Incorporated 1909	**INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY and NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project Title:	City of Orland 2009 Housing Element
Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Orland 815 4th Street Orland, CA 95963
Project Location:	City-wide
Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	City of Orland 815 4th Street Orland, CA 95963
General Plan Designation(s):	N/A
Zoning:	N/A
Contact Person:	Nancy Sailsbery, Community Services Department Director
Phone Number:	(530) 865-1608
Date Prepared	December 2, 2009

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is an Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the 2009 City of Orland Housing Element (referred to as the "2009 Housing Element" or the "proposed Housing Element"). This IS/ND has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines.

An Initial Study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064, an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if the Initial Study indicates that the proposed project under review may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. However, a negative declaration may be prepared instead, if the lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons why a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why it would not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a negative declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

a) The Initial Study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, or

b) The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects, but:

(1) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and

(2) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

If revisions are adopted into the proposed project in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15070(b), a mitigated negative declaration (MND) is prepared.

1.1 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over a proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b)(1), "the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." Based on these criteria, the City of Orland will serve as lead agency for the 2009 Housing Element.

1.2 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this Initial Study and Negative Declaration is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed 2009 City of Orland Housing Element. This document is divided into the following sections:

1.0 **Introduction:** Provides an introduction and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

2.0 **Project Description:** Provides a detailed description of the proposed Housing Element.

3.0 **Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:** Provides an identification of those environmental factors that involve a "Potentially Significant Impact."

4.0 **Determination:** Provides the environmental determination for the proposed Housing Element.

5.0 **Environmental Checklist and Evaluation:** Describes the environmental setting for each of the environmental subject areas, evaluates a range of impacts classified as "no impact," "less than significant," "potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated," or "potentially significant" in response to the environmental checklist.

This ND has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15000 et seq. The ND analyzes the potential impacts of the 2009 City of Orland Housing Element.

This is a public document to be used by the City to determine whether the proposed Housing Element may have a significant effect on the environment. The Orland General Plan was adopted by the City Council in 2003. The General Plan contains supporting environmental studies, as well as extensive goals and policies designed to identify and address the environmental impacts of development within the City over the long term.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE 2009 HOUSING ELEMENT

The Draft City of Orland 2009 Housing Element is designed to address the projected housing needs of current and future City residents and to comply with state law requiring amendment of the Housing Element in 2009 (Section 65580–65589.8 of the Government Code). The 2009 Housing Element is the City's policy document guiding the provision of housing to meet future needs for all economic segments of Orland, including housing affordable to lower-income households. The 2009 Housing Element identifies the policies and programs which the City will implement to ensure that housing in Orland is affordable, safe, and decent. It addresses housing needs by encouraging the provision of an adequate quantity of sites designated for multi-family housing, by assisting in affordable housing development, and through the preservation and maintenance of existing affordable housing stock.

Amendment of the Housing Element is subject to CEQA. No specific development projects are proposed as part of the 2009 Housing Element. However, the 2009 Housing Element does propose changes in existing land use designations, land use densities and to land use regulations. These proposed changes include the following:

- The amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to offer a density bonus of up to 35 percent to meet the requirements of the state density bonus law.

- The amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use in the R-3 (Residential Multiple Family) and M-U (Mixed Use) zoning districts to meet Senate Bill 2 requirements.

- The amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to include a specific definition of Single-Room Occupancy Units (SROs) to meet Assembly Bill 2534 requirements.

- The amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to rezone Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 046-090-016 to at least the Medium Density Residential district, allowing an increase in the Medium Density Residential (R-M) land use and a minimum of 10 units per acre.

- As part of the 2008-2028 General Plan Update, a re-designation of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 040-050-017 from Low Density Residential to the High Density Residential designation, allowing further land for multi-family development that the City anticipates will develop during the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle.

- As part of the 2008-2028 General Plan Update, a re-designation of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 040-251-009 from Limited Industrial to High Density Residential for multi-family development that the City anticipates will develop during the next RHNA cycle.

The 2009 Housing Element provides policies and implementation measures to encourage the development of affordable housing consistent with current General Plan objectives and policies. Zoning Ordinance changes associated with implementation of the 2009 Housing Element would be minor and mainly proposed to update the Zoning Ordinance to existing State requirements, which the City currently complies with.

2.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE 2009 HOUSING ELEMENT

The 2009 Housing Element contains the following goals:

- Goal HE-1: Housing Quality – Promote the development of new housing that meets safety standards, offers a variety of housing types in a variety of locations, and enhances existing neighborhoods, services, and the environment.

- Goal HE-2: Housing Quantity – Encourage the preservation of existing housing and the construction of new housing at a range of costs and in quantities to meet the needs of all income groups, including the very low-, low-, and moderate-income groups.

- Goal HE-3: Affordable Housing – Promote affordability of housing of all types to meet the present and projected needs of households of all income levels.

- Goal HE-4: Equal Housing Opportunity – Assure that discrimination is not a factor for the ability of households to obtain housing.

- Goal HE-5: Natural Resources and Energy Conservation – Promote the conservation of natural resources and energy in housing production.

Under each Housing Element Goal are the guiding policies and implementation measures associated with each goal that will be implemented during the 2009–2014 Housing Element period to accomplish the goal. Detailed descriptions of each guiding policy and program, as well as specific time frames, responsibility for programs, and funding sources are provided in the City's Draft 2009 Housing Element.

2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The environmental setting consists of the areas located within the City limits of Orland, which is located in northwestern Glenn County, approximately 100 miles north of Sacramento. The City is situated at the crossroads of State Route 32 and Interstate 5. The City encompasses approximately 1,876 acres, or 2.93 square miles. The Orland Planning Area encompasses 4,110 acres, or 6.42 square miles.

2.4 OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED

There are no other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) for the proposed Housing Element. The State Department of Housing and Community Development reviews and certifies Housing Elements; however, its approval is not required for adoption by the City.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the 2009 Housing Element, as indicated by the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

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

4.0 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.

Planner's Signature

Planner's Printed Name

City of Orland Community Development Dept./ Date

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND EVALUATION

5.1 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the information shows that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses" may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) for potential impacts. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

    b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

The City of Orland is an agricultural community located in Glenn County. Most of the land surrounding the City is agricultural in nature, which provides a rural character to the area that many residents and visitors consider aesthetically-pleasing. Future development under the City's General Plan would encroach upon some of this agricultural land, and would therefore change the character of the developed land from its current rural to a more urban nature. However, most of the land outside of the Planning Area would retain a rural character, as would some of the land within it.

Scenic views available within the Orland area include the Coast Range and Black Butte to the west, and on clear days Mt. Lassen and the Cascade and Sierra mountains and foothills to the east and northeast. Although State Route 32 and Interstate 5 both pass through Orland, neither is classified as a State scenic highway.

Stony Creek, which defines the entire northern edge of the Planning Area, is the most significant natural scenic resource within the Orland Area. As part of General Plan policies and programs, restrictions have been placed on development within floodplains in order to maintain the natural features of Stony Creek. All of the land along Stony Creek within the Planning Area is privately owned. Private land uses generally include grazing, gravel mining, agriculture, and rural residential uses. The area along Stony Creek and Hambright Creek in the vicinity of Interstate 5 is designated Open Space/Resource Conservation (OS/RC) by the General Plan. Policies and programs of the Housing Element would not conflict with General Plan policies and designations.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less than Significant.** Scenic views within the Orland area generally consist of the Coast Ranges and Black Butte to the west, with occasional views of Mt. Lassen and the Cascade

and Sierra Mountains to the east and northeast on clear days. Implementation of the Project would potentially lead to an increase in residential density within the City. However, implementation of the Project would not allow for development beyond those identified in the City's General Plan as all proposed adjustments to the City's Zoning Code would be consistent with the General Plan. The 2009 Housing Element would not adversely affect any scenic vista. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

b-c) **Less than Significant.** Future housing development could have impact on trees, particularly on vacant lots that have not been previously-developed. The most significant concentration of trees is along Stony and Hambright Creeks. These areas along the creeks are generally within the 100-year floodplain, where General Plan policies and programs would discourage development (Policies 3.2.B and 3.2.C). Further, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document. While the Housing Element encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, it does not include any specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would degrade the existing visual character of the City.

The Housing Element anticipates land uses that are consistent with the land use designations established by the General Plan. Future residential development projects will be required to comply with City Zoning Code requirements associated with general use and design requirements (Chapter 17.76). The City General Plan would ensure physical, visual, and functional compatibility between residential and other uses, as well as encourage high-quality development in keeping with the desired character of the City. In addition, large housing projects would be subject to the City's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review process, which would include design review. Implementation of the proposed Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts associated with the degradation of the visual character of the City.

d) **Less than Significant.** As discussed under **b-c)** above the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would increase daytime glare or nighttime illumination in the City. Future residential development projects within the City would be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with Zoning Code requirements associated with general use and design regulations (Chapter 17.76). Furthermore, light and glare impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts associated with increased light and glare.

II. AGRICULTURAL 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

Agriculture is the most extensive land use in Glenn County, and the most significant component in the County's economy. Two-thirds of Glenn County's 1,317 square miles are comprised of agricultural croplands and pasture. The City of Orland is surrounded by agricultural uses, which constitute a significant component of the local economy. Agricultural operations within the planning area are primarily hobby farms, meaning that they provide supplemental rather than primary income. Crops include orchards of almonds, walnuts, olives, peaches, and prunes.

Under the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), most of the agricultural farmland surrounding the City is classified as "Prime Farmland", "Farmland of Statewide Importance", and "Unique Farmland". There is also agricultural land classified as "Farmland of Local Importance", which is not considered as valuable as the other three types of farmland, but is of importance to the local economy due to its productivity.

Owners of agricultural lands have opportunities to take advantage of the property tax advantages offered by the Williamson Act (California Land Conservation Act), which reduces such taxes on qualifying agricultural land in exchange for a commitment from the landowner to not develop the land with uses other than those compatible with and supportive of agriculture. There are currently no lands under Williamson Act contract within the Orland Planning Area.

The General Plan contains policies and programs designed to minimize the impacts of development on nearby agricultural areas. Policies include the encouragement of development and redevelopment within the City limits; directing urban development to areas

where agricultural operations are already constrained by non-agricultural uses; addressing potential conflicts within agricultural operations, including the use of buffers; working with the County to establish "Areas of Mutual Concern" and considering standard mitigation measures to reduce impacts to agricultural activities; etc.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less than Significant.** The Housing Element contains policies and programs that encourage more intensive development within the City limits, which would reduce the pressure on developing outside City limits and on agricultural lands. Future housing development would also be subject to other General Plan Land Use and Open Space/Conservation policies and programs, which would minimize impacts on agricultural lands (Policy 4.1.A, Policy 4.1.B, Policy 4.1.C and 4.1.F). Therefore, impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses would be considered to have a less than significant impact.

b) **Less than Significant.** As discussed above, policies and programs within the Housing Element and the City's General Plan would minimize impacts on agricultural lands. Additionally, there are currently no Williamson Act contracted lands within the Orland Planning Area which could result in a conflict. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

c) **Less than Significant**. The placement of non-agricultural uses adjacent to agricultural uses can result in agriculture-urban interface conflicts that inadvertently place growth pressure on agricultural lands to convert to urban uses. These conflicts include inconveniences or discomforts associated with dust, smoke, noise, and odor from agricultural operations, restrictions on agricultural operations (such as pesticide application) along interfaces with urban uses, farm equipment and vehicles using roadways, and trespassing and vandalism on active farms. The proposed Housing Element does not identify specific development. Although the Housing Element does identify the need for increased density as well as the need to change some land use regulations, the project does not involve the construction or expansion of residential development. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Furthermore, General Plan Policy 4.1.F maintains buffer zones around areas of existing and planned agricultural processing activities and does not permit conflicting uses to encroach within the buffer zones. Therefore, impacts associated with changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use would be considered less than significant.

III. 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:	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting:

The City is located within the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which includes the Sacramento Valley and is bounded by the coastal ranges to the west and the Sierra Nevada to the east. The entire air basin is about 200 miles long in a north-south direction and has a maximum width of about 150 miles, although the valley floor averages only about 50 miles in width. The environmental conditions of Glenn County are conducive to potentially adverse air quality conditions. The basin area traps pollutants between two mountain ranges to the east and the west. This problem is exacerbated by a temperature inversion layer that traps air at lower levels below an overlying layer of warmer air. Prevailing winds in the area are from the south and southwest. Sea breezes flow over the San Francisco Bay Area and into the Sacramento Valley, transporting pollutants from the large urban areas. Growth and urbanization in Glenn County have also contributed to an increase in emissions.

Both Federal and State governments have enacted laws mandating the identification of regions which do not meet the ambient air quality standards, and require the development of regional air quality plans to eventually attain the standards. Under the federal Clean Air Act, Glenn County is currently considered to be in attainment or unclassified for all national ambient air quality standards. It is a nonattainment area for the more stringent State ambient air quality

standards for ozone and PM_{10}. The air districts of the Northern Sacramento Air Basin have jointly prepared and adopted a uniform air quality attainment plan addressing ozone and PM_{10}.

The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (GCAPCD) is responsible for local air quality regulation in the Orland region. The GCAPCD's primary responsibility is to regulate stationary sources and develop plans to achieve and maintain air quality standards. To protect public health the GCAPCD has adopted plans to achieve ambient air quality standards. The GCAPCD must continuously monitor its progress for plan implementation and report this effort regularly to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). It must also periodically revise its attainment plans to reflect new conditions and requirements. The GCAPCD tries to exercise a uniform emission control effort that will bring the entire region into compliance with State and federal standards as quickly as possible.

In 1994, the air districts within the NSVAB, including GCAPCD, prepared the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Air Quality Attainment Plan for ozone and PM_{10}. This plan was updated in 1997, 2000, 2003, and again in 2006. Like the preceding plans, the 2006 plan focuses on the adoption and implementation of control measures for stationary sources, area-wide sources, indirect sources, and public information and education programs. The 2006 plan also addresses the effect that pollutant transport has on the NSVAB's ability to meet and attain the state standards. The 2006 plan contains eighteen feasible control measures designed to reduce ozone emissions, in compliance with the goals of California's State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone. GCAPCD has adopted nine of those measures.

Discussion/Conclusion

a) **Less than Significant.** A project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality attainment plan (Air Quality Attainment Plan) if it is inconsistent with the growth assumptions, in terms of population, employment, or regional growth in vehicle miles traveled. These population forecasts are developed, in part, on data obtained from local jurisdictions and projected land uses and population projections identified in community plans. Projects that result in an increase in population growth that is inconsistent with local community plans would be considered inconsistent with the Air Quality Attainment Plan. However, the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Air Quality Attainment Plan is required to be updated every three years. The Attainment Plan states that one reason for this requirement is to update the growth rates of population, industry, and vehicle related emissions. Therefore, the incremental population growth experienced in Orland as a result of the proposed Housing Element would be accounted into the Attainment Plan on a triennial basis, thus maintaining consistency between the population assumptions of the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Air Quality Attainment Plan and the actual population of Orland.

   Certain policies in the Housing Element propose changes to existing land use densities as well as changes to land use regulations. However, those policies do not include any specific development designs or proposals, nor do they grant any entitlements for development. The proposed Housing Element does not identify specific development. Additionally, all future development would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan and Zoning Code. For example, General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element Policy 4.4.B mandates that the City work with the GCAPCD in efforts to maintain air quality standards and to minimize air quality impacts associated with new development. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, impacts associated with

obstructing implementation of the regional air quality attainment plan would be less than significant.

b-c) **Less than Significant.** All ambient air quality standards except State standards for ozone and PM_{10} are met in the Orland area. In 2008, the State ambient standards of ozone were exceeded only twice (sufficient data is lacking to access PM_{10} emissions) (CARB, 2009). Future development of housing units facilitated by the proposed Housing Element could result in an increase in criteria pollutants during both construction and operational activities and could also contribute substantially to the existing nonattainment status of the North Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which includes the City. Construction activities such as excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth could generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would affect local air quality. This is variable depending on the weather, soil conditions, and the amount of activity taking place, as well as the nature of dust control efforts. Likewise, operational air quality impacts are dependent on the types of land uses and mitigation being used.

Future housing projects would be subject to environmental review, which would evaluate potential air quality impacts and require mitigation measures if necessary. Also, housing development would be subject to Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.4.A and 4.4.B, which would minimize impacts.

d) **Less than Significant.** Future housing development within the Orland area, as well as overall development under the General Plan, would have an impact on pollutant levels in the Orland area. However, implementation of the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize impacts: Circulation Element Policies 2.3.C, 2.5.C, 2.5.D, 2.8.A, 2.8.D, 2.8.E, and Program 2.5.C.1; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.4.A and 4.4.B.

e) **Less than Significant.** Housing units facilitated by the proposed Housing Element would be considered sensitive receptors that could be exposed to pollutant concentrations. However, the proposed Housing Element does not include any specific development designs or development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Future residential development would be required to conform to the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Air Quality Attainment Plan described above, and meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and GCAPCD thresholds during both construction and operational activities. Also, development would be subject to the following General Plan policies and programs that would minimize impacts: Land Use Element Policy 1.4.B and Programs 1.2.A.4, 1.4.B.2. These policies and programs ensure buffer areas between incompatible uses. In addition, Open Space Conservation Element Policy 4.3.A provides the City with authority to apply mitigation measures to development projects during grading activities. The proposed Housing Element would have less than significant impacts associated with exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations.

f) **No Impact**. Residential developments are not considered to be an emission source that would result in objectionable odors. No impact would occur.

IV. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

As stated previously, most of the lands within the Orland area have been developed for urban or agricultural uses. The General Plan Background Report indicates that the primary area which has natural vegetation and wildlife is along Stony Creek, which defines the entire northern edge of the Planning Area. As a western Sacramento Valley foothill stream, Stony Creek has a seasonal run-off pattern of high winter flows, and low summer and fall flows, with an average annual precipitation of 15 inches in the lower watershed. Riparian vegetation, including willow,

cottonwood, and valley oak, are located in the low floodplain, while annual grasslands and valley oak are found in the high floodplain and low terraces.

Stony Creek below Black Butte Dam extends approximately 24 miles before its confluence with the Sacramento River. The majority of the adjacent riparian corridor of the creek is privately owned and as such, fishing access is restricted. Stony Creek's streambed has a low gradient and alternates between a meandering single channel and a braided channel. Water temperatures in Stony Creek in the Planning Area become warm in the summer months, providing suitable habitat conditions for many native and introduced (exotic) warm-water species. Flows in Stony Creek can diminish to extremely low levels during the summer months, resulting in segmented stream habitats.

The majority of the Stony Creek area is designated Open Space/Resource Conservation under the General Plan, which helps to maintain habitats. Additionally, the floodplain area of Stony Creek is subject to General Plan policies that would restrict development within the floodplain. The General Plan also contains policies and programs designed to avoid or minimize impacts on biological resources.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less Than Significant**. Future residential development projects consistent with the 2009 Housing Element could result in impacts to biological resources. Site-specific field studies are generally required to search for special-status species and to determine whether suitable habitat for any special-status species occurs on or near a study area. The proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document. While it encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, it does not include any specific development designs or development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Additionally, most housing development would take place away from Stony Creek, which is the main source of wildlife in the area. As stated previously, the Stony Creek area is within the 100-year floodplain, where development is discouraged by General Plan policies and programs (Policies 3.2.B and 3.2.C). In addition, future projects would be subject to Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.3.A, 4.3.B, 4.3.C, and 4.3.D, which would reduce potential impacts on special-status species to a level that is less than significant by requiring development to conduct site-specific field studies to determine the potential for the occurrence of protected plant and wildlife species within the development area and if the presence of protected species are determined to be likely prepare the required mitigation.

   There is a potential for valley elderberry bushes to be located on some possible future housing sites. These bushes provide habitat for the listed valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Although such bushes would not commonly be found on most housing sites, impacts on these bushes would be potentially significant. However, as stated previously, housing projects would be subject to environmental review. If the review determines that potential impacts on elderberry bushes may occur, mitigation measures would be implemented on a case-by-case basis to reduce or eliminate such impacts.

b–c) **Less than Significant.** The most significant riparian habitats and wetland areas are located along Stony and Hambright Creeks. As discussed previously, future housing development would be discouraged in these areas, since they are within the 100-year floodplain. Future residential development within the City of Orland outside of the floodplain could result in adverse impacts to sensitive natural communities such as riparian habitat and federally protected wetlands. However, as discussed under a) above, the proposed Housing

Element does not include any specific development designs or development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. While the 2009 Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities as well as changes to land use regulations, future residential development projects will be required to comply with the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (Policies 4.3.C and 4.3.D). In addition, General Plan Program 4.5.A.3 ensures that new development has a minimal impact on natural drainage channels. Therefore, adverse impacts to federally protected wetlands and riparian resources would be less than significant.

d) **Less than Significant.** As discussed under a) above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document and, while it proposes changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not include any site-specific designs or development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. The most significant wildlife migratory corridors and nursery sites in the area are located along Stony and Hambright Creeks. As previously discussed, future development would be discouraged in these areas, since they are located within the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, housing development would be subject to the following General Plan policies that would minimize impacts: Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.3.A, 4.3.B, 4.3.C, 4.3.D. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) **Less than Significant**. As discussed under a–d) above, the proposed Housing Element does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would affect biological resources. Additionally, Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.3.A and 4.3.B protect biological resources within the City. Therefore, the proposed Housing Element would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f) **No Impact**. No habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other habitat conservation plans apply to the Orland area. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with any such plans.

V. 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 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

Prior to the arrival of Euroamericans in the region, California was inhabited by groups of Native Americans speaking more than 100 different languages and occupying a variety of ecological settings. Nomlaki, a division of the Wintu, occupied a territory that extended from the vicinity of Cottonwood Creek in the north to Glenn County in the south and from the crest of the Coast Range in the west past the Sacramento River in the east (Goldschmidt 1978). Nomlaki exploited a wide variety of seasonally available resources that were distributed across the landscape. Plant resources used by Nomlaki include acorns, seeds, tubers, clover, pine nuts, berries, and mushrooms. Plant resources were primarily gathered, stored, and prepared by women. Animal resources used by Nomlaki include deer, elk, antelope, rabbit, squirrel, and rat. Anadromous and other fish were also important food resources. Fish were caught by hand, net, weir, or trap. Men hunted animal resources either individually or in groups.

Nomlaki were divided into local groups centered in a village or *kewel*. A typical village consisted of a chieftain's house, family houses surrounding the chieftain's house, a dance house, and a menstrual hut that was placed on the side of the village opposite the water source. Population size varied among villages ranging from 25 inhabitants to over 200 occupying 5 to 50 family houses. Group activities included smoking, storytelling, dancing, and gambling. The position of chieftain *(cabatu)* was hereditary, although men in a village could voice an opinion regarding a change in succession of a chieftain. The chief's status derived from his personal qualifications and from his wealth.

Euroamerican contact with Native American groups living in the Central Valley of California began during the last half of the eighteenth century. At this time, the attention of Spanish missionaries shifted away from the coast, and its dwindling Native American population, to the conversion and missionization of interior populations. Indeed, Luis Argüello led an early expedition into the Glenn County area in 1821.

The end of the Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 marked the beginning of the American period (ca. 1848-Present) in California history.

Regardless of a change in economic focus, the plight of Native American populations remained, at best, relatively poor. The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed an ongoing and growing immigration of Euroamericans into the area, an influx also accompanied by regional cultural and economic changes. These changes are highlighted by the development of towns and businesses associated with either gold mining or agriculture and a dramatic decline of Native American culture and people.

Glenn County, named after Dr. Hugh J. Glenn, was established in 1891 subsequent to its separation from Colusa County. Glenn came to California in 1849 and originally worked a mining claim. Glenn, however, soon became interested in agriculture and purchased large tracts of land for the production of wheat. He farmed 55,000 acres of land and became known as the "Wheat King" before his death in 1883.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 presents guidance on evaluating the significance of impacts on historically significant resources and on mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–d) **Less than Significant**. Future residential development within the City could conflict with existing known cultural and historical resources in the City. In addition to "known" resource areas, there is the potential that there are undiscovered paleontological and archeological resources that would be encountered and potentially impacted by future construction activities. These resources could include human remains located outside of cemeteries. The Housing Element is a policy-level document. While the Housing Element encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, it does not include any specific development designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would adversely affect archaeological, paleontological, or historic resources. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including Land Use Element Policy 1.1.B. Additionally, Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, and historic resources, as well as human remains, are considered less than significant.

VI. 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting:

The General Plan Background Report states that there are three major soils types in the Orland Planning Area: Riverwash, Orland Loam, and Cortina Loam. Riverwash consists of stratified deposits of sand and gravel with low slopes, and occurs along drainage ways, on sand and gravel bars of major active streams, and in the channels of intermittent creeks. The Orland loam and Cortina loam soils are related. Most of the soils on more recent alluvial fans and floodways generally consist of shallow to deep, well-drained to excessively-drained gravelly and non-

gravelly stratified material. There is not a significant difference in the soils between different parts of the Planning Area that would be an overriding consideration for recommendation of development in one area or another.

Soils within the Planning Area are essentially gravelly. Therefore, expansive soils that are typically associated with clay soils are not common, except west of Interstate 5. There is a low potential for soil erosion within the Planning Area due to the flat topography. However, soils that are stripped of vegetation and exposed to wind or precipitation can be expected to erode.

The Planning Area is expected to experience few seismic or geologic hazards. Ground shaking from earthquakes outside the Planning Area may be experienced, but the probability of structural damage from these events is low. Given the existence of shallow groundwater and alluvial soils, liquefaction is a possibility. However, liquefaction would require the occurrence of high-intensity ground shaking, the probability of which is considered low. Subsidence may occur if there is an overdraft of groundwater resources. To date, no subsidence has been reported in the area, and groundwater has continually recharged.

The Safety Element of the updated General Plan addresses some of the issues related to seismic and geologic hazards. Policies and programs include requiring a soils reports within areas of identified soils limitations at the City's discretion, constructing public buildings to seismic safety standards, encouraging seismic improvements to existing buildings and considering funding options to support such improvements, and requiring a report evaluating the potential for subsidence associated with projects involving water, gas and oil extraction. The Open Space and Conservation Element has policies and programs that would require a grading and erosion control plan with tentative maps, and adherence to Regional Water Quality Control Board discharge standards to surface waters.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a)

i-iv) **Less than Significant.** There are no Alquist-Priolo earthquake zones in the Orland area. Some ground shaking could potentially be experienced, due mainly to earthquakes on faults outside Glenn County. Because nearby faults have not been active, the likelihood of an earthquake originating from them is considered low, and the likelihood of structural damage resulting from ground shaking is also considered low. Liquefaction hazards would occur mainly in areas of wet soils, primarily near Stony and Hambright Creeks. Since the terrain in Orland is flat, the area has no potential for landslides.

The Housing Element includes policies and implementation measures designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing which could increase exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards, including rupture of a fault, strong seismic shaking, and seismic-related ground failure. However, the Housing Element is a policy-level document that encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels rather than identifying any specific designs or development proposals. While the Housing Element does propose changes to land use densities and regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal.

In addition, future residential development projects would be required to comply with the General Plan Safety Element Policy 3.4.A and Programs 3.4.A.1, 3.4.A.2, 3.4.A.3, and 3.4.A.4 to minimize the potential for seismic safety impacts. For example, Program 3.4.A.1 requires that a soils report, prepared by a licensed soils engineer, be required for all proposed development projects within areas of identified soils limitations such as areas with shrink/swell and/or liquefaction potential. In addition, all future residential developments would be required to conform to Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements that are intended to be sufficient to prevent significant damage from ground shaking during seismic events. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards would be considered less than significant.

b) **Less than Significant**. Future construction within the City would result in the moving and grading of topsoil, which would lead to disturbed soils that are more likely to suffer from erosion from a variety of sources, such as wind and water. As discussed under a) above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not propose any specific development and does not directly result in adverse impacts associated with substantial loss of topsoil or erosion. Any future residential developments would be subject to the following General Plan policies and programs that would minimize soil erosion impacts. For example, Safety Element Policy 3.4.A, which considers the potential for expansive soils and earthquake related hazards when reviewing applications for development, and Program 3.4.A.1, described above. In addition, housing construction on sites of one acre or more would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process. Part of the NPDES process typically involves the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that incorporates best management practices (BMPs) that control runoff and minimize erosion impacts.

c) **Less than Significant.** As described above, soils within the Orland area are generally stable in their composition. In addition, future housing development would be subject to Safety Element Policies 3.4.A and 3.4.B and Program 3.4.A.1, which would minimize impacts.

d) **Less than Significant.** As described above, soils in the Orland area are generally gravelly in composition, and therefore not likely to contain expansive soils. The General Plan Background Report states that the majority of expansive soils in the Orland area are west of Interstate 5. Under the City of Orland Land Development Standards, Section II.A, a soils report shall be prepared for all subdivisions for which a final map is filed, unless waived in writing by the City Engineer. The soils report must contain definitive information regarding soil types, expansive characteristics, estimated load bearing capacity, and other soil characteristics which could potentially affect the stability of support structures. In addition, future housing development would be subject to Safety Element Policy 3.4.A and Program 3.4.A.1, which would minimize impacts.

e) **Less than Significant.** The Housing Element includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing. It is expected that the majority of future housing development in Orland would be connected to the City's sewer system. Housing development would be subject to Open Space and Conservation Element Policy 4.7.A, which ensures that sufficient wastewater treatment capacity is available to serve anticipated growth, which would minimize impacts.

VII. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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. According to California Health and Safety Code Section 25501(o), "Hazardous material" means any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material that a handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Searches of the Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor database (DTSC, 2009) and the State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker database (SWRCB, 2009) identified seven hazardous material sites in Orland that are associated with a hazardous material related release or occurrence. Most of these sites are listed for having leaking underground tanks. New State laws regulating the installation of underground tanks may have led to many of these sites being cleaned up. Interstate 5 and State Route 32 are roadways that vehicles transporting hazardous materials use, raising concerns about accidents. Again, the transport of hazardous materials is strictly regulated by State and federal agencies.

Several policies and programs in the General Plan address issues related to hazards and hazardous materials. One of these policies involves working with the County to manage hazardous wastes. Programs associated with this policy include coordination of hazardous waste programs with the County Waste Management Plan and the County Emergency Operations Plan, reference of projects located on sites with potentially hazardous materials to the County Health Department to ensure compliance with appropriate regulations, and requirement of a conditional use permit for land uses involving hazardous substances that are located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Since most of the City is surrounded by agricultural lands, no unique or significant fire hazards are considered to exist at the rural/urban interface. Vacant lots within the City are a potential source of fires, but the fires would be localized in nature and not likely to spread over a wide area. Fire protection services are readily available within the City.

The nearest airport to Orland is Orland Airport, located southeast of the City off County Road 28. The airport is located in a predominantly rural area, away from significant urban concentrations. Therefore, potential hazards associated with the airport are limited.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less than Significant.** Residential subdivisions and multifamily complexes do not generate a demand for hazardous materials, except for household and lawn/garden products that are relatively small in quantity. Some hazardous materials would be used in housing project construction. Roadway construction typically uses hot mix asphalt, which is composed of aggregate and asphalt cement, a viscous petroleum product. Hot mix asphalt cools rapidly and hardens once applied, and the low potential fire hazard associated with this material would be eliminated once it hardens. The only other potentially hazardous materials that would be used during project construction would be motor vehicle fuels and oils, which would present a minor hazard, and only if spillage occurs (see below). Use of these materials would cease once project construction is completed.

b) **Less than Significant.** Activities associated with the construction of residences typically include refueling and minor maintenance of construction equipment on location, 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. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential hazardous material impacts: Circulation Element Policies 2.1.B, 2.2.G, 2.2.H; Safety Element Policies 3.1.B, 3.5.A, 3.5.B and Programs 3.5.A.1, 3.5.A.2, 3.5.A.3. For example, Program 3.5.A.2 refers all permits for new projects located on sites identified by the State as having or containing likely hazardous substances or materials to the Glenn County Health Department to ensure compliance with applicable State and local regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Less than Significant.** As discussed previously, future housing projects would not generate any hazardous material use outside of household chemicals. No hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous materials would be generated by housing development. Furthermore, General Plan Program 3.5.A.3 states that any use which uses or manufactures hazardous substances within one-quarter miles of any existing or proposed school shall only be permitted when authorized by a conditional use permit, with ample assurances that the students will not be placed in a hazardous environment.

d) **Less than Significant.** As discussed above, the seven listed Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List ("Cortese List") sites in Orland are generally located within commercial or industrial lands. Residential development would generally not occur on these lands. Housing projects would be subject to environmental review. If the review determined that a project is located on or adjacent to a Cortese List site, appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Each business in Glenn County that handles, uses, generates or stores hazardous materials is required to comply with State and Federal community right-to-know laws. The Glenn County Air Pollution Control District (GCAPCD), which is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for all jurisdictions and unincorporated areas within Glenn County, which includes Orland, issues permits to and conducts inspections of businesses that use, store, or handle quantities of hazardous materials and/or waste greater than or equal to 55 gallons, 500 pounds, or 200 cubic feet of a compressed gas at any time. The GCAPCD is responsible for regulating hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, underground storage tank facilities, above ground storage tanks, and stationary sources handling regulated substances. The GCAPCD also provides readily available information regarding the location, type and health risks of hazardous materials to emergency response personnel, authorized government officials, and the public. These requirements are found in California Health & Safety Code (CHSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Sections 25500-25520; California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 19, Chapter 2, Sub-chapter 3, Article 4, Sections 2729-2734, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), EPA (SARA, Title III). In addition, future housing projects would be subject to Safety Element Policy 3.5.A and Program 3.5.A.2, which would also minimize potential impacts.

e) **Less than Significant.** As discussed above, Orland Airport is located in a predominantly rural area, away from significant urban concentrations. The General Plan Land Use Diagram indicates that future planned residential development would not be located within the flight path of Orland Airport. Also, future housing projects would be subject to Land Use Element Policy 1.4.B, which seeks to avoid development which results in land use incompatibility and Program 1.4.B.2, which mandates the incorporation of design

buffers between potentially incompatible land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) **No Impact.** There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site.

g) **Less than Significant.** The Safety Element of the Orland General Plan describes the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and evacuation routes in Orland. Although standard evacuation routes have not been designated within Glenn County or the City of Orland, it is likely that CALTRANS facilities such as Highway 32 and Interstate 5 would be utilized to evacuate the community in an emergency, according to the General Plan. Additionally, major County roads, such as Sixth Street (County Road 99) and South Street are also suited for evacuation depending on the location of the emergency. Future housing development may occur along identified evacuation routes, and construction activities may hinder the smooth flow of traffic along these routes. Impacts to these routes would be identified on a case-by-case basis as part of the individual reviews of the future projects, and mitigation measures would be implemented. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential emergency evacuation impacts: Circulation Element Policies 2.2.A, 2.3.C, 2.4.B; Safety Element Policy 3.6.A and Programs 3.6.A.1, 3.6.A.2. Additionally, the City's Land Division Standards and Improvement Standards require two accesses for subdivisions as well as an access for emergency vehicles.

h) **Less than Significant.** The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Natural Hazard Disclosure (Fire) map shows that the City does not contain any land designated as "Wildland Area That May Contain Substantial Forest Fire Risks and Hazards" or as a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone – AB 337". Additionally, most of the lands in the Orland area are agricultural in nature or already developed. The only areas in Orland which would be at significant risk for wild fires are located along Stony and Hambright Creeks, within which development would not occur as discussed previously. Additionally, adherence to Safety Element Policies 3.3.A, 3.3.B and Programs 3.3.A.1, 3.3.A.2, 3.3.A.3, 3.3.A.4, 3.3.A.5 would significantly reduce the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

VIII. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY **Would the project:**	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

Stony and Hambright Creeks are the main natural surface water features in the Planning Area. The Tehama-Colusa Canal, which supplies irrigation water to the western Sacramento Valley, is located along the eastern boundary of the Planning Area, and several smaller manmade channels traverse the region. Groundwater is the primary source of domestic water supply in the Planning Area. The local aquifer is recharged by Stony Creek, winter precipitation and percolation water applied during agricultural operations. While groundwater levels drop seasonally and during drought years, the aquifer has historically recharged.

The groundwater basin underlying the project area is referred to as the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin. This 5,000 square mile groundwater basin extends from Red Bluff south to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, to the North Coast Range on the west, and east to the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Ranges. A thick sequence of sedimentary materials underlying the valley floor contain fresh groundwater to a depth of about 400' near Orland in the northern portion of the Glenn County region and 800' to 1200' in the Colusa Subbasin south of the City of Willows (Glenn County, 1993). The groundwater used by the City of Orland is extracted from the Colusa Subbasin.

The storage capacity of the subbasin was projected based on estimates of specific yield for the Sacramento Valley as developed in Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006). The estimated storage capacity to a depth of 200 feet is approximately 13,025,887 acre-feet. Estimates of groundwater extraction for the Colusa Subbasin are based on surveys conducted by the California Department of Water Resources during 1993, 1994, and 1999. Surveys included land use and sources of water. Estimates of groundwater extraction for agricultural, municipal and industrial, and environmental wetland uses are 310,000; 14,000; and 22,000 acre-feet, respectively. Deep percolation from applied water is estimated to be 64,000 acre-feet. The Department of Water Resources has not identified the Colusa Subbasin as overdrafted in its DWR Bulletin 118. Also, there has been no indication of any existing or anticipated overdraft condition in studies prepared by other entities (DWR, 2006).

Numerous agricultural water suppliers overlay the Colusa Subbasin. As a result of agricultural and domestic groundwater use within the subbasin, groundwater levels vary seasonally. Generally, groundwater level data show an average seasonal fluctuation of approximately 5 feet for normal and dry years.

Despite seasonal variations, long-term groundwater levels of the Colusa Subbasin have remained relatively constant. This condition is likely the result of a combination of recharge from the river and surrounding mountains, as well as deep percolation of applied irrigation water from agricultural practices and rainfall throughout the Colusa Subbasin. A review of hydrographs for

long-term comparison of spring-to-spring groundwater levels indicated a slight decline in groundwater levels associated with the 1976-77 and 1987-94 droughts, followed by recovery to pre-drought conditions of the early 1970s and 1980s. Some wells increased in levels beyond the pre-drought conditions of the 1970s during the wet season of the early 1980s. Generally, groundwater level data show an average seasonal fluctuation of approximately 5 feet for normal and dry years. Overall, there does not appear to be any increasing or decreasing trends in groundwater levels.

Water quality in Orland is generally good. Potential sources of ground water contamination include chemicals from agricultural operations, industrial sources, and improperly installed septic systems. Surface water quality is regulated through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), a federal program administered locally by the state Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Local and State programs address protection of surface and ground waters from contamination from agricultural operations. The Glenn County Health Department regulates the installation of wells and individual septic systems.

Flood hazard areas within the Orland vicinity are mainly confined to the areas adjacent to Stony Creek and Hambright Creek, although the northwestern and northeastern corners of the City are subject to 500-year flood events. Most of the Planning Area lies within the dam inundation area of Black Butte Reservoir - the area that would be expected to flood if Black Butte Dam failed. Dam failure is a rare event, and the dam inundation map drawn for Black Butte Reservoir is used mainly to develop emergency plans.

Seiches, or waves generated in bodies of water, usually by seismic events, similar to the back-and-forth sloshing of water in a tub, could possibly occur in swimming pools and water tanks; however, they also do not pose a serious threat to the Orland area since the threat of a seiche is limited. Orland is not at risk from tsunami due to its inland location. Finally, the Orland area is also not at risk of mudflows due to its relatively flat topography and distance from any hillsides.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less than Significant.** The proposed Housing Element encourages the development of a range of housing types at varying affordability levels within Orland. Future residential development within the City could result in both construction and operational impacts to water quality and discharge standards. Potential operational impacts include the use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides to maintain lawns, as well as motor vehicle operation and maintenance. Potential construction impacts include grading and vegetation removal activities that would result in the exposure of raw soil materials to the natural elements (wind, rain, etc.). However, the purpose of the proposed Housing Element is to identify the policies and programs which the City will implement to ensure that housing in Orland is affordable, safe, and decent. The proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific design or development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Therefore, identification and analysis of water quality impacts associated with the proposed Housing Element would be speculative at this time.

Residential projects are typically not subject to waste discharge requirements, as they are not significant dischargers of pollutants. They also do not significantly affect water quality, except for runoff that may contain contaminants from landscaping or roadways (see below). The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential water quality impacts: Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.5.A, 4.5.B, 4.6.A and Programs 4.5.A.1, 4.5.A.2, 4.5.B.1, 4.5.B.2, 4.5.B.3, 4.6.A.1, 4.6.A.2. For example, Policy

4.5.A ensures that new development complies with State and Federal regulations and standards in order to maintain and improve water quality. Program 4.5.A.1 requires new development to adhere to Regional Water Quality Control Board discharge standards and Program 4.5.A.2 require that a grading and erosion control plan be submitted and standard Regional Water Quality Control Board best management practices are incorporated in these plans. Therefore, water quality and waste discharge impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Less than Significant.** Most future residential projects would be connected to the City's water system. Some wells may be drilled as part of some larger projects, but they would mainly be used to ensure adequate fire flows. As previously mentioned, The Department of Water Resources has not identified the Colusa Subbasin as overdrafted in its DWR Bulletin 118. Also, there has been no indication of any existing or anticipated overdraft condition in studies prepared by other entities (DWR, 2006). The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential groundwater impacts: Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.5.C, 4.6.B and Programs 4.5.B.1, 4.6.B.1.

c) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, construction sites one acre or greater would be subject to the NPDES permit process, which typically would require Best Management Practices in the control of erosion. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential erosion impacts: Safety Element Policy 3.4.A and Program 3.4.A.1; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.5.A, 4.5.B and Programs 4.5.A.1, 4.5.A.2, 4.5.A.3, 4.5.B.1.

d) **Less than Significant.** Typically, housing projects create additional impervious surfaces, which generate additional runoff. Depending on the size of the project, the additional runoff could potentially increase likelihood of localized flooding, if there is no adequate drainage system. Housing projects are subject to environmental review, which would determine if there are runoff and drainage issues and if mitigation for drainage is required. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential drainage impacts: Safety Element Policies 3.2.A, 3.2.B and Programs 3.2.A.1, 3.2.A.2; Open Space and Conservation Element Program 4.4.B.1.

e) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in d) above, impacts of a project on runoff and drainage would be evaluated as part of a project-specific environmental review. Runoff from newly developed residential subdivisions may contain elevated levels of contaminants typically associated with urban runoff, including motor vehicle fluids, metals, and lawn and garden products. The quantity of these contaminants would be relatively small, and they would be diluted by the runoff. The highest concentration of such contaminants would occur in runoff from the first rainstorm after the dry season, when road deposits that accumulated over the summer would be washed off the streets. Runoff from subsequent rainstorms would carry smaller concentrations.

The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential drainage and runoff impacts: Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Safety Element Policy 3.2.A and Programs 3.2.A.1, 3.2.A.2, 3.2.A.3; Open Space and Conservation Element Programs 4.4.A.3, 4.4.B.1.

f) **Less than Significant.** There are no anticipated adverse impacts on water quality associated with the Housing Element, other than those identified above.

g) **Less than Significant.** Most areas in which future residential development is allowed by the Orland General Plan are located outside the identified 100-year floodplains, which are around Stony and Hambright Creeks. General Plan policies and programs would discourage residential development within these floodplains. These policies and programs are as follows: Safety Element Policies 3.2.A, 3.2.B, 3.2.C and Program 3.2.A.1; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.2.A, 4.2.C and Programs 4.4.A.3, 4.4.B.1. For example Policy 3.2.B states that *n*ew development shall not be approved in areas which are subject to flooding without prior review and approval of plans for improvements which provide a minimum flood protection level equal to the 100 year occurrence storm event. Policy 3.2.C states that development of habitable or commercial structures within the 100-year floodplain must be completely mitigated through proper design.

h) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in g) above, General Plan policies and programs would discourage development within the 100-year floodplain.

i) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in g) above, General Plan policies and programs would discourage development within the 100-year floodplain. The entire City of Orland is located within the dam inundation area for Black Butte Dam. However, inundation would not occur in the area until approximately two hours after dam failure, which would allow some time for emergency evacuations.

j) **Less than Significant.** The City of Orland is not located near a volcano or the coastline; therefore, there would be no mudflow or tsunami hazards. There are no large bodies of water located near Orland, so no seiche hazards are present.

IX. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

The proposed Housing Element would become a part of the City of Orland General Plan. The General Plan provides the fundamental guidelines for land use development in the Orland area. The General Plan includes goals, objectives, and policies concerning land development. The objectives and policies provided in the General Plan are designed to mitigate potentially adverse effects of development during the planning period. The General Plan was adopted by the City in 2003, although it is currently involved in a comprehensive revision and update.

The Orland Zoning Ordinance acts as one of the implementing tools for the General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance (Orland Municipal Code, Title 17) provides for consistency of land use regulations with the General Plan. Under the Zoning Ordinance, land use zoning districts are established. Each district delineates allowable land uses and procedures necessary to establish an individual land use. There are also development requirements for each zoning district, including but not limited to minimum lot sizes, maximum building heights and setbacks. The City adopted an update of the Zoning Ordinance in 2003. The City is currently working on a Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update to incorporate new environmental and housing mandates (i.e. SB 2).

The Orland Subdivision Ordinance (Orland Municipal Code, Title 16) also acts to implement the General Plan along with the City's updated and adopted Land Division Standards and Improvement Standards. This ordinance contains standards, regulations and procedures for the subdivision of land, as authorized and directed by the state Subdivision Map Act and other applicable provisions of law. The Subdivision Ordinance sets forth procedures for the submittal of subdivision maps. It also lists improvements that must be installed (e.g., streets, sidewalks, water and sewer lines) and the general design standards for the subdivided area.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–b) **Less than Significant**. The Housing Element is consistent with the land uses envisioned in the General Plan and would not remove policies that currently protect environmental

resources. The Housing Element is a policy-level document that encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels. The proposed Housing Element does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. The Housing Element anticipates land uses that are consistent with the land use designations established by the General Plan Land Use Element. Future residential development projects will require compliance with General Plan policies related to land use and Zoning Ordinance requirements associated with zoning districts, allowable uses, and development standards. While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan and Municipal Code. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would ensure the necessary consistency: Land Use Element Policies 1.1.A, 1.2.A and Programs 1.1.A.1, 1.1.A.2, 1.1.A.3, 1.1.A.4, 1.2.A.1, 1.2.A.2, 1.2.A.3, 1.2.A.5, 1.3.A.1; Circulation Element Policies 2.4.A, 2.4.C. With the application of the above noted policies and programs, the impacts of the Housing Element on land use and planning would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant**. As discussed previously, the City of Orland does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur. In addition, Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.2.C and 4.2.D would cover any biological resources affected by those plans. Impacts would be less than significant.

X. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting:

According to the General Plan Background Report, the only significant mineral resources within the Planning Area are aggregate deposits along Stony Creek. The state Division of Mines and Geology (now the California Geological Survey) classified these deposits as MRZ-2a (marginal reserves).

To protect valuable mineral resources in California, the State Legislature has adopted the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA), which includes a process called "classification-designation." The purpose of this process is to provide local agencies with information about the location, need and importance of various mineral resources within their jurisdiction, and to ensure this information is used in local land use decisions. The first mineral commodity which has been researched and designated by the State in each county is "construction aggregate," which includes sand, gravel and crushed rock. Currently, there are two gravel extraction facilities in operation along Stony Creek that are within or adjacent to the Planning Area. All operations are subject to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) and have prepared reclamation plans.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–b) **No Impact**. The Orland General Plan does not identify any locally-important mineral resource recovery sites. Additionally, residential development would not be planned in any mineral resource area. Future housing projects would be subject to Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.2.A, 4.2.B, and Programs 4.2.B.1, 4.2.B.2, and 4.2.B.3. With the application of the above noted policies and programs, the impacts of the Housing Element on mineral resources would cause no impacts to occur.

XI. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

The major noise sources in the City are vehicular traffic on I-5, State Route 32, and local traffic on City Streets, with Sixth Street and South Street being the most significant. There is some aircraft noise generation, although the Orland Airport is located southeast of the City, away from significant urban concentrations, and thus creates few significant noise levels to existing urban areas.

Noise sources associated with service commercial uses such as automotive repair facilities, wrecking yards, tire installation centers, car washes, loading docks, etc., are found at various locations within the City. The noise emissions of these types of uses are dependent on many factors, and are therefore difficult to quantify precisely. There are also several park and school uses within the City. Noise generated by these uses depends on the age and number of people utilizing the respective facility and the types of activities they are engaged in. School playing field activities tend to generate more noise than those of neighborhood parks, as the intensity of school playground usage tends to be higher. At a distance of 100 feet from an elementary

school playground being used by 100 students, average and maximum noise levels of 60 and 75 dB, respectively, can be expected.

The General Plan includes a Noise Element that contains policies and programs designed to reduce the potential noise impacts of future development. Among them are interior and exterior noise level standards for noise-sensitive areas of new uses affected by transportation and non-transportation noise sources, and requirements that mitigation measures be implemented if these noise level standards are exceeded. Also, to reduce impacts on noise-sensitive land uses, construction activities would be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm unless the City grants an exemption, and internal combustion engines used in construction activities would be muffled according to manufacturer's requirements. General Plan Policy 5.I.J currently exempts construction activities from noise standards.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–d) **Less Than Significant**. The proposed Housing Element encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels. Housing is not considered a major source of noise in the City, but placing housing adjacent to major sources of noise could expose people to temporary or permanent noise levels in excess of standards established in the City General Plan. However, as stated previously, the Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Future residential development projects will be required to comply with General Plan policies and implementation programs related to noise and vibration standards (Noise Element Policies 5.1.A, 5.1.B, 5.1.D, 5.1.F, 5.1.G, 5.1.H, and Program 5.1.F.1, as well as Land Use Element Policy 1.4.B).

While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan and Municipal Code. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, adverse impacts related to a temporary or permanent increase in noise levels would be less than significant.

e–f) **Less than Significant.** As discussed under a–d) above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would expose people to excessive noise levels. Future development projects would be subject to the General Plan regarding noise sources and would require compliance with Noise Element Policies 5.1.A through 5.1.L. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XII. 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting:

The City of Orland has grown steadily in the past few decades. The population in Orland increased by approximately 24 percent from 5,052 in 1990 to 6,281 in 2000, according to the US Census. The California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates the City's 2008 population to be 7,353 persons, which represents an additional 17 percent growth rate from 2000's population. The existing General Plan projected Orland's future population based upon historic growth rates ranging from 1.8 percent to 2.6 percent. The projection estimated that the population in the Orland area would be from 8,974 to 10,495 by 2020. The projected population increase of 2,693 to 4,214 represents an increase of approximately 135 to 210 persons per year, a percentage increase of 1.8-2.6 percent per year. The current General Plan can accommodate development for a population of 21,000. However, the General Plan is currently undergoing a comprehensive update in order to reflect upon changing conditions and issues, and to provide a direction for the future growth of the City in the next 15 to 20 years.

The Land Use Diagram in the current General Plan designates land uses within the Planning Area. Within the existing City limits, land is designated for Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential. Outside the City limits, residential land is designated Low Density Residential or Residential Estates.

Displacement of population would only occur in limited situations where dilapidated housing may be removed. Determining the percentage of units built prior to 1970 provides an estimate of major rehabilitation or replacement need. One can also assume that homes built prior to 1980 may also have rehabilitation needs. According to the US Census, approximately 43 percent of the units were built before 1970. An additional 20 percent of units were built between 1970 and 1980, totaling 63 percent of homes that likely require rehabilitation or replacement depending on the level of maintenance the units have had. In recent years, the City has experienced growth that has added new homes to the housing stock. Building officials estimate that approximately 7.6 percent (based on the last Housing Element) of the City's total housing stock is substandard enough to warrant replacement.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less Than Significant**. The proposed Housing Element contains housing goals intended to encourage housing to meet the City's affordable housing needs and would therefore accommodate growth rather than induce it. Furthermore, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels. It does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would induce population growth. Future residential development projects will require compliance with General Plan policies related to population growth in the City.

While the Housing Element does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses, it does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations. For example, Housing Element Program HE-2.A could increase the number of sites available for medium- and high-density residential development than is currently accommodated under the existing General Plan designations, as discussed in the General Plan. However, actions taken to implement this program would be subject to environmental review for potential adverse impacts, and mitigation measures would be implemented if appropriate. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan Land Use Element Policies 1.1.A, 1.2.A; Circulation Element Policy 2.8.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.1.A and 4.1.B; as well as the City's Zoning Ordinance. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, growth-inducing impacts would be less than significant.

b–c) ***No Impact***. The proposed Housing Element encourages the provision and preservation of a range of housing types and affordability levels to meet the City's housing needs. Implementation of the Housing Element would not displace or decrease housing units in the City. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES **Would the project result in:**	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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**:**				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

Fire protection services within Orland are provided by the Orland Volunteer Fire Department. The City Department has a mutual aid agreement with the Orland Rural Fire District which is a separate department that provides fire protection services to Orland's surrounding unincorporated area. Both of these fire protection services are staffed by volunteers. Training, equipment, and other funding is provided by the City's General Fund. The Department provides services in the form of fire emergency response, medical emergency response, and disaster aid. The Department service area is within the Orland City limits.

The City of Orland Police Department provides police protection services within the City of Orland. The main station is located at 817 Fourth Street. The Police Department office is open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, except holidays. During weekends and at night, services are provided by the Glenn County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol and emergency dispatch services to the City. The Orland Police Department currently has 16 employees, comprising one sworn community service officer, three non-sworn support employees, two sergeants, nine patrol officers, and one chief. The Police Department uses five vehicles for its services.

The Orland Unified School District offers school services from elementary to high school levels. Butte Community College has established a learning center in the City. The Orland Free Library, located on Mill Street, is operated by the City.

Fire and police services are paid for from the City's General Fund, as are library and park services. Money for parks is also provided by proceeds from the sale of state bonds explicitly sold for such purposes. Schools receive funds from local property taxes and various state and federal funding sources, as well as proceeds from State and local bond measures as they are available.

The City has the authority to impose development impact fees on future development to pay for construction of specified public facilities that may be needed (Orland Municipal Code Chapter 15.48). The Orland Unified School District imposes impact fees on new development to pay for new school facilities.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–b) **Less than Significant**. The proposed Housing Element includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet the City's affordable housing needs. For example, Program HE-2.A of the Housing Element proposes to increase the number of sites available for medium- and high-density residential development. Subsequent development projects could result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection due to regulatory changes resulting in increased population densities. However, as discussed previously, the Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan Circulation Element Policy 2.2.I; Safety Element Policies 3.1.A, 3.3.A, and 3.3.B, and Programs 3.3.A.1 through 3.3.A.5.

c) **Less than Significant.** Future housing projects would increase demand for school facilities and services. The Orland Unified School District imposes development fees on new residential construction, the proceeds from which would be used for the construction of new school facilities. The impact fees are intended to offset the potential impact such development would have on school facilities. Since the amount of residential square footage to be constructed is not known, it cannot be determined how much future projects would pay in impact fees, or if the amount would be sufficient to finance any necessary projects to accommodate the additional students that are generated. However, under Government Code Section 65996(b), as amended by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the payment of impact fees is to be considered full and adequate mitigation for potential impacts on schools, notwithstanding the provisions of CEQA.

d) **Less than Significant.** Future housing projects would be subject to environmental review, which would evaluate potential impacts on park services and require mitigation measures if necessary. Also, housing development would be subject to the following General Plan policies and programs that would minimize impacts: Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.7.A, 4.7.B, 4.7.C, 4.7.D and Programs 4.7.B.2, 4.7.B.4. Impacts to parks are considered less than significant.

e) **Less than Significant.** As discussed previously, future housing projects would be subject to environmental review, which would evaluate potential impacts on other public services and require mitigation measures if necessary. Also, housing development would be subject to the following General Plan policies and programs that would minimize impacts: Land Use Element Policy 1.1.C. Therefore, impacts associated with an increased demand for public services would be less than significant.

XIV. RECREATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

According to the General Plan, the City of Orland provides approximately 53 acres of parks and recreational services at five parks. These parks provide a variety of recreational facilities, including softball and baseball fields, soccer fields, basketball courts, lighted tennis courts, horseshoe pits, a children's playground and a swimming pool. As the population of the City grows, demands for recreational services are expected to increase. Sources of funding for recreational services include the City's General Fund, user fees, and proceeds from state bond measures as they are available. The Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan addresses park and recreation issues.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less Than Significant**. Future residential development consistent with the 2009 Housing Element could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. However, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document. While it encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, it does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would result in an increase demand for park and recreational facilities. Since there are no specific proposed residential developments, the demand and requirements for specific parkland acreages, park facilities, financing, and timing associated with the proposed Housing Element cannot be established at this time.

Future residential development projects will require compliance with the following General Plan policies related to parks: Open Space/Conservation Element Policies 4.7.A, 4.7.B, 4.7.C, 4.7.D and Programs 4.7.B.1, 4.7.B.2, 4.7.B.4, and 4.7.D.1.

b) **Less than Significant.** While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan Land Use Element Policy 1.1.A and the City's Zoning Code. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a

case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, impacts to park and recreation facilities and services would be less than significant.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC **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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

The circulation-transportation system is typical of a rural town, with the exception that the western boundary is formed by Interstate 5 and State Route 32 runs east-west through the middle of the City. The City circulation system consists of a grid pattern street layout with north-south and east-west oriented facilities. The existing roadway system is made up of residential streets, collectors (major and minor), arterials, and freeways. The existing system within the Orland area comprises approximately 27 miles of paved roadway. The majority of the circulation system is maintained by the City of Orland and generally consists of 2-lane roadway facilities with stop sign controls at intersections.

Highway 32, which is designated Walker Street through Orland, generally consists of a 2-lane rural highway with a center turn lane. Walker Street traverses the City's business district and serves as the primary roadway through the commercial corridor of the City. This section of road is the most heavily used thoroughfare for entering and exiting Orland and serves as both a major truck route and a significant road for regional recreational traffic.

The City of Orland is served by railroad lines which are owned by the Union Pacific Railroad and leased/operated by the California Northern Railroad, which provides freight hauling service. The line runs north-south between Sixth and Fifth Streets. Passenger rail service provided by Amtrak runs the Sacramento-Dunsmuir line; the nearest passenger stop is in Chico. The line generally operates two trips per day.

There are two publicly owned airports in Glenn County: Haigh Field, located near Orland, and the Willows-Glenn Airport. Haigh Field, located southeast of the City off County Road P, has a 5,160-foot paved and "pilot-controlled" lighted runway, 50 feet wide. Its length qualifies it as a "Basic Transport" facility, suitable for use by general aviation users and capable of handling small or light business jets. There is sufficient land area for expanding service and facilities to meet the City's needs and also those of the region.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a–b) **Less Than Significant**. Housing development encouraged by the policies and programs of the Housing Element would lead to an increase in traffic volumes in the Orland area. Subsequent residential development projects could therefore result in an increase in traffic on City roadways and a decrease in level of service (LOS) on those roadways. However, the Housing Element is a policy-level document and does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including General Plan Circulation Element Policies, as well as the City's Municipal Code. Additionally, environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Therefore, impacts associated with an increased demand for transportation facilities would be less than significant.

c) **No Impact**. There are no airports or private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area. The nearest airport is Orland Airport, located southeast of the City. No housing development is planned within the flight path or safety zone. The only impact future housing may have on air traffic is to contribute to a potential increase in passenger air traffic. Orland Airport does not provide regularly scheduled commercial air service; residents requiring such service would go to airports in Chico, Redding or Sacramento. In addition, Circulation Element Policies 2.4.A and 2.4.C would minimize the potential impacts on air traffic.

d–f) **Less Than Significant**. As discussed under a–b) above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would affect the site design, emergency access, or parking of any developments. Future residential development projects will require compliance with General Plan policies related to traffic and circulation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g) **Less Than Significant**. As discussed under a–b) above, the proposed Housing Element does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Future residential development would be required to comply with General Plan policies related to alternative transportation, including Circulation Element Policies 2.1.C, 2.6.A, 2.6.B, 2.6.C, 2.7.A, and 2.7.C, as well as Programs 2.6.A.1 and 2.7.B.2. For example, Policy 2.6.A states that *p*lanning and development of Arterial and Major

Collector streets shall include design features that can be used as public transit stops and Policy 2.6 requires the City to coordinate with regional transit planners to determine the feasibility of developing and/or improving commuter bus and rail service. Therefore, the proposed Housing Element would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting:

As described in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, groundwater is the primary source of domestic water supply in the Planning Area. The City of Orland's primary water system, Public Water System 1110001, consists of six wells distributed throughout the City. The wells have an average depth of approximately 200 feet, and the average depth of groundwater is generally between 20-50 feet. Pressure for the City water system is provided by gravity flow from an 80,000 gallon elevated storage tank. The wells produce between approximately 500 and 1,200 gallons per minute each, and are automatically regulated by the water level in the storage tank. The City is investigating the possibility of either rehabilitating or replacing the elevated tank. Auxiliary stand-by power is provided at four of the City's wells. The water transmission and distribution systems consist of approximately 30 miles of pipeline. The City currently has adequate capacity

to meet peak water demands. While demand on water supply would increase with subsequent development occurring resulting from the proposed Housing Element, part of this increase would be offset by a reduction in use by agricultural operations currently within the Planning Area, since some of these operations would cease with development. Also, as described in Section 4.8, the General Plan contains policies and programs that encourage water conservation and otherwise reduce potential demands on the water supply.

The City's sanitary sewer system is a gravity-flow based system with flow moving in a southeasterly direction. In areas where gravity flow is not an option, the City utilizes four lift-stations to transport wastewater to gravity-flow lines. All sewage that is generated inside of the Orland City Limits is collected and treated by the City of Orland Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility. Areas outside of the City limits are treated by private on-site septic systems. According to the General Plan, the wastewater treatment plant has a design capacity of 2.1 million gallons per day of average dry weather flow. Current average domestic wastewater flow is 1.3 million gallons per day. The plant has adequate capacity to serve a City population of 12,000, which is above the estimated high range limit of 10,495 for the year 2020. No problems with the wastewater collection system have been identified.

The City's storm drainage system is operating at capacity, although the City has proposed improvements. Some developments discharge their runoff in Stony and Hambright Creeks, while others have onsite retention basins.

The City utilizes a County-owned landfill facility. The total capacity of the landfill is 1.2 million tons. Currently, the landfill can accommodate approximately 600,000 tons according to the General Plan. Under present operating conditions, the landfill will reach its total capacity by 2018. Plans are under way for an expansion of the landfill.

Discussion/Conclusion:

a) **Less than Significant.** The proposed Housing Element includes policies designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet the City's affordable housing needs. However, the Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Additionally, future housing development within the Orland area would be consistent with the buildout scenario of the City's General Plan. As described above, the City's wastewater treatment plant has adequate capacity to serve a City population of 12,000, which is above the estimated high range limit of 10,495 for the year 2020. Program HE-2.A, by potentially making more land available for higher-density housing, may lead to a greater demand for wastewater treatment than that projected at buildout under the current General Plan. However, that demand is not expected to exceed the current capacity of the treatment plant. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize wastewater impacts: Open Space and Conservation Element Policy 4.6.A and Programs 4.4.B.2, 4.6.A.1.

b) **Less than Significant.** The construction of future residences would require the extension of the water distribution and wastewater collection system. However, as described above, the wastewater treatment would not need to be expanded. The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential impacts on the water and wastewater systems: Land Use Element Policy 1.1.A; Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.2.A, 4.5.C, 4.6.A, 4.6.B and Programs 4.4.B.2, 4.6.A.1.

c) **Less than Significant**. Future housing development would require the expansion of the storm drainage collection system. The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize potential impacts on the storm drainage system: Land Use Element Policy 1.1.A; Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.4.A, 4.4.B and Programs 4.4.A.1, 4.4.A.2, 4.4.A.3, 4.4.B.3.

d) **Less than Significant.** As discussed previously, water demand from future development would be partially offset by a decrease in agricultural demand. In addition, the following General Plan policies and programs would minimize water supply impacts: Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policies 4.4.C, 4.5.A, 4.5.B, 4.5.C and Programs 4.5.A.1, 4.5.A.2, 4.5.B.1.

e) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in a) above, there would be adequate wastewater treatment capacity to support future housing development. The following General Plan policies and programs would minimize wastewater impacts: Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A; Open Space and Conservation Element Policy 4.6.A and Program 4.4.B.2.

f–g) **Less than Significant**. As discussed under a) above, the proposed Housing Element includes policies and programs designed to facilitate the construction and conservation of housing to meet the City's affordable housing needs but does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. Any future residential development would increase the demand for solid waste services in the area and would increase the amount of solid waste generated and sent to local landfills. Solid waste collection and disposal for single-family and multi-family residential units would be serviced by the current franchise private hauler. The landfill serving the City has permitted capacity to serve future development.

Assembly Bill 939 and the County Integrated Waste Management Plan, which require recycling programs that result in a 50 percent diversion away from landfills, would apply to new development. Additionally, future development proposals would be reviewed by the appropriate service agencies as part of the development application review process in order to ensure that sufficient capacity in all public services and facilities would be available on time to maintain desired service levels. Furthermore, Circulation Element Policy 2.9.A would minimize solid waste disposal impacts. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) 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.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion/Conclusion:

a); c) **Less Than Significant.** The Housing Element is a policy-level document. While the Housing Element encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels, it does not include specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment to adversely affect human beings. While the Housing Element does propose changes to existing land use densities and land use regulations, it does not involve the construction or expansion of any residential land uses. All future residential development occurring within the City would be required to be in accordance with local regulations, including the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would also be considered pursuant to CEQA on a case-by-case basis following submittal of a specific development proposal. Future residential development projects would require compliance with General Plan policies and other City codes and ordinances intended to protect the environment. Therefore, the proposed Housing Element

would result in less than significant adverse impacts to the environment or to human beings as a result of environmental degradation.

b) **Less Than Significant.** As discussed above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not propose any specific development. Therefore, identifying or analyzing cumulative impacts would be speculative at this time. Future residential development projects and/or policies would be subject to environmental review, including a review of cumulative impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

The following documents were used to determine the potential for impact from the proposed project. Compliance with federal, state and local laws is assumed in all projects.

City of Orland General Plan 2001-2020, adopted March 2003 (incorporated by reference).

City of Orland General Plan Update Initial Study and Negative Declaration, adopted March 2003 (incorporated by reference).

Background Report for the City of Orland General Plan Update, March 2002.

California Air Resource Board (CARB). 2009. *Air Quality Data Statistics.* http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome.html (accessed October 27, 2009).

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2007. *Glenn County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA*. http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/glenn/fhszs_map.11.jpg (accessed October 29, 2009).

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2007. *Glenn County Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*.
http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/glenn/fhszl06_1_map.11.pdf (accessed October 29, 2009).

California Department of Water Resources (DWR, 2006). *California's Groundwater, Bulletin 118.* Sacramento, CA.

California Farm Bureau Federation. Website: *Glenn County Farm Bureau*. www.cfbf.com/counties/?id=11 (accessed October 27, 2009).

Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico. *Glenn County Economic & Demographic Profile, 2007*.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 1982. *Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number. 0600590001C (1982)*.

Glenn County. Glenn County Website: *Certified Unified Program Agency*. *http://www.countyofglenn.net/govt/departments/cupa/* (accessed October 29, 2009).

Glenn County. 1993. *Glenn County General Plan*. Glenn County, CA.

Goldschmidt, W. R. 1951. *American Archaeology and Ethnology. Volume XLII 1945-1951*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California.

State of California, Department of Finance (DOF). May 2009. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2009, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California.

State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2009. Envirostor website. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ (accessed July 15, 2009).

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2009. Geotracker website. http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/ (accessed July 15, 2009).

U.S. Census. 1990, 2000. U.S. Census Website: *Population Finder*. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFPopulation?_event=Search&_name=orland&_state=04000US06&_county=orland&_cityTown=orland&_zip=&_sse=on&_lang=en&pctxt=fph (accessed October 30, 2009).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2009. *Web Soil Survey*. http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx (accessed October 28, 2009).