

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

## LASSEN COUNTY NOISE ELEMENT UPDATE AND NOISE ORDINANCE

*Prepared for:*

**Lassen County Planning and Building Services Department**

707 Nevada Street  
Susanville , CA, 96130  
*Contact: Gaylon Norwood*

*Prepared by:*

**DUDEK**  
1102 R Street  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
*Contact: Jonathan Leech*

**JULY 2021**



# Table of Contents

---

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Overview .....	1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance .....	1
1.3 Project Planning Setting.....	1
1.4 Public Review Process .....	1
<b>2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	3
2.2 Environmental Determination.....	3
<b>3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Aesthetics .....	8
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	10
3.3 Air Quality.....	12
3.4 Biological Resources .....	14
3.5 Cultural Resources .....	17
3.6 Energy .....	18
3.7 Geology and Soils .....	19
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	23
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	24
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	27
3.11 Land Use and Planning.....	30
3.12 Mineral Resources .....	31
3.13 Noise .....	33
3.14 Population and Housing.....	39
3.15 Public Services .....	41
3.16 Recreation.....	42
3.17 Transportation .....	44
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	45
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	47
3.20 Wildfire .....	49
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	50
<b>4 REFERENCES AND PREPARERS.....</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1 References Cited .....	52
4.2 List of Preparers .....	53

**APPENDICES**

- A Draft Noise Element Update
- B Draft Noise Ordinance (Lassen County Code Chapter 9.65)

**FIGURES**

- 1 Figure Caption ..... 55
- 2 Figure Caption ..... 57

**TABLES**

- 1 Table Caption ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Project Overview

The County of Lassen adopted the existing General Plan Noise Element in 1989. There have been no alterations, revisions, or updates to the Noise Element since it was adopted in 1989. Approaches to noise exposure management have occurred between 1989 and the present, and therefore the County proposes to Update the Noise Element in order to make it more accessible to the general public and to simplify and clarify the application of included policies by County staff. The County also proposes to establish a new chapter in the Lassen County Code that provides standards and regulations for noise management, that would be informally referenced as the “Noise Ordinance.”

## 1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The County of Lassen has authority to act as the Lead Agency for the proposed project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15050-15051, and is responsible for preparing this environmental document. The purpose of the analysis is to determine whether the project may have significant effects on the environment. Among other things, it provides the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration (ND), and provides documentation of the factual basis for the finding in an ND that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

## 1.3 Project Objective

The primary objective of this project is to update the Noise Element of the General Plan (hereto referred to as the Noise Element Update or “NEU”) and to establish Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code (hereto referred to as the Noise Ordinance or “Ordinance”) to function as the primary implementation tool for the Noise Element Update.

## 1.4 Public Review Process

In accordance with CEQA, the County has provided a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration (ND) to the public, Responsible agencies, Trustee agencies and the Lassen County Clerk’s Office. Comments can be submitted on the ND in writing before the end of the comment period or at the Planning Commission hearing on its potential adoption and project approval.

In reviewing the ND, affected agencies and interested public should focus on the adequacy of the information provided in identifying environmental impacts of the project.

A 30-day review and comment period will be established in accordance with Section 15105(b) of the CEQA Guidelines. Following the close of the public comment period, the County will consider this ND, as well as comments provided by agencies and interested parties in determining whether to approve the project. Written comments should be mailed to the following contact:

Gaylon F. Norwood  
Lassen County Planning and Building Services Department  
707 Nevada Street  
Susanville, CA, 96130.

## 2 Summary of Findings

---

This Initial Study examines each of the issue areas contained in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The following sub-sections provide a summary of the findings of the Initial Study completed for the Lassen County Noise Element Update and Noise Ordinance project.

### 2.1 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

## 2.2 Environmental 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature



Date



## 3 Initial Study Checklist

---

**1. Project title:**

Lassen County Noise Element Update and Proposed Chapter 9.65 of Lassen County Code (a new Noise Ordinance)

**2. Lead agency name and address:**

Lassen County Planning and Building Services Department  
707 Nevada Street  
Susanville, CA, 96130

**3. Contact person and phone number:**

Gaylon F. Norwood  
Assistant Director of Planning and Building Services  
(530) 251-8269

**4. Project location:**

Lassen County

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**

Lassen County Planning and Building Services Department  
707 Nevada Street  
Susanville, CA, 96130

**6. General Plan Designation:**

The Noise Element Update and Noise Ordinance would apply to all Land Use Designations contained in the Lassen County General Plan.

**7. Zoning:**

The Noise Element Update and Noise Ordinance would apply to all Zoning Districts contained in the Lassen County Zoning Ordinance (Lassen County Code, Title 18 Zoning).

**8. Description of Project.**

The project proposes to update the General Plan Noise Element (1989) according to the 2003 OPR General Plan Guidelines and more recent updates to state planning and zoning laws. The project also proposes to establish Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code to function as the Noise Ordinance for Lassen County, and the primary implementation tool for the updated Noise Element. Proposed updates to the Noise

Element include current characterization of the ambient noise levels existing throughout the County, addition of definitions for acoustic terminology used in discussing noise, a revision of noise policies to currently employed standards used throughout the state, and more detailed representation of noise data in graphical form via web-based geographic tools. The proposed new Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code provides detailed standards for the successful enforcement of noise management policies presented in the Updated Noise Element.

The draft language of the Noise Element update is attached to this initial study as Appendix A and the draft language of Lassen County Code Chapter 9.65 (Noise Ordinance) is attached as Appendix B.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The proposed Noise Element Update (NEU) and Ordinance address all land within the unincorporated areas of Lassen County. Please refer to the Setting sub-sections for each issue area in the checklist portion of this Initial Study/Negative Declaration for a description of the setting relevant to each topic.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for Lassen County are the decision-making bodies for potential adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. No approval would be required from agencies outside of the Lassen County Planning and Building Services Department.

**11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The proposed text amendments to the Noise Element and the proposed new Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code (the Noise Ordinance) would not directly or indirectly result in construction, alteration of existing land uses, or ground disturbance. As the project is regulatory in nature, there would be no potential for impacts to tribal cultural resources.

## Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show 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 a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, 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, then 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 Environmental Impact Report (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," as described in (5) below, 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 for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). 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. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - d. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - e. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

### 3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The aesthetic character of the County is generally composed of natural landscapes, with low density rural development in areas of the County outside of incorporated Susanville. Important aesthetic resources in the County include natural forms, such as lakes and rivers, mountains, hills, meadows, geologic formations, and native vegetation.

**a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

The adoption of the Noise Element Update (NEU) and noise Ordinance (Ordinance) would not result in adverse effects on scenic vistas. The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would be regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to existing scenic vistas would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

As previously discussed, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would be regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or land-use changes, including direct or indirect changes to existing scenic resources. Therefore, **no impact** would occur as a result of the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- c) *In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land uses. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, the proposed adoption would not conflict with the existing visual characteristics in non-urbanized and urbanized areas and would not conflict with applicable zoning and governing scenic quality regulations. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in land use that would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

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

**Existing Setting:**

Most of Lassen County has scant rainfall, a short growing season, and severe winters. Other resource limitations which challenge agricultural production in various parts of Lassen County include soil quality and the availability and quality of water resources. Field crops, grain production, and livestock raising are important components of the County's agriculture economy (Lassen County General Plan Agriculture Element, 2000). Ranked in terms of revenue generated for various agriculture-related activities, timber harvest was the highest revenue, followed by field crops, fruits/seeds/vegetables, and then livestock (Lassen County 2000).

- a) *Would the project 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?*

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in impacts to Important Farmlands (Prime, Unique, Statewide, or Important Local Farmlands). The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. Additionally, the proposed changes to the NEU and new noise Ordinance are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes to existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Moreover, the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. As such, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in the conversion of Important Farmland. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature and would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU or Ordinance. As no development or changes in land use are proposed, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not conflict, either directly or indirectly, with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses, including changes to existing forest land or timberland, would result from the adoption of the proposed Neu and Ordinance. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the Noise Element Update.

- d) *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not conflict with or result in changes to zoning related to forest land. No physical construction or changes to existing land uses would occur from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As no development or changes in land use are proposed, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

e) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature and would not result in the physical construction or any change to existing land usage. Moreover, adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. As such, the adoption of the Update would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the Noise Element Update.

### 3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact <sup>0</sup>	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control District may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County is located in the Northeast Plateau Air Basin. In general, air emission sources in Lassen County are associated with motor vehicles, wood-burning stoves, wildfires, prescribed fires, and fugitive dust from unimproved roads and sparsely vegetated or unvegetated lands, including dry lakebeds. Periodic emissions occur from agricultural activities, such as discing and agricultural waste burning (County of Lassen General Plan Natural Resources Element, 2000).

State and Federal air quality standards have been established for specific "criteria" air pollutants, including ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, lead, and particulate matter. In addition, there are State standards for visibility reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride. State standards are called California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and federal standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). NAAQS are composed of health-based primary standards and welfare-based secondary standards.



The Lassen County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has regulatory jurisdiction over the County's air quality permitting process. The District's air pollution regulations comply with the standards established by Environmental Protection Agency Guidelines (County of Lassen 2000).

The APCD, through the Air Pollution Control Officer and with technical assistance from the California Air Resources Control Board, reviews proposals and plans to ensure that air quality standards are met. Projects that may emit pollutants from a stationary source must obtain an Authority to Construct Permit from the APCD prior to construction. After construction of the facility is completed and the project can demonstrate that it can operate in compliance with emission requirements set forth in the Authority to Construct, a Permit to Operate must be obtained (County of Lassen 2000).

The overall air quality of Lassen County is considered adequate by the APCD. Under the state air quality standards, the basin is in attainment for nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, carbon monoxide, and lead. It is unclassified for PM-10 (CARB 2017). An air basin is unclassified for a criteria pollutant when the available data is insufficient to determine attainment status. Unclassified areas are treated as attainment areas until proven otherwise (County of Lassen 2000).

**a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

The General Plan contains an Air Quality Report under the Natural Resources Element (Chapter 3), which establishes specific goals, objectives, and policies related to air quality in Lassen County. No amendments are currently proposed for the Air Quality Element.

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in impacts to air quality in Lassen County. The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The Update does not revise, replace or attempt to supersede any existing air quality standards adopted by the County or the State of California. Additionally, the proposed changes to Noise Element and new Ordinance are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) *Would the project 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?***

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text-based amendments that would result in regulatory changes to the Noise Element and the establishment of new restrictions under the Ordinance. No physical construction or changes in land use are proposed in the NEU or Ordinance. Therefore, no new sources of pollutants would be created as a result of the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would be regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes in land use are proposed in the amendment. Therefore, the adoption of the NEU

and Ordinance would not generate new pollutants and thus would not expose sensitive receptors to additional pollutants. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?***

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would be regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes in land use are proposed in the amendment. Therefore, the adoption of the Update would not generate new emissions, including those associated with odors. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County contains extensive natural open space that supports diverse plant communities and wildlife that depend upon these habitats. At elevations below 6,500 feet the dominant native vegetation community is the mixed conifer forest. Ponderosa and Jeffrey pines, sugar pine, and white fir occur in this natural plant community. Above the mixed conifer forest, at elevations between 6,500 and 8,000 feet, the major natural plant community is the red fir forest, characterized by western white pine, mountain hemlock, and lodgepole pine. From 8,000 feet to tree line, plants are fewer in overall number with exposed patches of bare ground providing a harsh environment. Rock spirea, lupine, Indian paintbrush, and penstemon are a few of the rugged members of this community (Lassen County General Plan, 2000). Important wildlife mammal species found in Lassen County include black bear, mountain lion, red fox, and deer. Avian species include rough-legged hawk, great gray owl, osprey, grouse and hummingbirds. (Lassen County 2000).

- a) *Would the project 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?*

The General Plan contains a Land Use Element (Chapter 2), a Natural Resource Element (Chapter 3), and a Wildlife Element (Chapter 4), which includes goals, objectives, and policies related to sensitive biological resources in Lassen County. No amendments are currently proposed for these elements.

The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses, including modifications to known habitats, would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed Update

would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Moreover, no physical construction or changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed amendment. Therefore, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not adversely affect riparian and sensitive habitats and would not conflict with existing biological federal, state, and local plans, policies, and regulations. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes to existing land uses. Therefore, the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in adverse effects to state or federally protected wetlands. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- d) *Would the project 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?*

Again, the proposed NEU and Ordinance is regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land use. Therefore, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in adverse changes to identified wildlife corridors and native wildlife nursery sites. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

As previously discussed, the proposed adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in potential impacts on biological resources. The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The proposed changes would not conflict with local policies or ordinances related to biological resources. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

As previously discussed, the proposed adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would only consist of text amendments to existing noise policy documents and the introduction of a new noise Ordinance intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The proposed changes would not conflict with adopted habitat provisions, including existing or proposed Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The Lassen area was a gathering place for at least four American Indian groups: Atsugewi, Yana, Yahi, and Maidu. Because of its weather and snow conditions, generally high elevation, and seasonally mobile deer populations, the Lassen area was not conducive to year-round living. These Native American groups camped here in warmer months for hunting and gathering, leaving behind evidence that has been recorded as archaeological resources (NPS 2021). The California Office of Historic Preservation lists a number of emigrant trails and two historic fort locations in Lassen County (OHP 2021).

**a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?***

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in ground disturbance and/or potential impacts to cultural resources. The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure in the County and would not directly result in any ground disturbance. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance, including changes that would adversely affect significant historical resources.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, ***no impact*** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes to existing land use would occur as a result of the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, no changes to existing archaeological resources would occur due to the NEU and Ordinance. As such, *no impact* would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

As previously discussed, no ground disturbance activities, including those that would disturb human remains, would occur as a result of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, *no impact* would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>VI. Energy – Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County produces electricity from two main sources: Honey Lake power plant, a hybrid facility using biomass and geothermal resources; and Muck Valley, a hydroelectric facility on the Pit River. Cogeneration units fueled with wood waste from lumber mills has been a secondary source of electrical power generation. Geothermal power production in the County has included two power plants, Wineagle and Amedee. Both plants are located on the northern shore of Honey Lake, near Wendel (Lassen County Natural Resources Element, 2000).

**a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in wasteful and inefficient consumption of energy resources. The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the

adoption of the proposed project. As the proposed project involves changes in policy related to the Noise Element and a new noise Ordinance, no component of the project would require energy resources.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

As previously described, the proposed project is an update to the Noise Element and establishment of a noise Ordinance. This NEU and Ordinance would not result in any construction, nor would it result in changes in land use. As such, no component of the proposed project would obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County lies at the intersection of four major physiographic provinces: the Sierra Nevada, the Cascade Range, the Modoc Plateau, and the Basin and Range Province. These physiographic provinces are determined by their geologic structure and formation (County of Lassen 2000).

The rocks of the Sierra Nevada are essentially the exposed granite of the Sierra Batholith and associated sedimentary and contact metamorphic rocks with some late Tertiary volcanics. Although there are some granitic features north of Susanville, the Diamond Mountains are commonly regarded as the northern-most part of the Sierra Nevada Range (County of Lassen 2000).

The Cascade Range extends from the northern end of the Sierra Nevada to the Canadian border and is especially noted for the many great and recently active volcanoes scattered along its entire length. The exposed rocks of the California Cascades are predominantly volcanics of great variety and form (County of Lassen 2000).

The Modoc Plateau is an undulating platform composed of various volcanic materials, principally Miocene to recent basaltic lava flows with some sedimentary and tuffaceous interbeds. The average elevation of the area is 4,500 feet above sea level, but many peaks exceed this level. The Modoc Plateau consists of a series of northwest to north-trending block faulted ranges and deposits resulting from the disruption of drainage by faulting or volcanism. The geologic history of the Modoc Plateau is closely connected to that of the Cascade Range and Basin and Range Provinces. Quaternary volcanic flows of the Cascade Range overlap the western boundary of the Modoc Plateau (County of Lassen 2000).

The Basin and Range Province consist typically of north-south trending fault-block mountains separated by valleys, many of which are closed basins. Most of the province is located in neighboring Nevada. The sharply defined structure of the Honey Lake Valley, formed by the presence of fault zones along its borders, is characteristic of the Basin and Range Province. Interior drainage, resulting in playas such as Honey Lake, is also a common characteristic of basins in this province. North-trending normal faults bound basins and ranges throughout much of this province. Prominent right-lateral faults in the western Basin and Range constitute a generally northwest-trending zone known as the Walker Lane belt (County of Lassen 2000).

In general, the soils in the County can be separated into two broad groups: 1) residual soils that have developed in place, and 2) transported soils formed by sediments deposited by wind, water, or ice. The formation and distribution



of soils on the landscape are influenced by the parent geology and the material, climate, topography, and vegetation present in the soil-forming environment (County of Lassen 2000).

a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause 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.*

The proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. Additionally, the proposed changes to the Noise Element and new Ordinance are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Consequently, potential substantial adverse geologic effects associated with the construction of possible future development, including rupture associated with a known Alquist Priolo Fault, would be assessed on a project-by-project basis to ensure significant fault-related impacts would be avoided or mitigated. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed amendment would not result in substantial adverse geologic effects, including those associated with strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Again, the proposed NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature, intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not result in or exacerbate the risk of seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

iv) *Landslides?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project represents a change to noise regulation only. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in or exacerbate the risk of landslides. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

The proposed NEU and Ordinance involve changes to policies and regulations governing noise within Lassen County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed project. As the NEU and Ordinance are regulatory in nature, no soil erosion or loss of topsoil would occur as a result of the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**c) *Would the project 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?***

The project would not result in any physical construction or any changes to existing land uses, either directly or indirectly. As the project is regulatory in nature, no on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would occur as a result of the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?***

As previously discussed, the project is regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or any changes to existing land uses. As such, the project would not upset existing geologic conditions, including those associated with expansive soils. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

As previously discussed, the project is regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or any changes to existing land uses. No component of the project would use septic tanks or or alternative waste water disposal. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

As previously discussed, no ground disturbance activities or changes in land use would occur as a result of the proposed Update. As such, **no impact** associated with unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features would occur from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

**Existing Setting:**

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are those gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. GHGs are emitted by natural and industrial processes, and the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the earth's temperature. GHGs that are regulated by the State and/or EPA are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) and nitrous oxide (NO2). CO2 emissions are largely from fossil fuel combustion. In California, approximately 43% of the CO2 emissions come from cars and trucks. Electricity generation is another important source of CO2 emissions. Agriculture is a major source of both methane and NO2, with additional methane coming primarily from landfills. Most HFC emissions come from refrigerants, solvents, propellant agents and industrial processes, and persist in the atmosphere for longer periods, and have greater effects at lower concentrations compared to CO2. Global warming's adverse impacts include impacts to air quality, water supply, ecosystem balance, sea level rise (flooding), fire hazards, and an increase in health-related problems.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act, was adopted in September 2006 and required that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through regulations to reduce emissions from stationary sources and from vehicles. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) is the State agency responsible for developing rules and regulations to cap and reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the Governor signed Senate Bill 97 in 2007, directing the California Office of Planning and Research to develop guidelines for the analysis and mitigation of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and mandating that GHG impacts be evaluated in CEQA documents. CEQA Guidelines Amendments for GHG Emissions were adopted by OPR on December 30, 2009.

**a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. All future development proposals would be subject to site-specific greenhouse gas emissions review as deemed appropriate by the County. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or

indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in the generation of new greenhouse gas emissions.

The adoption of the proposed Update would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, all future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) Would the project generate conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

As previously discussed, the proposed project is regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed Update. All future development proposals would be subject to site-specific greenhouse gas emissions review as deemed appropriate by the County. As such, the proposed Update would not conflict with applicable greenhouse plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The interface of the natural and manmade environments within the County, and the presence of industries that employ materials classified as hazardous, pose potential safety hazards associated with wildfires and risk of upset. Other potential safety hazards include naturally occurring asbestos, past mining operations, and airport operations.

**a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. All future development proposals would be subject to site-specific hazardous material reviews as deemed appropriate by the County. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The adoption of the proposed Update would not grant any entitlements for development projects. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) *Would the project 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?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project is regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land use. Moreover, no portion of the proposed project would result in or increase usage of hazardous materials. As such, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public and would not exacerbate the risk of releasing hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project is a revision of the County Noise Element and a new accompanying noise ordinance. As the NEU and Ordinance are a countywide initiative, existing and proposed schools are located within the proposed project regulatory scope. However, the proposed project involves text-based changes that would not result in physical construction or existing land-use changes. As a result, the proposed project would not emit, use, or indirectly result in the use of hazardous materials. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site that 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?*

The project involves updating the Noise Element and creation of a noise ordinance, both of which are countywide initiatives, and thus hazardous material sites may be located within the proposed project's regulatory scope. However, the proposed amendments involve text-based changes to regulations and would not result in physical construction or changes in land use, including those associated with hazardous material sites. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project is a revision of the County Noise Element and adoption of a noise ordinance. As the project involves a countywide initiative, existing public airports within the County would be included within the proposed project's regulatory scope. However, the amendment involves only text-based changes to regulations and would not result in physical changes or changes in existing land uses, including those associated with airports. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in excess noise or safety hazards within two miles of existing airports and would not conflict with existing land uses. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The General Plan contains a Safety Element, which includes goals, objectives, and policies related to adopted emergency plans in Lassen County. No amendments are currently proposed for this element.

As previously discussed, the proposed project is a revision of the County Noise Element and adoption of a noise ordinance. No physical construction or changes in existing land use would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- g) *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project is regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed project, including those that would increase exposure to wildland fires. All future development proposals would be subject to site-specific environmental review as deemed appropriate by the County. As such, the proposed Update would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to wildfires. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County encompasses 4,547 square miles (2,910,000 acres) of varied topography. The highest point in Lassen County is 8,737 feet above mean sea level (msl) at Hat Peak in the northeast, and the lowest elevation is 3,270 feet above msl, where the Pit River exits the county to the west (County of Lassen 2007). Temperature and precipitation follow noticeable patterns for various regions in Lassen County. Lower elevations generally experience warmer temperatures with lesser amounts of annual rainfall, in contrast to higher elevations that experience cooler temperatures throughout the year and greater amounts of annual snowfall (County of Lassen 2007).

The mountains within Lassen County influence precipitation; greater precipitation typically occurs in the county's western portion at higher elevations. Precipitation is caused by orographic uplift, as air temperatures cool as the air mass rises over the mountains, resulting in condensation that falls as precipitation (County of Lassen 2007).

Lassen County's rivers and streams' hydrologic characteristics vary depending on the watershed of origin, area-elevation relationships, and snowfall accumulation patterns. This section describes flows on three of Lassen County's rivers and creeks: the Pit River, the Susan River, and Long Valley Creek (County of Lassen 2007).

There are seven watersheds in Lassen County, including Duck Flat, Feather River, Madeline Plains, Pit River, Smoke Creek, Surprise Valley, and Susan River. The Pit River flows through the northwestern portion of the County, draining to the west. The Susan River flows easterly to Honey Lake in the central portion of the County. Long Valley Creek flows from Upper Long Valley north into Honey Lake. Honey Lake, the largest lake in Lassen County, receives water from the Susan River, Long Valley Creek, Baxter Creek, and Willow Creek (County of Lassen 2007).

There are 24 groundwater basins in Lassen County, including four priority basins: Big Valley, Willow Creek Valley, Long Valley, and Honey Lake Valley. Priority basins were identified from stakeholder input, land use, water source patterns, and existing groundwater well infrastructure. The majority of groundwater monitoring also occurs in the priority basins. Less information is available for the other groundwater basins in Lassen County (County of Lassen 2007).

**a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?***

Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in a significant impact on water or groundwater quality. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in the degradation of water or groundwater quality.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Depending upon the scale of the proposed development, a comprehensive review of potential hydrological impacts would be performed to ensure that significant environmental impacts would be avoided or mitigated. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.



**b) *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not result in an increase in groundwater usage, impervious surfaces, or conflict with existing sustainable groundwater management plans. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:***

**i) *result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not increase runoff rates and thus would not increase erosion or siltation rates. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**ii) *substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;***

As previously discussed, the regulation-based project would not directly or indirectly result in physical construction or any changes to existing land uses. As such, the proposed project would not alter existing drainages and would not result in impervious surfaces, which would result in flooding. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**iii) *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; or***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not increase runoff rates and would not generate additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**iv) *impede or redirect flood flows?***

Again, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not alter existing drainage patterns and would not introduce impermeable surfaces that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

The Federal Emergency Agency (FEMA) provides guidance for floodplain management. FEMA manages the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), which provides insurance to communities that participate in the program, and works with State and local agencies to adopt floodplain management policies and flood mitigation measures. Portions of the County are located in FEMA designated flood zones as well as could be subject to a seiche from adjacent water bodies. However, as previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not increase the risk of inundation and would not result in additional pollutants. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The need to achieve and maintain compatibility between adjacent land uses has long been a primary goal in land use planning in Lassen County. Compatibility is needed not only to protect property values and land use opportunities but also to preserve the general harmony, peace of mind, and perceived quality of people in the County (County of Lassen 2000).

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in a significant impact on land use and/or planning. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Moreover, no physical construction or any changes to existing land uses, including modifications to established communities, would result from the adoption of the proposed project. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project involves revisions to the existing Noise Element as well as creating a new noise ordinance, both of which are intended to better manage noise exposure within the County. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with existing land use plan, policies, or regulations. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The discovery of gold along the base of Diamond Mountain in 1856 and at Hayden Hill in 1870 fostered the settlement of the northern sectors of Lassen County. From around 1980 to 1989, the Hayden Hill area experienced a resurgence of interest and speculation in precious metals mining (Lassen County Natural Resources Element, 2000).

In 1989, Lassen Gold Mining, Inc. made applications to the County of Lassen and the Bureau of Land Management for a new open pit mine with heap leach and mill processing facilities. The project was approved for development

in September 1991. The Hayden Hill mining operation was constructed in the spring of 1992 and poured its first bar of Dore (gold and silver) on June 15, 1992. At the end of 1997, active mining at Hayden Hill was terminated (Lassen 2000).

Although the Diamond Mountain and Hayden Hill areas have been the predominate precious metal producers in Lassen County, there have been more modest discoveries and mining of gold and silver in other locations in Lassen County, including Round Valley and Skedaddle Mountain. Reports of high grade deposits of iron ore and copper have been made in the Mountain Meadows area, but these reports have never been verified or the resource developed (Lassen 2000).

Rhyolite tuff has been quarried at the west end of Susanville and in the Wendel area; this quarry stone was used extensively in Susanville's business district and also exported for a number of buildings in Alturas. Clay deposits in the Honey Lake Valley led to brick kiln operations from the late 1800's through about 1930. Deposits of gravel and cinders have been mined for base materials for railroads and road construction. (Lassen 2000).

Significant deposits of commercial grade pozzolan, known locally as lassenite, occur in Long Valley as lacustrine sediments and diatomaceous shale of Mio-Pliocene age. Pozzolan is a light, porous ash-sized siltstone composed of partially hydrated rhyolitic glass ash with some pumiceous and diatomaceous material. Pozzolan material is used as an additive to (or blended with) cement, contributing strength and water tightness to produce superior concretes (Lassen 2000).

**a) *Would the project 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?***

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not directly result in the loss of mineral resources. Furthermore, the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) *Would the project 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?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. As the NEU and noise ordinance are each a countywide initiative, locally important resource recovery sites may be located within the regulatory scope of the project. No physical construction or any changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Moreover, the proposed project would not conflict with existing general plan, specific plans, or other land use plans related to mineral resources. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:</b>				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Background and Existing Setting:**

Noise Characteristics

Noise is generally defined as any sound which is undesirable, and therefore is subjective to the listener or receiver. Sound on the other hand has specific definable characteristics. Sound may be described in terms of level or amplitude (measured in decibels (dB)), frequency or pitch (measured in hertz (Hz) or cycles per second), and duration (measured in seconds or minutes). The standard unit of measurement of sound level (amplitude) is the decibel, which employs a logarithmic scale. Because the human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale is used to relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) performs this compensation by discriminating against low and very high frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear. Several descriptors of noise (noise metrics) exist to help predict average community reactions to the adverse effects of environmental noise, including traffic-generated noise, on a community. These descriptors include the equivalent noise level over a given period ( $L_{eq}$ ), the maximum sound level ( $L_{max}$ ), the day-night average noise level (Ldn), and the community noise equivalent level (CNEL). Each of these descriptors uses units of dBA.

$L_{eq}$  is a sound energy level averaged over a specified time period (typically no less than 15 minutes for environmental studies).  $L_{eq}$  is a single numerical value that represents the amount of variable sound energy received by a receptor during a time interval. For example, a 1-hour  $L_{eq}$  measurement would represent the average amount of energy contained in all the noise that occurred in that hour.  $L_{eq}$  is an effective noise descriptor because of its ability to assess the total time-varying effects of noise on sensitive receptors.  $L_{max}$  is the greatest sound level measured during a designated time interval or event.

Unlike the  $L_{eq}$  metrics, Ldn and CNEL metrics always represent 24-hour periods, usually on an annualized basis. Ldn and CNEL also differ from  $L_{eq}$  because they apply a time-weighted factor designed to emphasize noise events that occur during the evening and nighttime hours (when speech and sleep disturbance is of more concern). “Time weighted” refers to the fact that Ldn and CNEL penalize noise that occurs during certain sensitive periods. In the case of CNEL, noise occurring during the daytime (7:00 a.m.–7:00 p.m.) receives no penalty. Noise during the evening (7:00 p.m.–10:00 p.m.) is penalized by adding 5 dB to each of the hourly  $L_{eq}$  values, while nighttime (10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.) noise is penalized by adding 10 dB to each of the hourly  $L_{eq}$  values. Ldn differs from CNEL in that the daytime period is defined as 7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m., thus eliminating the evening period. These two metrics generally differ from one another by no more than 0.5 to 1 dB.

Existing Setting

Lassen County is characterized primarily by undeveloped natural open space with small interspersed towns or villages, and one incorporated City (Lassen County Natural Resources Element, 2000). Primary noise sources in the County include highways and major roadways, airports, and major stationary sources associated with commercial or industrial enterprises; minor noise sources can be found in individual communities, generally associated with commercial businesses and local roadways. Tables 3.13-1 through 3.13-4 provide summaries of existing ambient noise levels compiled for the NEU (Dudek 2020).

<b>Location</b>	<b>Highways</b>	<b>Measured CNEL</b>	<b>Distance to 65 dBA CNEL (feet)</b>
Bieber	Highway 299	65 dBA	35
Doyle	Highway 395	71 dBA	70
Hallelujah Junction	Highway 70	67 dBA	35
Janesville	Highway 395	70 dBA	55
Johnstonville	Highway 395	77 dBA	120
Madeline	Highway 395	67 dBA	30
Nubieber	Highway 299	65 dBA	35
Ravendale	Highway 395	68 dBA	50
Standish	Highway 395	67 dBA	65
Susanville	Highway 36	75 dBA	70
	Highway 44	70 dBA	70
	Highway 139	61 dBA	25
	Highway 395	67 dBA	50
Wendel	Highway 395	67 dBA	50
Westwood	Highway 36	70 dBA	21

Source: Dudek 2020

General Location	Road	Measured CNEL	Distance to 65 dBA CNEL (feet)
Bieber	Susanville Road	69 dBA	35
Eagle Lake	Eagle Lake Road	54 dBA	Within ROW
	Mahogany Way	47 dBA	Within ROW
Herlong	Herlong Access Road	67 dBA	27
	Garnier Road	64 dBA	Within ROW
Janesville	Main Street	70 dBA	23
	North Main Street	65 dBA	23
Johnstonville	Johnstonville Road	61 dBA	24
	Center Road	75 dBA	105
Calif. Corr. Center	Rice Canyon Road	75 dBA	105
Standish	Standish-Buntingville Rd	66 dBA	50
Susanville	Eagle Lake Road	63 dBA	23
	Johnstonville Road	74 dBA	37
	Richmond Road	69 dBA	35
	Skyline Road	70 dBA	55
	Gold Run Road	61 dBA	Within ROW
	Wingfield Road	59 dBA	Within ROW
Westwood	Mooney Road	65 dBA	Within ROW

Source: Dudek 2020

Facility Name	Distance to 65 dBA CNEL from Runway Side (feet)	Distance to 65 dBA CNEL from Runway End (feet)
Bieber Airport	60	50
Herlong Airport	30	25
Ravendale Airport	30	25
Spalding Airport	60	50
Susanville Municipal Airport	100-400	180
Amedee Army Airfield	500	280
Banner Lassen Hospital Heliport	250	250
CAL FIRE Helipad	250	250

Source: Dudek 2020

<b>Table 3.13-4 Major Stationary Source Noise Levels</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Stationary Source</b>	<b>Distance to 65 dBA CNEL</b>
Bieber	Big Valley Lumber	Within facility property
Herlong	Sierra Army Depot	At facility property boundary
	Federal Corrections Institution	Within facility property
Johnstonville	Industrial Area Johnstonville Road (Recyclers/Auto Dismantlers)	75 to 150 feet
Leavitt Lake	High Desert State Prison/California Correction Center	At facility property boundary
	Ward Lake Pit	700 Feet (Primarily within facility boundary)
Milford	Honey Lake Motocross Track	1,200 feet
Standish	Standish Gravel Pit	At facility property boundary
Susanville	Diamond Mountain Speedway	225 feet
	Banner Lassen Hospital (Helipad)	250 feet
	Sierra Pacific Mills	Within facility property
Wendel	HL Power Plant	900 feet
Westwood	Ultra Power	Within facility property

Source: Dudek 2020

The proposed General Plan Noise Element Update and Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code) establish noise standards for individual zone districts within the unincorporated areas of the County. For zone districts in which residences are allowed, daytime (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.) exterior noise limits are set to 65 dBA, evening exterior noise limits (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) are lowered to 60 dBA, and exterior nighttime noise standards (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) are the most restrictive, set to 55 dBA maximum. Commercial zone districts have exterior noise limits of 75 dBA (daytime), 70 dBA (evening), and 65 dBA (nighttime). Manufacturing and industrial uses are subject to a daytime limit of 90 dBA, and an evening/nighttime limit of 80 dBA.

**a) *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Likewise, no physical construction would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. However, the NEU does propose to increase the allowable exterior noise exposure level applicable to residences by 5 dBA CNEL (from the existing 60 dBA CNEL to a proposed 65 dBA CNEL). This increase in the allowable exterior noise exposure levels for residences could theoretically lead to an increase in the existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of some residential uses in the County. Nevertheless, as discussed in further detail below, the proposed relaxation of the current exterior exposure limits for residences is not anticipated to result in significant noise impacts.



With respect to noise associated with highways (refer to Table 3.13-1), noise measurements conducted by Dudek for the NEU each indicate existing highway noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL. For local and regional roadways, measured noise levels exceeded 60 dBA CNEL at 15 of the 18 measured locations (refer to Table 3.13-2). Similarly, the boundary of the 65 dBA CNEL contours from airports and heliports ranged from a distance of 25 feet to 280 feet from the end of the runway (refer to Table 3.13-3). Consequently, residential land uses in locations close to these transportation facilities are already exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL. Lassen County does not have the authority to regulate transportation activity, and noise from these well-established transportation facilities is not anticipated to decrease substantially in the future. Hence, an increase in the allowable exterior noise exposure for residences from 60 dBA CNEL to 65 dBA CNEL would actually provide a closer match to the existing ambient noise levels in close proximity to transportation facilities, and should not itself result in an increase to ambient noise levels. On the other hand, for planned new residential land uses near transportation facilities, the updated noise element policies and noise ordinance would prevent exposure levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL in the exterior living areas (i.e., patio or yard) of such residential land uses.

The distance from major stationary noise sources to the boundary of their associated 65 dBA CNEL contour ranges up to approximately 1,200 feet (refer to Table 3.13-4). The distance to the boundary of the 60 dBA CNEL contour for each facility would be approximately twice the identified distance to the 65 dBA CNEL contour in Table 3.13-4. As such, there are currently residences nearby to these major stationary noise sources that are exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL. Similar to transportation noise sources, changing the exterior noise exposure limit to 65 dBA CNEL would more closely match existing exterior noise exposure in close proximity to major stationary noise sources; it would also not result in ambient noise level increases within the area already encompassed by the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour for major stationary noise sources. New proposed stationary noise sources would be held to the revised standard, which now explicitly includes a restriction that facility noise must not exceed 65 dBA CNEL at any vicinity residences (regardless of the zone in which the stationary use would be located). The greater specificity in the standard would help avoid elevated exterior noise levels at residences from stationary noise sources.

The final consideration involves whether the project would result in increases in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The proposed noise element update would revise the standard applicable to residential land uses, increasing the exterior noise exposure limit to 65 dBA CNEL. The newly proposed noise ordinance (Chapter 9.65 of the Lassen County Code) would establish enforceable noise restrictions to ensure noise levels from generation sources comply with the revised noise element policies. In this regard, the project would not be anticipated to result in ambient noise levels that exceed the proposed new local standards. The change in exterior residential noise exposure limits to 65 dBA CNEL merits specific discussion in terms of comparison to the adopted standards of other agencies.

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 establishes an interior residential standard for multi-family dwellings of 45 dBA Ldn (or CNEL). These standards are designed for sleep and speech protection and most jurisdictions apply the same criterion for all residential uses. According to Caltrans (2013), standard construction for residential buildings achieves an interior reduction (or attenuation) of 20 dBA compared to exterior noise levels, when all windows and doors are closed. New residential buildings designed to comply with Title 24 energy conservation (including incorporation of dual-glazed windows) achieve an exterior to interior attenuation of 25 dBA (Caltrans 2013) when doors and windows are closed. Based on the reported attenuation for residential buildings, exterior noise exposure up to 65 dBA CNEL would result in interior noise levels no greater than 45 dBA CNEL, even in older homes. CCR Title 21, California Airport

Noise Standards, also directs that airport planning strive to prevent the placement of homes in airport influence areas with noise in excess of 65 dBA CNEL (as depicted by the boundary of the 65 dBA CNEL contour mapped for each airport). It should be noted that Caltrans has adopted an exterior noise exposure limit of 67 dBA CNEL for residences that could be affected by freeway/highway noise (Caltrans 2020). Thus, the proposed 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise exposure limit for residences would be consistent with interior noise standards found in CCR Title 24, would be equal to the restrictions in CCR Title 21, and would be slightly more restrictive than standards adopted by Caltrans for residential land use noise exposure levels.

With respect to the enjoyment of residential exterior living spaces, the threshold for speech interference outdoors is approximately 60 dBA if the noise is steady or above 70 dBA if the noise fluctuates. Most environmental noise sources, including transportation and stationary equipment, generally produce fluctuating sound levels rather than steady levels. Thus, activities such as conversation or outdoor dining or yard-oriented recreation would not be anticipated to be substantially affected by a change in the maximum allowable exterior noise level from 60 dBA CNEL to 65 dBA CNEL. The proposed noise ordinance includes lower allowable noise levels in the evening period compared to daytime, and lower still limits in the overnight period. These new more specific limits in the evening and nighttime periods should avoid noise nuisances that could interfere with home entertainment, relaxation, and sleep that occur in these more sensitive periods of each 24-hour day.

In conclusion, while the proposed NEU includes an increase in the allowable exterior noise exposure for residential land uses from 60 to 65 dBA CNEL, widespread increases in ambient noise levels as a result of the new implementation are not anticipated. The proposed new exterior noise limit would also more closely align with adopted standards of other agencies, many of which have been put in place more recently than the original 1989 version of the Lassen County Noise Element. And the adoption of a noise ordinance as an effective implementation tool for the NEU will introduce enforceable restrictions that will ensure compliance with NEU policies on a more comprehensive basis than has occurred to date. Consequently, the NEU and noise ordinance would result in **less than significant impacts** on the ambient noise environment.

***b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Important sources of vibration include heavy equipment used for major construction projects, railroad operations, and heavy truck travel along highways and roadways. Very large stationary equipment used in industrial sites may also generate vibration if there are rotating components (e.g., large scale compressors) or if the equipment includes a striking or stamping movement.

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure within the County. Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?*

The proposed Noise Element Update and Noise Ordinance would apply to all unincorporated areas of Lassen County. There are six airports located within the County: Susanville Municipal Airport, Herlong, Spalding, Bieber, and Ravendale Airports, and the Amedee Army Airfield. Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) establishes that 65 dBA CNEL is the maximum acceptable level of aircraft noise exposure for residents affected by airport operations; a noise contour map indicating the boundary of the 65 dBA CNEL associated with airport operations is generally used as the basis for determining if residences would be exposed to airport noise levels in excess of 65 dB CNEL.

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (formerly called Airport Land Use Plans) are designed to avoid incompatibilities between aircraft operations and surrounding land uses, via establishment of safety zones associated with aircraft arrival and departures, as well as identification of the boundary of noise contours from airport operations. Noise contour maps created for Amadee Airfield (ALUCP, Lassen County 2016), Susanville Municipal Airport (ALUP, Susanville, 1986), and Herlong, Spalding, Bieber, and Ravendale Airports (ALUP, County of Lassen, 1988) have been incorporated into the proposed Noise Element Update, and language is provided that would incorporate noise contours from any future updates to these airport plans.

The proposed amendments would not directly or indirectly alter any airport operations, nor modify the boundaries of the existing CNEL contour boundaries adopted for public airports in Lassen County. The proposed amendments would establish 65 dB CNEL as the maximum allowable exterior noise exposure level for residences and other noise sensitive land uses, which would achieve consistency with airport noise exposure standards established under CCR Title 21.

Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not grant any entitlements for development projects. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

The 2019 General Plan Housing Element Update (Lassen 2019) indicated implementation of the proposed Housing Element Update would have the potential to increase the County’s population by approximately 186 if all of the projected 77 units were new to the County, and all of the residents were also new to the County. If all new units are occupied by new residents, the change in population represents 1.17 percent of the 2018 population of the County, which was 15,957 people. The population of the County is projected to decline to 15,946 in 2020, which represents a decrease of 0.07 percent from the 2018 population. By 2050, the population is expected to decline to 14,548 which is a decrease of 8.82 percent from the 2018 population (Lassen 2019).

*a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?*

The General Plan contains a Land Use Element and Housing Element (Chapter 1) that establish specific Goals, Policies, and Programs related to land use, population, and housing in Lassen County. However, no amendments to the Land Use Element are included as part of the project.

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure within the County. Adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not directly impact population and/or housing. Furthermore, the approval of the proposed project would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed amendment.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

*b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

As previously discussed, the project would not directly impact population and housing, and the adoption of the proposed CEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Moreover, no physical construction or changes to existing land uses, including population density changes, would occur either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed amendment. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Public services within the unincorporated County are provided by the County of Lassen, state and federal agencies, and numerous special districts, including fire protection districts, school districts, park and recreation districts, and an irrigation district.

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

*Fire protection?*

The General Plan contains a Land Use Element and Safety Seismic Element, which includes goals, objectives, and public services policies within Lassen County. No amendments are currently proposed for these elements.

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change in existing land uses would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, there would be no direct or indirect changes to public services, including adverse impacts to wildfire protection.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

***Police protection?***

As previously discussed, the proposed amendment would not result in direct or indirect changes to existing public services in Lassen County. As such, adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in adverse effects on police protection within the County. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the Neu and Ordinance.

***Schools?***

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change in existing land uses would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.. As such, approval of the regulatory-based project would not result in adverse effects to proposed or existing schools within the County. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

***Parks?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect changes to existing public services in Lassen County. As such, adoption of the revision would not result in adverse effects to proposed or existing parks within the County. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

***Other public facilities?***

The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change in existing land uses would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, there would be no adverse effect on other existing or proposed public facilities within the County. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XVI. RECREATION</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Recreational opportunities within Lassen County are varied, ranging from parks, campgrounds, a downhill ski park, boat ramps and public swimming areas. Many natural resource areas offer unique resources that support the potential for the development of recreation facilities. This is true in the case of the County's Susanville Ranch park property northwest of Susanville. It may also be true for areas having potential for downhill ski areas, golf courses, RV parks, or other recreation-related development projects (County of Lassen 2000)

**a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in impacts to recreational uses or facilities. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Additionally, the proposed changes are regulatory in nature. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses, including increased use of recreational facilities, would result from adopting the proposed NEU and Ordinance.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**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?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to noise policy documents intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No physical construction or changes to existing land uses would result from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, or the need for such expanded facilities. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

Lassen County is served by one Federal highway and six state highways. These highways provide the main regional transportation routes for automobiles and trucks. The highway network includes US 395 and State Routes 36, 44, 70, 139, 147, and 299 (County of Lassen General Plan Circulation Element, 2000). The Lassen County transportation system also includes a county road network consisting of approximately 905 miles of roadway. Within the City of Susanville is a municipal street system of approximately 39 miles (County of Lassen 2000).

There is also within Lassen County a significant number and mileage of roads on Federal lands, including lands managed by the National Parks Service, Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. These roads and the other highways and roads which cross Federal lands provide access for the use and enjoyment of the public. For example, the 1992 Land and Resource Management Plan of the Lassen National Forest reported that the Forest contained 3,472 miles of "forest development roads" (not all of which are in Lassen County). There are also approximately 1,200 miles of roads on Bureau of Land Management administered lands (County of Lassen 2000).

**a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?***

The General Plan contains a Circulation Element (Chapter 7), which establishes specific goals, objectives, and policies related to transportation and traffic hazards in Lassen County. No amendments are currently proposed for the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

The proposed regulatory-based project consists only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found



to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

The proposed project would be regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes to existing land use would result from the adoption of the proposed project. As such, the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not result in conditions that would result in increases in traffic congestion or require additional development of roadways. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

As previously discussed, the proposed project is regulatory in nature, involving no physical construction or changes to existing land uses. Therefore, adoption of the NEU and Ordinance would not result in increases in hazardous conditions due to geometric design features and incompatible uses. As such, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

**d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

As previously discussed, the proposed Update is regulatory in nature. No physical construction or changes to existing land use would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance, including changes to emergency plans and access routes. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

i) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not affect tribal cultural resources. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents, which are intended to manage noise exposure in the County and would not directly or indirectly result in any ground disturbance. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result, either directly or indirectly, from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance, including an absence of changes that would adversely affect significant tribal cultural resources.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

ii) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

As previously discussed, the proposed Update is a text-only amendment to the Noise Element and a new noise ordinance, both of which are intended to manage noise exposure in the County. No

physical construction or changes to existing land use would result from the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance. Approval of the project would not result in changes that would conflict with Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 or adversely affect Native American tribe resources. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

- a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in impacts to utilities. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for

development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses would result from the approval of the proposed project. As such, the adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not require the use of utility facilities and would not directly or indirectly result in the relocation or expansion of new utility-related facilities.

All future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- b) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?***

As previously discussed, the proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Moreover, no physical construction or changes in land use are proposed as a result of the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, the proposed amendment would not increase water demand or decrease water supplies, directly or indirectly, within the County. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

- c) *Would the project 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?***

As previously discussed, the proposed NEU and Ordinance consist only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The approval of the proposed project would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Moreover, no physical construction or changes in land use are proposed as a result of the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, no wastewater would be generated, directly or indirectly, by the adoption of the proposed Update. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the NEU and Ordinance.

- d) *Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***

Again, the proposed consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The adoption of the proposed NEU and Ordinance would not grant any entitlements for development projects. Moreover, no physical construction or changes in land use are proposed as a result of the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance. As such, no solid waste would be generated, directly or indirectly, by the adoption of the proposed Update. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the NEU and Ordinance.

- e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No solid waste would be generated, directly or indirectly, due to the adoption of the proposed Neu and Ordinance. As such, the proposed project would not violate existing federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

**a) *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

The adoption of the NEU and Ordinance, in themselves, would not result in impacts to wildfires or wildfire preparedness. The proposed project consists only of text amendments to policy documents intended to manage noise exposure within the County. The approval of the proposed project would not grant any entitlements for development projects. No physical construction or any change to the existing land uses, including impairment of emergency response plans, would occur from adopting the proposed amendment.

Additionally, all future development proposals that would be subject to compliance with the NEU and Ordinance would be evaluated with respect to CEQA, and if found to be non-exempt, would result in project-specific detailed environmental review. Therefore, *no impact* would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

The proposed project would be regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land uses. As such, the proposed project would not result in conditions that would exacerbate wildfire risks or expose people to wildfires or wildfire pollutants. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

c) *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

As previously discussed, the proposed project would be regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land uses. As such, the proposed project would not result in conditions such that fire-fighting infrastructure would need to be installed or maintained. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

d) *Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

The proposed project would be regulatory in nature and would not result in physical construction or changes in existing land uses. As such, the proposed project would not result in conditions that would expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, from post-fire conditions. Therefore, **no impact** would result from the adoption of the NEU and Ordinance.

### 3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Existing Setting:**

- a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?*

As described under 3.4 *Biological Resources*, the proposed project would have no impact on biological resources, including native plant communities, wildlife habitat, or fish or wildlife populations.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

The project has been determined to have potential impacts only in the issue area of noise. Because the project proposes to update the noise element for the entire Lassen County, and to adopt a noise ordinance for Lassen County, it represents a comprehensive noise management approach designed to minimize land-use based noise conflicts and to control noise levels County-wide.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The project aims to enhance noise management in the County to avoid exposure of residents and visitors to elevated noise levels that could be harmful.

## 4 References and Preparers

---

### 4.1 References Cited

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2017. *Proposed amendments to Area Designations for State Ambient Air Quality Standards*. Accessed March 29, 2021. <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/regact/2018/area18/isor.pdf>

California Code of Regulations. 14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A through L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

California Code of Regulations Title 21, *California Airport Noise Standards*

California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11, *California Noise Insulation Standards*

California Department of Transportation. 2013. *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. September 2013.

California Department of Transportation. 2020. *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. April 2020.

California Office of Historic Preservation Website. Accessed March 30, 2021.  
[https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=21426](https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21426)

California Public Resources Code, Section 21000–21177. California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 2021 “California Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants.” Accessed on February 8, 2021.  
[https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo\\_ca.html](https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_ca.html)

Lassen County Airport Land Use Commission. 1987. *Airport Land Use Plan Susanville Municipal Airport*. March 27, 1987.

Lassen County Airport Land Use Commission. 1988. *Airport Land Use Plan Airports at Herlong, Spaulding, Bieber, Ravendale*. April 28, 1988.

Lassen County Airport Land Use Commission. 2016. *Amedee Army Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan*. August 11, 2016

Lassen County. 2000. *Lassen County General Plan*. Accessed February & March, 2021.

Lassen County. 2007. *Lassen County Groundwater Management Plan*. Accessed on February 12, 2021.  
<http://celassen.ucanr.edu/files/49957.pdf>

National Park Service (NPS) Website. Accessed March 29, 2012. <https://www.nps.gov/lavo/learn/tribes.htm>



## 4.2 List of Preparers

Jonathan V. Leech, Project Manager, Dudek

Ryan Munnikhuis, Environmental Analyst, Dudek

David Ortega, Environmental Technical Analyst, Dudek

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 1      Figure Caption

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 2      Figure Caption

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# Appendix A

---

Appendix Title