the project site. There is a church on Honey Run Road, southeast of the project site. Longest Drive, a private dead-end road approaches the intersection from the west side of the project site. Skyway Golf Course is located on Longest Drive, southwest of the project site. The majority of parcels northeast of the project site are undeveloped grazing and open lands. The parcels to the northwest of the project site are industrial in nature. Weekday traffic volumes on the Skyway and Honey Run Road increase notably during the morning and evening hours due to commuting traffic between Paradise, Butte Creek Canyon and Chico.

A City of Chico bike path begins north of the project site along the Potter Road alignment. It intercepts the Skyway west of the project site and continues along Honey Run Road into Butte Creek Canyon. The proposed project improvements would tie into the bike path.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Traffic and Transportation:

a) Less Than Significant. The project would not generate additional traffic as it does not include the development of any residential, commercial or other buildings for land use activities that generate traffic. The project is designed to alleviate congestion, drainage and safety deficiencies that have been identified and/or projected within the project site. The project is not expected to result in additional vehicular trips

or impacts to the area's levels of service. Congestion and safety conditions are expected to improve upon project completion. Thus, potential traffic impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

b - d) No Impact. As previously described, the project would not impact or influence traffic volumes. Therefore, the level of service on the segment would remain essentially the same as the existing Level of Service (LOS). The potential for the improvement of the intersection to lessen the impacts from traffic accidents and provide for a smoother traffic flow would lead to an improvement of LOS.

The proposed project is an intersection and roadway improvement, with no impact on the air traffic system in the County. There are no airports or private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area.

The purpose of the project is to improve the safety and traffic flow of the Skyway/Honey Run intersection and the adjacent roadways. When completed the project would allow for safer passage and smoother flow for vehicles. Additionally, the project is being proposed as a response to an existing deficiency. Upon completion, access to the surrounding area, intersection safety and the area's drainage conditions are expected to be improved over pre-project conditions.

Mitigation: None Required

e) Less Than Significant. Emergency vehicles using the intersection may be slowed at the project area during the construction phase. However, passage for emergency vehicles, as well as other vehicles will be available. As described in Section 3.13 of this document (Public Services), the project will be required to adhere to pertinent construction site standards. Temporary traffic control activities during the construction phase of the proposed project would not prevent emergency vehicle movement throughout the area. Upon completion, the project will allow for safer passage, loading and smoother flow for emergency vehicles.

Mitigation: None Required

f - g) No Impact. The project would not create the need for onsite or offsite parking. The improved connectivity between surrounding areas is expected to improve non-vehicular movement within the project area. The project proposed intersection improvements would make the project site safer for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The improvements to the intersection would also make driving easier for busses and other public transit vehicles that may use the roadway. It would not conflict with current alternative transportation policies.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

The proposed project would have no significant adverse impacts on traffic or transportation. By upgrading the roadway to current design and safety standards, the project would improve traffic flow and make travel safer for motor vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians in the project area. The proposed improvements would also bring the project site up to compliance with the applicable standards of the ADA.

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Setting:

The public utilities in the project area are both overhead and underground. The project would not generate wastewater or solid waste products. The project would not generate structures, such as dwellings or businesses, which would create additional demand on the area's water supplies.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Utilities and Service Systems:

a,b,d-g) No Impact. The project does not include any uses that would require increased wastewater treatment or solid waste disposal. Landfill capacity, wastewater treatment and solid waste generation are not potential impacts that would be generated by the proposed roadway/intersection improvements.

c) Less than Significant. The project would not require expansion of stormwater facilities outside the project site. Roadside drainages located in the project area would be realigned and existing cross culverts extended. Once these changes are made, stormwater drainage would improve. The applicable permitting and agreement requirements of the USACE, RWQCB and the DFG would be applicable. The project would not be permitted to affect the quantity or quality of the stormwater leaving the project site. Thus, improved onsite drainage is a major component of the proposed project. Stormwater facility impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None Required

Conclusion:

Impacts to public utilities as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

Discussion of Mandatory Findings of Significance Potential Impacts:

a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:

Construction activities could contribute to fugitive dust and air quality degradation. **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2** would reduce potential fugitive dust impacts and NOx emissions from construction related activities to levels less than significant. Similarly, the project’s potential air quality impacts generated due to the proximity of sensitive receptors (church) would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Implementation of **MM 3.3.2** would also ensure odor and equipment exhaust impacts are maintained at a level less than significant.

Project related activities could negatively impact special status species, habitat and water features. **MM 3.4.1** would ensure less than significant impacts to migratory birds and raptors. **MM 3.4.2** would reduce potential impacts to Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to less than significant levels. Both **MM 3.4.1** and **MM 3.4.2** would ensure less than significant impacts to migratory corridors and nursery sites. **MM 3.4.3** would reduce potential impacts to jurisdictional waters to a level considered less than significant.

Construction activities have the potential to disturb undocumented cultural resources and/or human remains. **MM 3.5.1** and **MM 3.5.2** are provided to reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

Construction activities have the potential to contribute to, or induce soil erosion, storm water pollution and the loss of topsoil. **MM 3.6.1** would ensure potential storm water pollution impacts occur at levels that are less than significant. This would ensure potential impacts from erosion, stormwater pollution or siltation occur at levels that are less than significant. **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.4.3** would ensure potential impacts of soil erosion and loss of top soil due to construction equipment are maintained at levels that are less than significant.

Construction related activities have the potential to cause significant impacts resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation of **MM 3.6.1**, which addresses spill prevention and public or environmental impacts, would ensure potential accidental release impacts are reduced to levels that are less than significant. **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2** would ensure potential impacts from fugitive dust and NOx emissions into the environment are also reduced to less than significant levels.

Project related activities have the potential to violate water quality, drainage, erosion and/or siltation standards. **MM 3.3.1**, **MM 3.4.3** and **MM 3.6.1** are provided. Among other requirements, these measures would ensure adherence to §404 and §401 of the Clean Water Act and §1600 of the CA Fish and Game Code. The project will be required to implement appropriate BMPs as required by County Code and approved by the Department of Public Works. Thus, these potential impacts would be reduced to levels that are less than significant.

b) Less Than Significant. Cumulative effects from the project will be primarily beneficial in nature, including decreased traffic accidents, smoother traffic flow, safer passage, and smoother flow for emergency vehicles. Access between regional areas will be safer. The project would not contribute to population increase, or an increase in demand for public facilities and services.

Mitigation: None Required

c) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Air Quality and Hazards/Hazardous Materials Sections of this study identify potential environmental effects that could cause hazards to human beings in the project area. **MM 3.3.1** and **MM 3.3.2** require adherence to BCAQMD's BAMMs. These mitigation measures and adherence to Chapter 13 of the County Code, as cited in this Initial Study, would reduce air quality impacts to less than significant levels. Potential impacts resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities were identified in the Hazards/Hazardous Materials Section. However, **MM 3.6.1** would ensure these potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

Adherence to CBC standards and specifications, as adopted by County Code, will ensure that impacts related to the potential for strong seismic ground shaking will be reduced to less than significant levels. The project would be required to adhere to CBC and County construction activity standards, which describe appropriate signage and traffic control actions for construction sites. The project would be required to adhere to the design and safety standards of the CBC. The project proposes to bring the site up to American with Disabilities Act compliance as it pertains to sidewalk, curb, tie-in and similar facility standards.

Through implementation of the required mitigation measures and adherence to the standard conditions of approval of the regulatory agencies, as identified in this document, the project would result in potential impacts that are less than significant.

Conclusion:

The project will be required to adhere to the relevant standards, regulations and policies of all local, regional, state and federal agencies, as described in this document. Through observation of the standard conditions of approval, adherence to existing design and construction standards and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this document, potentially significant impacts related to the project would be reduced to levels that are less than significant.