

Rezone Z 16-01

Zoning Code Text Amendment

Chapter 17.82 Medical Marijuana Collectives/Cooperatives (Separation Distances and Allowable Locations)

Initial Study and Negative Declaration



Lead Agency:
 City of Shasta Lake
 Planning Division
 P.O. Box 777
 Shasta Lake, CA 96019

March 2016

Environmental Checklist Form

- 1. Project title:** Rezone 16-01 (Text Amendment)
Marijuana Collectives Separation Distances
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** City of Shasta Lake
P.O. Box 777
Shasta Lake, CA 96019
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Carla L. Thompson, AICP
Development Services Director
530.275.7460
- 4. Project location:** The text amendment would apply to all locations in the City in which medical marijuana collectives (Collective) are allowed, which is currently in the Community Commercial (C-2) zone district on State Route 151 (SR 151) between the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) trestle and Cascade Boulevard and within the Village Commercial (VC) zone district on properties abutting SR 151. The amendment is requested in order to allow a Collective to be located at 5510 Shasta Dam Boulevard (Assessor's Parcel Number 007-120-034) in the Rite Aid Center, located on the southwest intersection of Shasta Dam Boulevard and Cascade Boulevard.
- This location corresponds to a portion of Section 32, Township 33 North, Range 4 West. Latitude: N 40° 40' 48.8568"; Longitude: W -122° 21' 9.2016" as estimated from the U.S. Geological Survey 7 ½-minute Project City Quadrangle topographical map.
- Staff's recommendation is for the Planning Commission to also consider limiting the area in which Collectives are allowed to the allowable zones between Cascade Boulevard to Ashby Road rather than to the trail trestle.
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Stacy Lidie
19858 Old Oregon Trail N
Redding, CA 96003
- 6. General Plan designation:** The Text Amendment would apply to designated areas in the City in which Medical Marijuana Collectives are allowed.
- 7. Zoning:** The Text Amendment would apply to designated areas in the City in which Medical Marijuana Collectives are allowed.
- 8. Project description:** The project is a Zoning Code text amendment that addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed. The applicant requests a reduction in the separation distance requirement between Collectives to 900 feet (currently 1,000 feet), and proposes to open a Collective at 5310 Shasta Dam Boulevard (Rite Aid Center), which would require no further approval by the City other than any proposed signage. The property on which the building is located is approximately 920 feet from an existing Collective. The applicant estimates a total of six employees on the largest shift and eight customers on site at the busiest time. Proposed hours of operation are 10:00 AM – 8:00 PM, seven days per week. The Zoning Code allows Collectives to be open seven days per week between the hours of 8:00 AM – 8:00 PM.

In order to reduce potential impacts related to a higher number of Collectives in the City, Staff proposes an additional amendment to state Collectives would be allowed in the designated Zone Districts between

Cascade Boulevard and Ashby Road (rather than to the UPRR trestle). The proposed reduction in setbacks between Collectives, combined with separation distance requirements between Collectives and schools, parks and day care centers, would result in no additional Collectives being allowed other than the proposed Collective at 5310 Shasta Dam Boulevard.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The majority of developed parcels along the section of SR 151 in which Collectives are allowed are developed with commercial retail, office and service uses. Parcels adjacent to these areas are developed with retail commercial, office and service uses and also include single-family residences.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is reduced to less than significant through the use of mitigation measures as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality / Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: ON THE BASIS OF THIS INITIAL EVALUATION:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Carla L. Thompson, AICP
 Development Services Director

February 10, 2016
Date

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

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives would be allowed. Zoning Code Chapter 17.84 includes design and architectural objectives which apply to new commercial development and façade improvements along SR 151. Furthermore, there are no scenic vistas visible from this area that would be impacted by the text amendment. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) This section of SR 151 is not designated as a Scenic Highway and no uses in this area are visible from a Scenic Highway. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 1.a. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) All new lighting is subject to the provisions of Zoning Code 17.84.050, which required all interior and exterior lighting to be designed and located to confine direct lighting to the premises. The Code further states no lighting shall be of the type or in a location that constitutes a hazard to vehicular traffic, either on private property or abutting streets. This is verified during review of building permit applications. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Aesthetics:

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.) In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) Prime Farmland is land that has been used for irrigated agricultural production and meets the physical and chemical criteria for Prime Farmland as determined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Unique Farmland is farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state’s leading agricultural crops. Farmland of Statewide Importance is similar to Prime Farmland but generally includes steeper slopes or less ability to store soil moisture.

According to the *Important Farmland in California* map published by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the project site is located in an area designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land.” There is no Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance mapped within the City. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- b) According to the Shasta Lake General Plan and Zoning Map, there are no properties within the City zoned for agricultural uses. There are no Williamson Act contracts for the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- c) This section of SR 151 is an urbanized area and the text amendment would not result in any development that would convert existing forest or timberland zoning. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- d) This section of SR 151 is an urbanized area and does not include any areas designated as forest land. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- e) See discussion under Sections 2.a-d above. The project site is not located in close proximity to forest land or farmland as shown on the maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation. There would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Agriculture and Forestry Resources:

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The Shasta County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) has permit authority over all stationary sources of air pollutants in Shasta County and acts as the primary reviewer of environmental documents as they pertain to air quality issues. The Shasta County AQMD develops rules and regulations to implement locally the requirements of the federal and California Clean Air Acts and other air quality legislation.

The project is a Zoning Code text amendment that addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed, which would allow the applicant to open a Collective in an existing building. The amendment also proposes to reduce the area in which Collectives can operate by limiting it to certain zone districts on SR 151 between Cascade Boulevard and Ashby Road. Collectives are involved with dispensing medical marijuana to qualified patients and include no activities that would generate any emissions that would conflict with an air quality plan. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- b) See discussion under Section 3.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 3.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) See discussion under Section 3.a above. Land uses considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes and retirement homes. Existing sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site include single-family dwelling units and a school approximately 900 feet to the north of 5310 Shasta Dam Boulevard. However, operation of a Collective would not result in the generation of pollutants. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) Objectionable odors are associated with certain strains of marijuana. To address this issue, Shasta Lake Municipal Code (SLMC) Section 17.82.050(D)(7) states *“A collective/cooperative shall have an air treatment system that ensures off-site odors shall not result.”* This is verified by the Building Official prior to commencement of the use. Therefore, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Air Quality:

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The proposed text amendment address areas in which Collectives would be allowed, which is within a developed, urbanized area. The proposed amendment does not propose any land disturbance that would result in any habitat modification; therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) See discussion under Section 4.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 4.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) See discussion under Section 4.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) See discussion under Section 4.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- f) Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved habitat conservation plans that include this section of SR 151. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Biological Resources

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The project addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed and does not propose any construction activities or land disturbance. Furthermore, there are no historical resources listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or any local register of historical resources within the City. In addition, the City has determined there are no resources which the City has identified as historically significant that would be impacted by the proposed text amendment. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) See discussion under Section 5.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 5.a above. There are no known paleontological resources or unique geological features in the project area and no mitigation is required.
- d) The proposed project does not propose or approve any land disturbance that would result in disturbance of human remains. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) Public Resources Code (PRC) §21074 defines “tribal cultural resources” as either of the following:
1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
 - a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
 - b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1 of the PRC.

2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

The proposed text amendment addresses locations in which Collectives are allowed, which is in a developed urbanized area. The proposed project does not propose or approve any construction or land disturbance that would result in adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Cultural Resources

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) i. A review of available geologic and fault maps indicate no faults are mapped across the project site and the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas* prepared by the California Department of Mines and Geology,

dated 2010, reveals that portions of the potentially active Battle Creek fault are located approximately 22 miles south of the project site. In addition, the closest active fault, which is related to faults along the Foothills Fault Zone, is located approximately 32 miles southeast of the subject property.

The Foothills Fault Zone is estimated to have a slip rate well below the minimum of 0.1 mm/yr, which can be characterized as a low-activity fault system. Based on the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) / California Geologic Survey (CGS) Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment (PSHA), the project site is located in an area of low peak ground acceleration (PGA) (California Geologic Survey 2006). The text amendment would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

- ii. The City of Shasta Lake, along with all of Shasta County, is located in California Building Code (CBC) Zone D (2010 CBC). This indicates that the area is subject to earthquakes that may cause minor to moderate structural damage. An earthquake history compiled for the Shasta Lake General Plan indicated that over a 120-year period, no deaths related to earthquakes have been recorded, and reported building damage has never been more than minor. All construction in the City is subject to the California Building Code for Seismic Zone D, which is designed to prevent structural damage from earthquakes of moderate intensity. The text amendment would have no impact and no mitigation is required.
 - iii. The project site has a low potential for liquefaction occurring beneath this site because there are no wetland features or areas of fill. All commercial projects are required by the 2013 California Building Code to submit a preliminary soils report as reflected in conditions of approval for the project. The required soils report will evaluate local soil conditions and address any soil related hazards, including liquefaction. The text amendment would have no impact and no mitigation is required.
 - iv. Although landslides occur throughout areas of Shasta County, landslides are not considered major hazards in the City of Shasta Lake. Landslides can be caused by both non-seismic and seismic activities. Excessive soil saturation can also trigger landslides. The project site and the surrounding area are very flat with little risk of landslides. No visible signs of landslides are evident in the immediate area; therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) The potential for erosion exists when vegetative cover is removed from natural ground surfaces due to grading activities associated with construction or fires. The project addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed and does not propose any earth disturbance. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
 - c) The subject area is located in a developed area of the City. Existing structures have existed in this area for many years with no evidence that the soil is unstable. There have been no incidents of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The project addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed and does not propose any earth disturbance. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
 - d) Expansive soils are those that greatly increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. As stated in Section 6.c above, there have been no issues with existing structures or paved parking lots in this area of the City. The project addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed and does not propose any earth disturbance. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
 - e) The proposed project does not include the use of septic tanks. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Geology and Soils

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) The text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed and does not propose any land disturbance that could generate greenhouse gas emissions on a temporary basis. In addition, in September 2005, an Initial Study (IS) was prepared and the Planning Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Rite Aid project, which included analysis of all impacts for the present uses and future uses of the project. The number of vehicle trips for a Collective are anticipated to be similar to those analyzed in the IS/MND for the Rite Aid project, which considered all impacts for the present uses and future uses of the project.

Impacts in other areas along SR 151 in which Collectives would be allowed also would have vehicle trips similar to other allowable commercial retail uses. In addition, Collectives are involved with dispensing medical marijuana to qualified patients and include no activities that would generate any greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- b) See discussion under 7.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The proposed text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed. Collectives are involved with dispensing medical marijuana to qualified patients and include no activities that would involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous substances. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) See discussion under Section 8.a above. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Sections 3.a, 7.a and 8.a above. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) None of the parcels on which Collectives are allowed are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 (Department of Toxic Substances Control). There is no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) According to the Shasta Lake and Shasta County General Plans, the project area is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any airport. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- f) According to the Shasta Lake and Shasta County General Plans, the project area is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- g) The area in which Collectives are allowed is an urbanized area with adequate emergency access. The text amendment would not hinder emergency vehicles entering and exiting the area. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- h) The project area and adjacent areas are located outside the area designated as “Very High” Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FRAP 2006). There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Hazards and Hazardous Materials

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The proposed text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed. The applicant proposes to establish a Collective in an existing building, which would not result in any land disturbance that may impact water quality or waste discharge requirements. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- b) The City's sole source of water is from Lake Shasta through a long-term contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The City does not have any groundwater supplies. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 9.a. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) See discussion under Section 9.a. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) See discussion under Section 9.a. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- f) See discussion under Section 9.a. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- g) The project does not involve housing; therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- h) The text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed but does not authorize any construction. When new construction is proposed within the City, staff references the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map for the City (Map Number 06089C1209G, March 17, 2011). Construction within a floodplain is required to comply with SLMC Chapter 15.04 (Floodplain Management). Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.
- i) Because no portion of the project site is protected by a levee or dam, the exposure of people and/or structures to significant risk or loss due to flooding from dam or levee failure is non-existent. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- j) Because of the project location, there is no potential for seiche or tsunami activity. Additionally, the City of Shasta Lake does not have a history of experiencing mudflows. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The proposed text amendment addresses areas in which Collectives are allowed but does not authorize any development that would physically divide an established community. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) There are no plans, policies or regulations regarding avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect that would apply to the proposed text amendment. As documented herein, establishment of a Collective in

an existing building would not result in any environmental effects. There are no impacts and no mitigation is required.

- c) There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans which would apply to the subject property. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Land Use and Planning

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The Shasta Lake General Plan Land Use Map shows lands designated as Mineral Resource (MR) only in the northern portion of the City. There are no identified mineral resources within the project area delineated on any local general plan, specific plan, or other land use map. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) There are no mineral resource recovery sites delineated on any local general plan, specific plan or other land use map. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Mineral Resources

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers

- a) The State of California’s Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Noise Element Guidelines (Office of Planning and Research 2003) include recommended exterior and interior noise level standards for use by local jurisdictions to identify and prevent incompatible land uses. Based on these guidelines, the City of Shasta Lake General Plan Noise Element (City of Shasta Lake 1999) has adopted land use compatibility criteria for its various community land uses.

The IS/MND for the Rite Aid project included analysis of all impacts for the present uses and future uses of the project. Operation of a Collective is not considered a significant noise generator and the addition of a Collective in this location would not increase noise levels over and above what was analyzed for the project. Other areas along SR 151 in which Collectives would be allowed are within developed, commercial areas, and a substantial increase in noise would not be anticipated. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- b) See discussion under 12.a above. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under 12.a above. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- d) See discussion under 12.a above. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- e) According to the Shasta Lake and Shasta County General Plans, the project area is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any airport. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- f) According to the Shasta Lake and Shasta County General Plans, the project area is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Noise

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The proposed text amendment addresses the allowable location for Collectives, which is in an urbanized area planned for commercial/retail uses. Commercial development in this area has been planned and anticipated for years under the County's General Plan prior to the City's incorporation, and under the City's current General Plan and Zoning Code. The addition of a Collective in the Rite Aid Center or other areas along SR 151 would not induce substantial population growth in the area.

The proposed project does not include a residential component, nor does it result in the need for any infrastructure improvements or extensions that would result in direct or indirect impacts that could result in substantial population growth in this area of the City; therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- b) See discussion under 13.a above. The area in which Collectives would be allowed is located within a developed, urbanized area and there are currently no dwelling units within these areas. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) See discussion under Section 13.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Population and Housing

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. 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 following public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) – e) The proposed text amendment addresses the allowable location for Collectives, which is within an urbanized area planned for commercial/retail uses. Therefore, no new facilities will need to be constructed or altered to provide for additional public services. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Public Services

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. RECREATION.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) See discussion under Section 13.a above. The proposed project will not increase the City’s population nor will it cause substantial physical deterioration or accelerated deterioration of any neighborhood or regional parks. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) See discussion under Section 13.a above. The project would not increase the population of the City nor require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Recreation

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The area in which Collectives would be allowed is a developed, urbanized area that is currently zoned for commercial/retail uses in the C-2 Zone and a mix of commercial and residential uses in the VC Zone. The IS/MND for the Rite Aid project included analysis of all impacts for the present uses and future uses of the project. The addition of a Collective in this location would not increase traffic over and above what was analyzed for the project. Collectives in other areas of SR 151 would have similar traffic impacts than other allowable uses in those areas. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- b) See discussion under Section 16.a above. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- c) According to the Shasta Lake and Shasta County General Plans, the project area is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any airport. Establishing and operating a Collective would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- d) See discussion under Section 16.a above. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- e) See discussion under Section 16.a above. The IS/MND adopted in 2005 analyzed emergency access issues. The addition of a Collective in this location would not increase traffic over and above what was analyzed for the Rite Aid project. Other areas along SR 151 in which Collective would be allowed are within developed, urbanized location in the City, and inadequate emergency access issues are not anticipated. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- f) The proposed text amendment would allow a Collective to establish and operate within an existing building in the Rite Aid Center. The IS/MND adopted for the Rite Aid Center analyzed parking impacts, and the required number of parking spaces were installed in accordance with the Zoning Code. Any future proposed Collectives would be reviewed to determine parking requirements. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- g) Areas surrounding the Rite Aid Center include sidewalk, bicycle lanes and a bus stop. Other areas along SR 151 include similar improvement or are planned for similar improvements by Caltrans. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Transportation/Traffic

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations related to electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations related to the City's water distribution system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations related to the City's wastewater distribution system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) Wastewater treatment needs for a Collective would be limited to employee and customer use. The increase would not exceed wastewater treatment permit and no mitigation is required
- b) See discussion under Section 17.a above. No new water or wastewater treatment facilities would need to be constructed for any future Collectives. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- c) Stormdrain facilities were installed for the Rite Aid project when the building and property were originally developed. There are similar improvements in other areas along SR 151 in which Collective would be

allowed. All new construction in the City is subject to the City's Stormwater Management Ordinance and State requirements for storm drainage; therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

- d) Water use for a Collective would be limited to employee and customer use. Staff compared average water demand of the two existing Collectives and the previous Starbucks, which was located in the building in which the applicant would like to open a Collective. The average water demand for both of the existing Collectives is much less than Starbucks and is anticipated to be similar to other commercial uses. There is currently sufficient water supply to serve the proposed Collective and other commercial/retail uses along SR 151, and no mitigation is required.
- e) See discussion under Section 17.d above. Wastewater flows for a Collective are anticipated to be similar in nature to a commercial retail use. There is currently sufficient capacity in the Wastewater Treatment Plant to serve the demands of a Collective, and no mitigation is required.
- f) Through an agreement with Shasta County, the Richard W. Curry Landfill south of Igo (about 9.2 miles west of State Highway 273), receives all residential, commercial, and industrial solid waste generated within the City. Waste generation from a Collective is anticipated to be similar to or less than a typical commercial retail use. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- g) All uses within the City are required to comply with adopted programs and regulations pertaining to solid waste, including mandatory recycling. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- h) The area in which Collectives would be allowed is within a developed area served by the City's Electric Utility. No new electric systems or extension of existing facilities would be required. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- i) The area in which Collectives would be allowed is with a developed area served by the City's Water Utility. No new systems or extension of existing facilities would be required. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- j) The area in which Collectives would be allowed is with a developed area served by the City's Wastewater system. No new systems or extension of existing facilities would be required. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Utilities and Service Systems

None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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 wild-life population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The text amendment addresses areas in the City in which Collectives would be allowed and is limited to certain areas along SR 151, a developed, urbanized area. As documented herein, no land use disturbance is proposed that would impact biological species or habitat or historical resources. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) Based on the discussions and documentation herein, there is no evidence found to suggest the project would have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) Based on the discussions and documentation herein, there is no evidence to support a finding that the project would have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Collectives are anticipated to have similar impacts in terms of traffic and noise than other allowable commercial retail uses along SR 151. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures Relating to Mandatory Findings of Significance

None Required.

References:

City of Shasta Lake General Plan

City of Shasta Lake Zoning Code

Use Permit UP 05-04, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Rite Aid Center. 2005

Attachments:

Location Maps

Exhibit A: Separation Distances Map



NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Rezone Z 16-01 Medical Marijuana Collectives Text Amendment (Separation Distances)

SUBJECT

Rezone 16-01 (Text Amendment), Marijuana Collectives Separation Distance

PROJECT LOCATION

The text amendment would apply to all locations in the City in which medical marijuana collectives (Collective) are allowed, which is currently in the Community Commercial (C-2) zone district on State Route 151 (SR 151) between the Union Pacific Railroad trestle and Cascade Boulevard and within the Village Commercial (VC) zone district on properties abutting SR 151.

The amendment is requested in order to allow a Collective to be located at 5510 Shasta Dam Boulevard in the Rite Aid Center, located generally on the south side of Shasta Dam Boulevard, west of Cascade Boulevard and east of Shasta Street.

This location corresponds to a portion of Section 32, Township 33 North, Range 4 West. Latitude: N 40° 40' 48.8568"; Longitude: W -122° 21' 9.2016" as estimated from the U.S. Geological Survey 7 ½-minute Project City Quadrangle topographical map.

Staff's recommendation is for the Planning Commission to also consider limiting the area in which Collectives are allowed to the allowable zones between Cascade Boulevard to Ashby Road rather than to the trail trestle.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

See Initial Study Number 8 (pages 2-3).

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING

See Initial Study Number 9 (Page 3).

FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

The City of Shasta Lake completed an Initial Study (attached), which determined that the proposed project would not have significant environmental effects. The project avoids the potentially significant environmental effects identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the City, that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment. If there are substantial changes that alter the character or impacts of the proposed project, another environmental impact determination will be necessary.

1. **Based on the whole record (including the Initial Study and any supporting documentation), the City of Shasta Lake has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.**
2. **The Negative Declaration, with its supporting documentation, reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency, which is the City of Shasta Lake.**

DOCUMENTATION

The Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above determination.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

Draft copies or notice of the Initial Environmental Study were distributed to:

- Redding Record Searchlight
- Posting at City Hall, John Beaudet Community Center, Shasta Lake Council Chambers and three Shasta Lake Post Offices
- Shasta County Clerk
- All property owners within a minimum of 300 feet of the boundaries IN WHICH Collectives would be allowed.

PUBLIC REVIEW

(X) Draft document referred for comments February 10, 2016.

- () No comments were received during the public review period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Negative Declaration findings or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the findings of the draft Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public review period. The letters and responses follow (see Response to Comments, attached).

Copies of the Negative Declaration, the Initial Study, and documentation materials may be obtained in the Planning Division of the Development Services Department, City of Shasta Lake, 1650 Stanton Drive, Shasta Lake, CA, Monday – Friday, 7:00 AM – 4:00 PM (closed from Noon – 1:00 PM) 530.275.7460.

DRAFT

Carla L. Thompson, AICP
Development Services Director