# Mt. Shasta Regular Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

City Park Upper Lodge 1315 Nixon Rd.
Mt. Shasta Tuesday, September 17, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Call to Order and Flag Salute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Roll call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | 3. Public Comment: 
Welcome to our Planning Commission meeting. The Commission invites the public to address the Commission on issues not listed on the agenda and that are within the Commission's subject matter jurisdiction. Those wishing to address the Commission are asked to sign-in and indicate their topic of interest. The public has a right to address the Commission on any subject within the Commission’s jurisdiction; however, the Commission may limit public comment on matters that are outside of its jurisdiction. The Planning Commission may regulate the total amount of time on particular issues and for speakers (typically 3 minutes). The Commission may place additional time limits on comments, to ensure members of the public have opportunity to speak and the Commission is able to complete its work. A group may be asked to choose a spokesperson to address the Commission on a subject matter, or the Commission may limit the number of persons addressing the Commission whenever a group of persons wishes to address the Commission on the same subject matter. Speakers are asked to provide their name and address for the public record. We greatly appreciate your active participation. |
|      | 4. Meeting Minutes  
   a. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for July 16, 2019  
   b. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for August 20, 2019 |
|      | 5. Freeze Mini Storage and Car Wash Project – Public Hearing  
Background: A Conditional Use Permit Application has been filed for 1301 Old Highway 99 to develop a Car Wash and Ministorage project. A Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared and a Conditional Use Permit for Planning Commission consideration.  
Commission Action: Motion to approve one of six possible outcome options pertaining to the environmental document and conditional use permit. |
|      | 6. Commission and Staff Comment |

---
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7. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. **Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process**

   a. 1119 Ream Avenue Parcel Map – 9/24/2019
   b. Off-Street Parking Requirements – 10/15/2019
   c. Roseburg Specific Plan Discussion – 10/15/2019

10. Adjourn – Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 24, 2019 at 6:00pm (Special Meeting)

Availability of Public Records: All public records related to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 305 North Mt. Shasta Blvd., Mt. Shasta, CA at the same time the public records are distributed or made available to the members of the legislative body. Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the legislative body after distribution of the Agenda packet will be available for public review within a separate binder at City Hall at the same time as they are made available to the members of the legislative body.

The City of Mt. Shasta does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or provision of services. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons requiring accommodations for a disability at a public meeting should notify the Deputy City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (530) 926-7510 in order to allow the City sufficient time to make reasonable arrangements to accommodate participation in this meeting.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission after distribution of the meeting Agenda Packet regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours within the binder entitled “Agenda Packet for Front Counter” located at City Hall at the desk on the right-hand side inside the front door.

Projects heard at this Planning Commission meeting may be subject to appeal. Please contact the Planning Department for information. Appeals must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office together with the appeal fee. If you challenge the environmental review of the project proposal in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Department on, or prior to, closing of the public comment period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order and Flag Salute</td>
<td>Chair Findling called to order at 6:02 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Roll call | **Present:** Chair Findling, Commissioners Saryon, Beck, Higuera, and Pardee  
**Absent:** Commissioners McDowell and Kirby |
| 3. Public Comment: None | |
| 4. Meeting Minutes: | Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting June 18, 2019  
**COMMISSION ACTION:** Postpone to next meeting due to no quorum of members present at last meeting |
| 5. Water Resource Element Draft | Frank Lyles and Derek Cheung, CivicSpark Fellows: Presentation of Water Resource Element  
Clarifying questions on process and document |
| **Public Comment** | Raven Stevens: Discussion on goals of the water resource element. Questions on inclusion of water goals centers on fuel management  
Geneva Oman: Discussion on connection between surface water and groundwater. Support for language in the General Plan about water quality better than state standards. |
| **Public Comment Closed** | Planning Commission requests that improvements be made to the wetland maps, addition of various map features, and elaborate on some of the presented goals.  
The Water Resource Element will be opened for public comment prior to draft adoption. |
| 6. Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance | Presentation of staff report  
Clarifying questions on ordinance language and applicability |
| **Public Comment: None** | Discussion on making the ordinance more reader friendly. Suggest using City of Redding Ordinance language.  
**COMMISSION ACTION:** Postpone item to future meeting  
Unanimous approval of present Commissioners |
7. Hazardous Vegetation and Combustible Material Abatement Ordinance

Staff report on proposed amendments to Weed Abatement Ordinance.
Clarifying questions on enforcement language and clarifying definitions.

Public Comment: None
Discussion on ordinance being too strict.

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve proposed amendments to the weed abatement ordinance for City Council consideration.
MOVED: Commissioner Pardee
SECONED: Commissioner Higuera
AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners Higuera and Pardee
NAYS: Commissioners Beck and Saryon
ABSTAIN: Commissioners Kirby and McDowell

Discussion on wanting more time to review the ordinance and City Attorney review of enforcement language.

COMMISSION ACTION: Reconsider motion to approve and postpone to next meeting
MOVED: Commissioner Pardee
SECONED: Commissioner Higuera
AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners Higuera and Pardee
NAYS: Commissioners Beck and Saryon
ABSTAIN: Commissioners Kirby and McDowell

6. Commission and Staff Comments

Beck: Discussion on safety concerns of July 4th event in terms of traffic control.
Findling: Discussion on Velaro compliance with ordinances.

9. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process

a. Off-Street Parking Requirements – 7/16/2019
b. Golden Eagle School Development CUP, Parcel Map, and CEQA Public Hearing TBD
c. Northern United Charter School CUP - TBD
d. Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project CUP and CEQA – 8/20/2019

10. Adjourn – Adjourned at 9:36 PM
STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order and Flag Salute – Chair Findling called to order at 6:00PM

2. Roll call
   - Present: Chair Findling, Commissioners, Beck, Higuera, Pardee, McDowell, and Kirby
   - Absent: Commissioner Saryon

3. Public Comment:
   Tim Stearns: Discussion on General Plan revision and maximum building height limits. Discussion on residential use on Roseburg Commerce Park and other properties.

4. Meeting Minutes:
   Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting June 18, 2019
   
   COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve minutes with minor spelling corrections
   Moved: Commissioner Beck
   Second: Commissioner McDowell
   AYES: Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, McDowell, and Kirby
   NAYS
   ABSTAIN: Commissioners Pardee and Higeura
   ABSENT: Commissioner Saryon
   
   Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting July 16, 2019 postponed due to no agenda item.

5. Northern United Charter School Conditional Use Permit
   City Staff: Presentation of project and recommended conditions
   
   Commissioner Higeura: Discussion and Questions on drop-off/pick-up monitor condition
   Commissioner Beck: Discussion and Questions on signage and changes to the building. CUP impact on other uses.
   Commissioner Pardee: Question on monitor and ADA
   Chair Findling: Question and discussion on drop-off/pick-up

   Public Hearing Opened at 6:36 PM
   Project Applicant: Discussion on sidewalk discussion, maximum number of students, and drop-off/pick-up of students
   Public Hearing Closed at 6:42 PM

   COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve conditional use permit for Northern United Charter School with the following conditions:
   - Student population onsite will not exceed 30 students for the facility.
   - Student drop-off and pick-up be confined to Alder Street. No drop-off and pick-up will occur on East Alma Street.
   - A minimum of one paved handicap parking space shall be created onsite.
- Existing parking lot will be repaved and striped to improve broken sections and to identify parking spaces as indicated on the proposed parking plan.
- The project Applicant shall install bike parking on the property to accommodate a minimum of 6 adult bikes. The bike parking can be bike racks, covered bike parking, and/or bike lockers.
- The project Applicant shall improve the curb on Alder Street to meet City standards.

**MOVED:** Commissioner Pardee  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Beck  
**AYES:** Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, McDowell, Pardee, Higuera, and Kirby  
**NAYS**  
**ABSTAIN:**  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Saryon

### 6. Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance

- Presentation of staff report  
- Clarifying questions

**Public Comment:** None

Discussion on shortening the ordinance

**COMMISSION ACTION:** Motion to approve proposed ordinance with abbreviated ordinance option and use City of Yreka Planting Guide with State Guide.

**MOVED:** Commissioner Higuera  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Pardee  
**AYES:** Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, McDowell, Pardee, Higuera, and Kirby  
**NAYS**  
**ABSTAIN:**  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Saryon

### 7. Hazardous Vegetation and Combustible Material Abatement Ordinance

- Presentation of staff report.  
- Clarifying questions on inspections, county regulations, implementation and compliance

**Public Comment:** None

Discussion on getting a track changes version of the ordinance. Support for complimentary implementation programming like green waste days, services, and find a way to ensure compliance without too much cost.

**COMMISSION ACTION:** Motion to approve proposed ordinance as presented

**MOVED:** Commissioner Pardee  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Kirby  
**AYES:** Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, Pardee, Higuera, and Kirby  
**NAYS:** Commissioner McDowell  
**ABSTAIN:**  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Saryon
8. **Commission and Staff Comments**
   - Higuera: Discussion on crosswalks and vehicles stopping for pedestrians
   - McDowell: Question on future agenda item
   - Kirby: Discussion on missing sidewalks
   - Beck: Discussion of Sphere of Influence and annexation. Discussion on public comment letters
   - Findling: Valero graphic compliance. Discussion on adopting NOEs for projects.
   - Pardee: Discussion on Flowering Pear Trees at Valero.
   - City Staff: Discussion on new CivicSpark Fellow

9. **Future Agenda Items** – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. **Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process**
   
a. Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project CUP and CEQA – 9/17/2019
b. 1119 Ream Avenue Parcel Map – 9/2019
c. Off-Street Parking Requirements – 10/15/2019
d. Roseburg Specific Plan Revision – 10/15/2019
e. Golden Eagle Charter School Parcel Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Architectural Design – TBD

10. **Adjourn** – Adjourned at 7:44 PM
Agenda Item # 5
Staff Report

Meeting Date: September 17, 2019
To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Subject: Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project Conditional Use Permit

Options for Action:

CEQA:

1. Motion to certify and adopt the Initial Study and Mitigate Negative Declaration and adopt Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program.

2. Motion to prepare an Environmental Impact Report

3. Motion to request additional information regarding environmental review and/or Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration document.

Conditional Use Permit:

1. Motion to deny conditional use permit for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project.

2. Motion to request more information regarding conditions of approval and/or conditional use findings.

3. Motion to approve Conditional Use Permit for Mini-Storage and/or Car Wash with conditions. (Items may be separated)

Background:

The City of Mt. Shasta began the process of development consultation with the Project Applicant in 2016. The Applicant proposed to construct a mini-storage and car wash project on three parcels between North Mt. Shasta Blvd, Ski Village Dr., and a privately-owned roadway. The Project Applicant has an easement to access the private roadway which leads to the Springhill Trailhead. The project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) as per state standards.
Project Description:

The proposed project consists of two components: a mini-storage and a car wash. The proposed mini-storage would be located on the northern portion of the project site on a 2.09-acre parcel (APN 057-801-230). The mini-storage would include one 234-square-foot single-story office building and a total of 153 storage units in three separate single-story buildings. Building roofing would be forest green to minimize reflection and glare. The mini-storage site would also include a small parking area with five parking stalls. The project would include approximately 13,563 square feet of landscaping/snow storage area, as well as security lighting throughout the project site, a 7-foot-tall perimeter security fence with slats to limit views of the project, and installation of a 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the western side of Ski Village Drive. The mini-storage site would have one public access driveway on Ski Village Drive and one emergency access driveway on N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard. The mini-storage would include landscaping for the majority of the project site’s perimeter. The mini-storage would be open from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. seven days a week.

The proposed car wash would be located on two parcels totaling 0.68 acre (APNs 057-801-160 and 057-801-040). The car wash includes an 11’4” × 32’ storage/equipment building, an 18’ × 40’ automatic car wash, three 16’ × 24’ self-wash wash bays, four vacuum stations, landscaping/snow storage areas, and a trash enclosure. The car wash would be open from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. seven days a week.

Project Location:

1301 Old Highway 99
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067
Latitude 41°19’45” N, Longitude 122°19’21”W, Section 9, Township 40N, Range 4W, Mount Diablo Meridian
(APNs: 057-801-160, 057-801-230, 057-801-040)

Surrounding Conditions & Uses:

Adjacent land uses include single-family homes directly east of the project site on the east side of Ski Village Drive. The property surrounding one single-family home forms a peninsula between the mini-storage and car wash sites. Small commercial developments are located south of the site. West of the site are N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard, railroad tracks, and Mt. Shasta City Park. North of the site is vacant land and the trailhead and parking area for the Spring Hill Trail. The project site is directly south of Spring Hill, a 4,290-foot, 200,000-year-old volcanic plug dome. The properties are zoned a combination of Unclassified and General Commercial.

General Plan Connection:

The properties have a General Plan land use designation of Commercial Center. The purpose of commercial center is to identify land for development with businesses that generally require customer traffic in order for the business to be successful. The type of businesses are not limited
in scope, class of customer, or the basis of the products offered. The suggested uses in the 2007 General Plan are shopping centers, offices, retail stores, and restaurants.

The Property is zoned C-2 General Commercial. The purpose of general commercial zoning is intended to serve the commercial land use district for areas outside of the downtown commercial areas of the City and achieve the goals of the business community. Permitted uses in the zone are like those mentioned in the 2007 General Commercial Center designation. Conditional uses of the zone are places of assembly like a community center or church, veterinary offices with overnight boarding, large scale commercial uses consistent with the City’s “Big Box” ordinance, and retail business establishments where the use is not conducted totally within a building.

The proposal does not exactly match the permitted uses listed in the zoning designation but could be argued to match the conditional uses in the C-2 zone. Mt. Shasta Municipal Code Section 18.20.150 states:

(A) The Director may determine that a proposed use not listed in this code is allowable for the purpose of accepting a land use permit application for processing, and the review authority may approve an application for an unlisted use, if all of the following findings are made:

(1) The characteristics of, and activities associated with, the proposed use are similar to those of one or more of the uses listed in the zoning district as allowable, and will not involve a higher level of activity or population density than the uses listed in the district;

(2) The proposed use will meet the purpose and intent of the zoning district that is applied to the site; and

(3) The proposed use will be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and any specific plan

(B) When the City determines that a proposed, but unlisted, use is similar to a listed use, the proposed use will be treated in the same manner as the listed use in determining where it is allowed, what permits are required and what other standards and requirements of this Land Development Code apply.

(C) Commission Determination. The Director may forward questions about similar uses directly to the Commission for determination at a public meeting.

The Planning Department has made the necessary three findings to present the conditional use permit to the Planning Commission for final determination. Planning Commission may agree with the determination of City Staff by granting the Conditional Use Permit with applicable conditions or find that the use is not compatible to the zoning designation and deny the permit application.

Environmental Review:

The California Environmental Quality Act (Section 21000, et. seq. of the California Public Resources Code, (hereinafter referred to as CEQA) requires analysis of agency approvals of discretionary “projects.” A “project,” under CEQA, is defined as “the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably
foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.” The proposed Project is a project under CEQA.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines § 15063, the City of Mt. Shasta planning consultant (Michael-Baker International, Inc.) prepared an Initial Study to assess the potential adverse environmental effects of the proposed Project. City Staff concluded that potentially significant environmental effects could occur from the Project implementation in the areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, and Tribal Cultural Resources. However, mitigation measures were identified that would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070, the planning consultant prepared a Draft Mitigated Negative declaration (MND) which was filed with the State Clearinghouse and the Siskiyou County Clerk. The Draft MND circulated for public review June 19, 2019 through August 28, 2019. Ninety-six (96) written comments were received regarding the Draft MND during the public review period. The comments did not introduce any new significant environmental impacts beyond those already covered. The comments did identify typos in the Draft which have been corrected in red, bolded lettering and changed mitigation measure NOI-2 to read “Prior to construction…” instead of “Prior to operation…”. Clarification was added to NOI-3 concerning the 6-foot noise wall option to attain the 50 dBA noise levels. Language was added to address concerns about aesthetics impacts of a sound barrier taller than 6 feet. The following language was added to NOI-3 to clarify the use of other noise attenuation options

“If the results indicate a 6-foot barrier is not sufficient, an additional noise-attenuation method must be included in design to reduce noise levels further to achieve the 50 dBA standard, which would minimize aesthetic impacts that may result with a taller barrier.”

These changes are identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program document (MMRP). A Final MND and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was prepared for the Planning Commission consideration. All public input letters received from outside agencies and members of the public have been reviewed and responses to concerns prepped in the next Staff Report section.

**Review of Public & Outside Agency Comment:**

Public notice was posted as per Government Code Sections § 65090 and § 65091, which requires specific posting requirements and noticing to property owners within 300 feet of the Project. The notice was also placed in the Mt. Shasta newspaper, at the Public Library, and at City Hall.

The City received ninety-six (96) comment letters during the CEQA public comment period and two additional letters after. All letters appear to be against the development and pose some questions and concerns about the project.

**Biological Resources**

Many commenters believed biological resources (Section 4.4) impacts should have been evaluated relative to conditions that existed prior the applicant’s removal of trees on the project site and
other activities that have left the site in its current condition. CEQA Guidelines Section §15125 establishes that a description of an environmental setting against which to evaluate whether a project’s environmental impacts would be significant is the physical environmental condition as they exist at the time the environmental analysis begins. It expressly states that “an existing conditions baseline shall not include hypothetical conditions.” To engage in speculation about what the condition of the site prior to tree removals and other disturbance would be hypothetical and thus contrary to CEQA requirements. The IS/MND accurately described the conditions as they existed in 2017, when environmental review for the project began, and therefore conforms to CEQA requirements.

The City received a letter from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The letter states that a staff biologist observed the site from the Spring Hill Trail parking lot and surrounding roadways, but the letter does not indicate when that visit occurred. The CDFW letter notes that cottonwood and blackberry species were located on the site, but the letter did not specify where those species were located. At the time of the consultant biologist’s site visit in April 2017, these species were not observed, nor was there any riparian habitat. The IS/MND included a description of site conditions, noting that there are no natural streams or water courses on the project site and that the site has been filled in many areas. As such, the IS/MND’s conclusion there would be no impact on sensitive habitat, including wetlands, was reasonable. However, to be responsive to the comment, the City will include, as a condition of approval, that the applicant shall submit a wetlands assessment, and delineation if determined to be necessary as a result of the assessment, to the City. If wetlands subject to CDFW jurisdiction are identified and would be impacted by the project, the condition shall require the applicant to submit the delineation to CDFW and implement appropriate avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation to ensure no net loss of wetland values prior to the City’s issuance of a grading permit for the project. The applicant will also be required to obtain and comply with any necessary permits.

In response to the comment concerning rare plants, it is unknown when the project might be constructed. As such, performing a rare plant survey would be most beneficial prior to when site preparation is likely to occur. To be responsive to the comment, the City will include, as a condition of approval, that the applicant provide the City the results of protocol-level surveys conducted at the appropriate time of year for special-status plants species with potential to occur on the site and prior to any site disturbance. If special-status plants are found and cannot be avoided, the City shall require the applicant to mitigate impacts, which could include replacing habitat and individuals at a ratio determined in consultation with the County, the CDFW, and/or the US Fish and Wildlife Service but no less than 1:1; preserving and enhancing existing populations, creating off-site populations on mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, with follow-up monitoring to ensure success; restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve the agreed-upon replacement ratio; and/or dedicating conservation easements, purchasing mitigation credits, or other off-site conservation measures.

The City will also include as a condition of approval CDFW’s recommendation for invasive species management. Such measures may include working from weed-free areas into infested areas, if necessary, cleaning equipment prior to entering and existing the site, and post-construction monitoring to ensure no new infestations of invasive species occur.
Several comments focused on consistency with the General Plan and the presentation of that analysis in the IS/MND, including the IS/MND’s conclusions on this topic. General Plan connection and consistency are discussed earlier in this staff report.

As explained in the IS/MND, a detailed analysis of a project’s consistency with every policy in the General Plan is not required under CEQA. The question to be answered is whether a project would conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted “for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.” Further, as stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15358(b), “effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change.” A policy inconsistency is considered to be a significant adverse environmental impact only when it conflicts with a policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and it is anticipated that the inconsistency would result in a significant adverse physical impact (based on the established significance criteria). Thus, the policies of the General Plan that are considered in the IS/MND are correctly limited to those directed at avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Policies that are not related to environmental issues will be addressed by the Planning Commission during the decision-making process based on information provided by City staff. Moreover, while the IS/MND considered the project’s consistency with applicable policies of the City of Mt. Shasta General Plan concerning environmental matters pursuant to CEQA Section 15125(d), the Planning Commission will ultimately make the determination of the project’s consistency with the General Plan for all relevant policies.

The IS/MND did not state there would be “no impact” relative to consistency with General Plan policies, as asserted by some commenters. The IS/MND concluded there would be potentially significant impacts requiring mitigation. General Plan policies, zoning regulations, and other applicable plans that are applicable to the proposed project for purposes of mitigating an environmental effect were identified, as appropriate, in the technical sections of the IS/MND. Those policies, regulations, and/or plans are identified in subsection 4.1 (Aesthetics), subsection 4.3 (Air Quality), subsection 4.4 (Biological Resources), subsection 4.5 (Cultural Resources), subsection 4.7 (Geology and Soils), subsection 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), subsection 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality), subsection 4.13 (Noise), subsection 4.17 (Transportation), and subsection 4.19 (Tribal Cultural Resources). Mitigation measures are identified in each of these sections to ensure compliance with policies, regulations, and plans, as appropriate to reduce potential impacts. With mitigation, the proposed project would be consistent with relevant plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For those topics where there is an applicable policy but would not result in an environmental effect, those issues are noted.

Stormwater/Drainage

Many of the commenters are concerned about the run-off and drainage of the Car Wash development. The Car Wash is required to keep site drainage at or below the pre-development standards of the site; therefore, there is no drainage from the Car Wash operation into the drainage system. The City has required the development of an industrial wastewater permit for the development to collect all water used in the car wash, process it onsite, and discharge to the
City’s wastewater system. A condition of approval has been added to address the concern of the commenters.

**Economic Development**

Commenters were concerned with the lack of job creation and reliability of the Car Wash Development. The development anticipates employing 2 to 3 people throughout the year. Once the storage facility is full, there is minimal need for employee supervision. The Car Wash is self-operating with occasional maintenance. The developments would be subject to sales tax.

Commenters are in favor of a development that would result in more job creation and tax revenue generation. Economic development and job creation are not topics assessed under CEQA nor considered negative impacts to mitigate through a conditional use permit. The Planning Commission or City Council are not able to amend the development proposal in the meeting to a completely different use as suggested by the commenters.

**Water Use/Demand:**

Water Use and Demand of the Car Wash portion of the project was referred to in the comment letters as a point of concern. The commenters identified that the water system in the area is not adequate to meet the needs of the development based on an assessment done by PACE Engineering (City Engineer Firm) in 2016. The study is outdated and did not take the Big Lakes Project improvements into account when calculating the available water system for the development. Since the completion of the Big Lakes project there is available water service to the development.

The Car Wash will also have a graywater system that will reuse car wash water. The preliminary design presented in the proposed development states:

> City supplies consist of spring and well sources that have a combined effective capacity of 3.5 to 4.0 mgd. The auto-wash would include a reclaimed water system, which would reduce water use. The combined demand from the auto-wash and self-wash stations would be approximately 423,400 gallons per year. This would be less than 0.01 percent of the overall city water demand in 2030. During normal and dry years there would be sufficient supply, and in drought years the proposed project would be subject to mandatory water use restrictions. (IS/MND, Page 4.0-48)

The exact mandatory water restrictions are associated with Executive Orders from the Governor in times of emergencies and from the Department of Water Resources. The City is not able to accurately predict the exact orders or restrictions that would be made at this time. In the past, drought measures on car washes have not been restrictive due to the efficiency and graywater systems required for the systems.

In terms of comments pertaining to water use and payment to the City, the car wash operation would be subject to the rates established in the last rate study for commercial enterprises. The development would be required to pay the base fee all commercial businesses pay and pay per
gallon similar to other users. The development does not received any subsidy from the City to use the municipal water system.

Fire Hazard

Comment letter were concerned with the increased risk of fire with the mini-storage portion of the development. The City Staff have reviewed the development and determined that the fire risk is a perceived rather than real risk. The development will be required to follow all applicable Building and Fire Codes which include fire safety measures within and around the buildings.

The current Fire Code requires that the development provide adequate water supplies, fire suppression equipment, and fire walls to contain and prevent fires from spreading in the development. The development will also have adequate clearance for the passage of fire vehicles and buffer any fires from spread to the surrounding area before fire personnel can arrive onsite.

There is no increased concern related to the development and fire risk in City Staff experience. City Staff do not recommend any additional condition measures to address this concern.

Traffic Access

The primary development will utilize the driveways on the east side of the development for daily activities. The driveway on the west side of the mini-storage site is required by the Fire Department as a secondary access point that will not be utilized for regular business. A condition of approval was included to ensure compliance with City recommendations.

The condition of the private road which services the Springhill Trailhead, the development, and surrounding properties was listed as a concern by neighbors of the proposed development. The property owner of the road is responsible for meeting these requirements and would not be the responsibility of an individual development. An agreement for use of the private road should include maintenance and is not the purview of the City to determine the level or fiscal contribution of private roads.

Aesthetics:

There was concern voiced in the comment letters received that the aesthetics of the development will degrade the surrounding area. The City of Mt. Shasta prescribes and reviews the architectural quality of all commercial and large-scale housing developments through Chapter 18.60 “Architectural Review” of the Mt. Shasta Municipal Code.

All commercial and large-scale housing development (5 units or more) are required to follow the City’s Architectural Design Guidelines which prescribe specific development requirements and give direction on general design elements such as color. The developments are required to follow the “alpine” aesthetics which has been translated to mean neutral, natural color schemes, the use of natural looking materials (rock or wood facades) and use minimally intrusive lighting.

There is a concern for light pollution on Springhill trail and for the surrounding areas. The architectural design guidelines require that all outdoor lighting be covered and downward facing to eliminate and minimize glare from nighttime lighting. The development will have security
lighting on the ends of the mini-storage building that are set at 8 to 10 feet to allow for adequate nighttime lighting without spilling onto adjacent lots. The car wash portion of the project will have lighting installed at the entrance and exit at 10 feet in height. No lighting poles will be installed around the development. The development will also be required to use landscaping to shield the lighting from adjacent properties. To address the concern of the public comments, a condition of approval was created to either reduce the intensity to no more than 2,000 lumens per square foot of the lighting or install motion sensitive lighting on both the mini-storage and car wash portions of the development. The lighting will also be required to be a warm color scheme instead of a blue based color scheme to reduce the concern for sleep interruption.

In addition to the Architectural Design Guidelines, the mini-storage development is considered a “large-scale” development under Chapter 18.70 “Size Restrictions for Large Scale Commercial, Industrial”, which adds architectural, lighting, and landscaping elements to minimize the impact of the development’s aesthetics on the surrounding landscape.

Some comments had 3D modeling inserted or attached to the letters. The representation presented in these comments do not accurately portray the development proposal nor the City’s architectural standards. The development proposes to use neutral, natural colors which are allowed within the City’s guidelines. It should be noted that the Architectural Guidelines are not specific requirements to be met but suggestions for architectural details of projects. The guidelines also allow for the construction of metal buildings, which was reported incorrectly by commenters. The guidelines support the look of natural materials but not necessarily just using natural materials:

As noted in these guidelines, the appearance in most cases is the important focus, not necessarily the material type. (page 9, Architectural Guidelines 2010)

The Project does propose to use a forest green matte finish on the roofing material, matte beige siding, and some faux-rock material on the outside of the buildings. These project details would achieve the intent of the guidelines. There are no recommended conditions to add to the conditional use permit in relation to building materials and façade aesthetics.

The property between the mini-storage and car wash development has requested that the proposed fencing be done on the grade of the development rather than the lower grade near the property to prevent individuals from viewing the backyard of the property. A condition of approval has been added to accommodate this request.

Cultural Assessment:

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires that jurisdictions consult with California Indigenous Tribes in the CEQA process in addition to the general public comment sections. The City sent letters to the twelve (12) listed contacts for tribes that claim heritage sites in the area. The City received no letters requesting consultation in the 30-day time period allotted for the tribal consultation ((Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)). A letter was received by the Pit River Tribe on May 22, 2019 indicating that there were no heritage sites on the property. The tribe did not request any addition consultation on the project.
A letter was received as part of the General Public Comment period from the Winnemem Wintu Tribe. Without a written request during the 30-day tribal consultation period, there is no requirement for the City to give special consultation to the tribe.

In terms of responding to the comments posed by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), the City has amended the sections in the MMRP to reflect the correct language that was intended and recommended by NAHC. There was a typo in the public draft that is highlighted and bolded in red in the MMRP.

**Air Quality**

Some commenters questioned the results of the air quality analysis in the IS/MND (Section 4.3). A major concern raised was the “climate zone” used in the CalEEMod model, which was used to estimate the project’s criteria air pollutant, ozone precursor, and GHG emissions. Emissions from customer vehicles were also a concern.

**CalEEMod Results**

CalEEMod (California Emissions Estimator Model) is a statewide computer model that quantifies construction and operational criteria pollutant and GHG emissions from land use development projects. The model evaluates construction emissions associated with site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coatings, and paving. Emission sources considered by the model include off-road construction equipment, on-road mobile vehicles, fugitive dust from land disturbance, and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities. CalEEMod quantifies project emissions based on user-defined inputs for project location, operational year, land use type (e.g., commercial), climate zone, and size. Based on these minimum data inputs, users can estimate construction emissions based on model-generated default assumptions for construction phasing, construction equipment inventory and activities, and trip lengths. Default values included in the model were provided by California air districts and account for local conditions and regulations. Where appropriate, CalEEMod combines local data with regional and statewide values to ensure enough information is available to quantify emissions. Users can override default values with project-specific information.

Some commenters asserted climate zone 16 should have been used instead of 14 in the CalEEMod modeling for the proposed project. This appears to be in reference to the Title 24 Building Climate Zones. As explained in the User’s Guide for CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, which was used for the analysis and which is readily available to the public online at [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4), “the climate zones that have been programmed into CalEEMod are based on the California Energy Commission’s (CEC) Forecasting Climate Zones, which are different from the Title 24 Building Climate Zones.” For Siskiyou County, the Title 24 Building Climate Zone is 16. In the CalEEMod User’s Guide, Appendix F (Climate Zones Lookup), there are only 14 climate zones, and the climate zone for the City of Mt. Shasta and Siskiyou County is 14. Therefore, the analysis in the IS/MND correctly used the appropriate climate zone (14) for purposes of estimating air and GHG emissions, and re-analysis, as demanded by the commenters, is not required.

**Vehicle Emissions**
Another concern raised by commenters was vehicle emissions from customer vehicles and potential health effects. Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM 2.5) is the size of ambient particulate matter air pollution most associated with adverse health effects of the air pollutants that have ambient air quality standards and is a component of vehicle exhaust. Most PM 2.5 is from combustion, such as the use of gasoline and diesel fuels by motor vehicles, burning of natural gas to generate electricity, and wood burning.

The total operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. The results were presented in the IS/MND (Table 4.3-2) and compared to Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District (SCAPCD) numerical thresholds, with detailed results in Appendix B. All the emissions were substantially lower than SCAPCD thresholds. In particular, total PM 2.5 emissions (0.21 pounds per day) would be less than 0.1% of the threshold. This reflects the small number of trips that would be associated with the project, which were quantified and evaluated in Section 4.17 in the IS/MND. The trips would occur throughout the day and would not be concentrated at any one time at any one specific location.

CalEEMod estimates mass emissions of a pollutant, but it does not quantify concentrations of the various air pollutants, which are needed to evaluate potential human health effects from exposure to criteria pollutants, over both the long-term and short-term. The potential health risk effects of project-related idling emissions, as requested by commenters, cannot be evaluated for two reasons. First, pollutants such as PM 2.5 emitted by a specific source often do not accumulate adjacent to that source. Pollutants can be transported by prevailing winds or transformed through chemical reactions and physical interactions with other pollutants in the atmosphere. Because some pollutants can be transported over long distances, health effects experienced by the local population may be the result of distant emission sources, some of which may not even be in the project vicinity or even within the same air basin. Second, the models and tools that have been developed to address human health effects are regional in nature and are not well suited to analyze small or localized changes in pollutant concentrations associated with individual projects, such as the proposed project. In 2015, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District stated: “it remains impossible, using today’s models, to correlate that increase in concentration to a specific health impact [because] such models are designed to determine regional, population-wide health impacts, and simply are not accurate when applied at the local level.” As of 2019, neither the SCAPCD nor any other air district currently have methodologies that could be used to evaluate the potential health risk effects of idling emissions from a project as small as the proposed project. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15145 (Speculation), any attempt at the analysis requested by commenters would be speculative and would not provide any meaningful data for which a determination of significance, thus possibly necessitating the need for mitigation measures, could be made.

Energy and Greenhouse Gas

The IS/MND included an evaluation of Energy (Section 4.6) GHG impacts (Section 4.8). The estimates of energy use and GHG emissions were calculated in the CalEEMod model, which used the correct climate zone (see Air Quality, above). Use of the CalEEMod provides a quantitative assessment of GHG emissions, explains the City’s rational for selection of appropriate numerical thresholds for evaluating whether GHG impacts would be significance and therefore is consistent with CEQA requirements (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4).
The specific use for the propane tank is not required for the analysis of energy or GHG impacts. The estimates of energy intensity assumed a CalEEMod default for natural gas, which is a proxy for propane tank use in the case of the proposed project. This provides a more conservative estimate of energy intensity and GHG (and other pollutant) emissions.

Some commenters were of the opinion the City should require the project to reduce GHG emissions to meet the state’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, which lays out the framework for achieving the mandate of SB 32 (2016) to reduce statewide GHG emissions to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by the end of 2030. As shown in Table 4.8-1, the project’s GHG emissions would not exceed thresholds for 2030 and therefore would not be significant, requiring mitigation measures. The City will require the applicant to comply with applicable Cal Green energy-reduction standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance, which also addresses GHG reduction. The City cannot compel the applicant to go above and beyond what is required by the code. The 40% reduction mandated in the Scoping Plan is a statewide goal; there is no regulatory mandate that this goal be applied to a specific project.

Noise

The City received numerous comments on the IS/MND’s analysis of noise impacts and mitigation measures (Section 4.13). The IS/MND did not impermissibly defer the analysis of operational noise impacts. In fact, the IS/MND determined such impacts could, in fact, be significant, thus requiring mitigation.

The City’s daytime 50 A-weighted decibel (dBA) criterion for residential properties was used for determining whether there would be a significant impact, as stated in the IS/MND. The 50-dBA standard applies to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., when the car wash would operate. The 50-dBA criterion is more restrictive than the 60 dBA criterion mentioned by many commenters. The City’s nighttime standard (45 dBA) does not apply, as mentioned by some commenters, because the car wash would not be allowed to operate between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The IS/MND is not required to evaluate or resolve whether the City’s noise standards are or are not restrictive enough, in general, or that some other criterion should have been applied because of the nature of the project. The IS/MND objectively and correctly applied the current City standard, which is based on the General Plan Noise Element.

The IS/MND included a quantitative analysis using standard analytical techniques and calculations showing that the 50-dBA criterion would or could be exceeded at certain off-site locations, including the closest residences. Even for locations where the 50-dBA criterion might not be exceeded or where the calculated noise level would be only a few tenths above 50 dB, the IS/MND conservatively assumed there could be an impact requiring mitigation.

The IS/MND included two mitigation measures (NOI-2 and NOI-3) that identify actions the applicant must take to ensure the City’s daytime noise standard of 50 dBA would not be exceeded. Under MM NOI-2, consistent with General Plan Implementation Measure NZ-1.2(a) and Policy NZ-1.7 requirements that methods to achieve noise standards are included in project design, the applicant will be required to include noise attenuation for the car wash in project design. This could include (a) installing automatic entrance and exit doors on the automatic car wash that operate immediately when the car wash is in use, (b) using quieter dryers, or (c)
installing a 6-foot noise barrier to the north and east. The use of automatic car wash doors can reduce noise levels substantially. Under any option, prior to the City’s issuance of an occupancy permit, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the resulting noise levels generated by the project with the inclusion of one or more of these options does not exceed the City’s 50 dBA standard at the closest residential properties. If the results indicate a 6-foot barrier is not sufficient, an additional noise-attenuation method must be included in design to reduce noise levels further to achieve the 50-dBA standard, which would help minimize aesthetic impacts that may result with a taller barrier.

For the vacuum station at the self-service wash, the 50-dBA criterion may or may not exceed, depending on how many units are operated, which is stated in the IS/MND. Under mitigation measure NOI-3, the applicant must implement one of the following, or equally effective, noise-reducing measures prior to project operation: (a) install mufflers or similar noise attenuation on the vacuum stations; (b) use vacuum units that produce less noise; or (c) install a noise barrier to the north and/or east as necessary. Under any option, noise monitoring must be performed at the applicant’s expense to demonstrate the resulting noise level is less than 50 dBA. If monitoring shows levels are not reduced, another method for noise reduction must be used or if the City’s 50 dBA cannot be achieved, the applicant will not be permitted to operate the vacuum station.

Under both MM NOI-2 and NOI-3, the applicant is required to provide the City the results of noise monitoring by a qualified professional demonstrating compliance with the 50-dBA daytime standard. Such noise monitoring shall also account for simultaneous operation of the vacuum stations with the auto wash. If the City’s 50 dBA noise standard is not achieved, the applicant must implement a remedy to reduce noise levels to the City’s satisfaction.

Consistent with CEQA requirements for mitigation measures, these mitigation measures are specific and timebound, contain a performance standard, and are feasible for the applicant to implement. The mitigation measures do not require further analysis or study to determine whether there is an impact, because significant impacts were already identified. The analysis leading to the conclusion that operational noise impacts would be significant are predictions (estimates) based on mathematical equations. Additional analysis or modeling of both impacts and mitigation measures, as demanded by commenters, would still only predict noise levels. The mitigation measures in the IS/MND require the applicant to provide the results of real-time noise monitoring at the closest residences, before the project is operational. This is not deferred mitigation. Such monitoring data and verification that the noise attenuation features provided in the project are meeting the 50-dBA standard can only be achieved when the features are in place and operating. In addition, the mitigation measures provide that if the City receives complaints from nearby residences about noise, the applicant is required to take corrective action to reduce noise levels to the City’s satisfaction. The approach and details presented in the mitigation measures are consistent with case law, which has established that the formulation of precise means of mitigating impacts that may be impractical at the time of project approval is acceptable provided that the impacts being mitigated are identified as significant at the time of project approval.

The IS/MND included noise measurement data, noting specifically that there is a wide range in noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the site, ranging from under 50 dBA to as high as 82 dBA. Some commenters were of the opinion the IS/MND did not adequately account for the existing
noise environment, suggesting that the project would add to daytime ambient noise levels that are already above 60 dBA, a level that the General Plan Noise Element establishes as acceptable for residential uses. Adding a new noise source to a high noise source does not necessarily result in substantially louder noise. The addition of a new noise source and resulting sound levels is not done through ordinary arithmetic because the decibel scale is logarithmic, not linear. For example, if the ambient noise level is approximately 68 dBA, and a new, continuous noise source generating 50 dBA is added, the estimated noise level would be 68.1 dBA. The increase, less than 1 dBA, would not be perceptible to the human ear. If the ambient noise level is less (e.g., 55 dBA), and a new, continuous 50 dBA source is added, the predicted noise level would be 56.2 dBA, slightly over a 1 dBA increase, which would also not be perceptible. In addition, the resulting 56 dBA would be within the range of noise levels measured in the vicinity of the project site and noise levels reported in the General Plan Noise Element. Moreover, the car wash would not be a continuous source of noise, but rather intermittent, as compared to other noise sources such as traffic and railroad operations, which are the primary contributors to ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. For these reasons, and with mitigation measures requiring noise attenuation, the IS/MND did not identify this as a significant impact.

Concerns were also raised about other sources of noise related to car wash use such as horns honking, vehicle audio systems, and uses of the site for activities other than as a car wash. These are examples of social behavior, which do not require analysis under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects). The frequency and nature of these activities cannot be predicted with any accuracy. Speculative impacts do not require analysis (CEQA Guidelines Section 15145, Speculation). Nuisance noise associated with car wash operations are subject to the California Vehicle Code (Section § 27007).

Analysis & Findings:

Chapter 18.29 “Conditional Use Permits” has a set of required findings that must be made to grant the use permit. Conditions of approval can be used to have the development proposal fit with the required findings.

(A) The proposed use is consistent with the Mt. Shasta General Plan, any applicable specific plan, and the provisions of this code.

As stated above, the General Plan designation and the zoning code allow for the Planning Director to refer non-listed uses that could fit the conditional or permitted uses to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Mini-Storage and the Car Wash uses could be argued as appropriate conditional uses to the C-2 zone due to similar uses being located in the zone (car wash on south Mt. Shasta Blvd. and along Lake Street are in C1 and C-2 zones) and mini storage is located in the C-2 zone along North Mt. Shasta Blvd just south of this development.

The development has also met the conditions of the large scale development ordinance for the mini storage use (IS/MND page 3.0-15). City Staff recommend the approval of the below conditions would allow the Planning Commission to make Finding A for the proposed development.
(B) The subject property is adequate in land area to accommodate the proposed project, its required parking area, access, landscaping, and site improvements.

The proposed development is zoned C-2 which has no minimum setbacks for buildings on the properties. The mini storage development does qualify as a “large scale” development which requires special setbacks and buffers. A 30-foot landscape buffer is required and achieved by the proposed development between adjacent residential uses. Springhill is not considered an adjacent residential use; therefore, a landscape buffer is not required.

The development proposes to use a decorative metal fencing with public art installation along the development to minimize the aesthetic impacts of the development. The chain link fence with slats is proposed between the development and the residential use between the two proposed uses. The fencing has complimentary landscaping to minimize impacts to the surrounding area. The IS/MND also includes additional mitigations that when adopted will meet Finding A.

The City does recommend the adoption of a condition to require the boundary fence around the residential use APN 057-801-200 to be built at the grade of the development rather than below grade. The movement of the fencing to the higher grade will result in greater privacy for the residential use.

The development would not result in the loss of on street parking in the immediate area. The parking for the Springhill Trailhead will remain intact and not subject to change due to the project. On-site the development provides an adequate number of parking spaces to accommodate the employees. Both the mini-storage and car wash uses do not require long-term onsite parking for visitors and those using the facilities. The Mini Storage does allow for the passing and temporary parking of vehicles for users to access the facility and leave. The Car Wash use allows for vehicles to cycle in and out of the facility with enough parking for periodic employees to service the facility.

City Staff feels Finding B can be made with the recommended conditions of approval below.

(C) The proposed land use is compatible with neighboring land use and zoning.

Finding C could be made by observing similar uses in other areas of the City as discussed in Finding A. The main difference to be considered by the Planning Commission is that the area around the proposed development is mainly built out with residential uses rather than a mixture of commercial and residential.

As stated in Finding A, the proposed uses could be argued as compatible with the current zoning code designation.

(D) The public and private roads providing access to the subject property meet necessary standards to provide safe and adequate access, or have been amended by conditions of project approval to satisfy the access requirements.
The City Staff have reviewed the development proposal and feel the ingress and egress of the development is adequate for the proposed use with the condition that the western driveway is only used in cases of emergency access.

Planning Commission may add a condition of approval to address the private road condition, but the private road is used by a number of different users, like the SpringHill Trailhead, that could have a higher estimated number of trips per day than the proposed development. The City Staff recommendation is to not include a condition of approval and allow the private road owner to negotiate appropriate maintenance terms with the adjacent property owners.

(E) Conditions of project approval are necessary for protection of the public health, safety, and welfare, and to reduce or eliminate potential environmental effects.

The IS/MND prepared for the development includes a number of mitigations to reduce the environmental impacts of the development to less than significant. In addition to those mitigation, the City Staff have added conditions of approval to address the public concern voiced about wetland and sensitive species. Although the CEQA documentation does not note any wetland or sensitive habitat, the City Staff offer conditions to ease the distress surrounding the topic area.

The other conditions listed below will allow the Planning Commission to meet Finding E.

(F) Any requirements for the dedication of land are reasonably related to the use of the property.

The City has easements to access the sewer line running at the northern boundary of the mini storage development. There are no other areas in need of dedication.

The City has included conditions of approval for the possible dedication of a conservation easement with the wetland or sensitive species studies find habitat in the area. Again, the CEQA process did not highlight any wetland or sensitive habitat but a condition is recommend to address the public concern.

The City Staff feel Planning Commission can make Finding F with the below conditions of approval.

(G) The requirements for the posting of improvement security for installation of public or private improvements is reasonably related to the use of the property.

The security measures installed for the mini storage and car wash project are adequate and similar to best practices related to the uses. The City has offered the Planning Commission a condition of approval to ensure that the security lighting does not disturb the adjacent properties while still providing adequate security.

There was public concern over the mini storage facility and fire risk, but the development is require to employ all fire code measures and the City Staff did not perceive the mini storage as a safety risk once the Fire Code measures are applied.

City Staff feels that the Planning Commission can make Finding E with the below conditions of approval.
Recommendation Motions & Discussion:

CEQA

1. “I motion that the Planning Commission certify and adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project and accompanying Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission agrees that the following finding was made based on the evidence.

Finding: All potentially significant impacts have been adequately analyzed in a Mitigated Negative Declaration that was prepared for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project by the City. Staff has reviewed the Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, which indicates the Project, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

Evidence: Staff prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project and mitigation measures have been developed that will reduce potential environmental impacts to less than significant levels. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) recorded on the property will ensure compliance with all mitigation measures throughout project implementation.

The City distributed the Notice of Intent to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration on June 19, 2019. It was posted at the Siskiyou County Clerk’s office, distributed through State Clearinghouse, and at the City offices, Public Library, and City Newspapers, pursuant to Section 15072 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (State CEQA Guidelines). The Mitigated Negative Declaration was made available to the public during this 70-day review period, which closed on August 28, 2019.

Based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration, environmental analysis, and the whole record, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant adverse impact on the environment above those addressed within the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. “I motion that the Planning Commission approve the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project.”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission cannot make the necessary finding that all potentially significant impacts have been reduces to less than significant impacts through the mitigations presented and will require additional environmental review through an Environmental Impact Report.
3. “I motion to request additional information from City Staff regarding [environmental review and/or Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration document.]”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission needs more information to confirm whether the necessary finding can be made. The motioning Planning Commissioner should state the specific information that is being requested at the end of the motion.

**Conditional Use Permit**

4. “I motion to deny conditional use permit for the Freeze Mini-Storage [and/or] Car Wash Project.”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission cannot grant a conditional use permit to the development in whole or part because it cannot make the necessary findings outlined in Section 18.29.030. Planning Commissioner making the motion should specify whether the conditional use permit can be granted to the whole development or just one piece of the development. If the Planning Commission make the motion to deny a piece of the development, an additional meeting will be scheduled to consider the revised application.

5. “I motion to request more information regarding conditions of approval and/or conditional use findings and table the item until more information is available.”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission is requesting more analysis and information regarding the project and/or conditions. Planning Commissioner motioning should state the specific information needed to make an informed decision.

6. “I motion to approve Conditional Use Permit for Mini-Storage and/or Car Wash with the recommended conditions of approval.”

By making this motion, the Planning Commission can make the necessary findings outlined in the “Analysis and Findings” section of this report with the recommended conditions of approval. Planning Commission may add to the list of conditions of approval to address issues they see with the Project.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

- Condition to complete the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

- Condition to prepare at a minimum a Level 2 rapid wetland assessment of all parcels prior to ground disturbance. The City shall require a delineation if the assessment indicates wetland areas on the property. If wetlands are subject to CDFW jurisdiction, the Applicant will submit the delineation to CDFW and implement appropriate avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation to ensure no net loss of wetland values prior
to the City’s issuance of a grading permit for the project. Applicant shall also be required to obtain and comply with any necessary permitting.

- Condition to provide the City the results of protocol-level surveys conducted at the appropriate time of year for special-status plant species with potential to occur on the site and prior to any site disturbance. If special-status species are found and cannot be avoided, the City shall require the applicant to mitigate impacts, which could include replacing habitat and individuals at a ratio determined in consultation with the County, the CDFW, and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but no less than 1:1; preserving and enhancing existing populations, creating off-site populations on mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, with follow-up monitoring to ensure success; restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve the agreed-upon replacement ratio; and/or dedicating conservation easements, purchasing mitigation credits, or other off-site conservation measures.

- Condition to implement invasive plant species control measures. These measures will include working from weed-free areas into infested areas if necessary, cleaning equipment prior to entering and exiting a new site, and post-construction monitoring to ensure no new infestations of invasive species occurring.

- Condition to limit the activity of the car wash to 50 cars a day based on the estimations and studies presented in the Initial Study. If the applicant wishes to increase activity, amendments to the Conditional Use Permit

- Condition that the western driveway of the mini-storage development only be used in cases of emergency in which public safety vehicles must access the development.

- Condition to require the development install lighting measures to reduce the lighting to 2,000 lumens per square foot during nighttime hours (10PM to 7AM) or install motion sensitive lighting on all portions of the development. The lighting shall be of a warm color scheme.

- Condition that all Car Wash wastewater must be collected, treated onsite, and discharged into the City’s wastewater system as per the final Industrial Wastewater Permit.

- Condition to require fencing around APN #057-801-200 be constructed at the development grade around the property instead of at the lower grade of the residential property.

Attachments:

1. Site Location
2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
3. Architectural Attachments
1. INTRODUCTION

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Freeze Mini-Storage and Car Wash Project. An MMRP is required for the proposed project because the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has identified potentially significant impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts to less than significant. This MMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to “adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.”

2. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The MMRP is presented in tabular form on the following pages. The components of the MMRP are described briefly below.

- **Mitigation Measure:** The mitigation measures are taken from the IS/MND, in the same order they appear in the IS/MND.

- **Mitigation Responsibility:** Identifies which entity is responsible for implementing the activities in the mitigation measure.

- **Mitigation Action/Timing:** Identifies at which stage of the project the mitigation must be implemented and/or completed.

- **Compliance Monitoring Responsibility:** Identifies which entity is responsible for ensuring the mitigation measure is implemented. In all cases, the City will be responsible for monitoring compliance.

- **Verification Action/Timing:** Identifies when compliance with the mitigation measure must be verified by the City.

- **Verification (Date and Initials):** Indicates the person who reviewed the mitigation measure and the date the measure was determined complete.
This page intentionally left blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Responsibility</th>
<th>Mitigation Action/Timing</th>
<th>Compliance Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verification Action/Timing</th>
<th>Verification (Date and Initials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM AES-1</strong></td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Show on site plan and implement during construction.</td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
<td>Site plan review and inspection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal fencing with stone veneer columns instead of wire fabric with colored slats shall be installed along the northeast side of the mini-storage, connecting the decorative fencing planned along the northwest and east sides, to provide a continuous single-style design. The location and type of fencing shall be shown on the final site plan.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Revise landscape plan; implement during construction; and monitor plant success during operation.</td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM AES-2</strong></td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Revise landscape plan; implement during construction; and monitor plant success during operation.</td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
<td>Landscape plan review and inspection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant shall submit revised landscaping plans for the mini-storage and car wash identifying trees to remain, trees to be removed, and the locations and species of new trees and shrubs to be planted. The updated landscape plans shall be submitted to the City at the time of grading permit application. The grading and/or site utilities plan shall indicate the location of landscape irrigation systems. All landscaped areas shall be irrigated or shall be certified that they can be maintained and survive without artificial irrigation. If the plantings fail to survive, the property owner shall replace them. All landscaping shall be maintained throughout the site for the life of the project.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MM AES-3** Metal fencing with stone veneer columns identical to that planned for the mini-storage shall be installed along the car wash frontage on Ski Village Drive between the two car wash driveways and along the southern and western boundary, where it will connect to the mini-storage security fence. The trash enclosure shall be placed inside the fencing. The location and type of fencing shall be shown on the final site plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>Show on site plan and implement during construction.</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Site plan review and inspection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MM AES-4** As part of the building permit application, the applicant shall submit a lighting report and plan for the entire site (mini-storage and car wash) to the City for approval. The plan shall include the following to demonstrate how indirect overflow of light onto adjacent properties (spillover) light will be minimized:

- A brief written narrative, with accompanying plan or sketch, which demonstrates the objectives of the lighting.
- Photometric data, Color Rendering Index (CRI) of all lamps (bulbs), and other descriptive information on the fixtures, and, if applicable or required, designation as Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) “cut-off” fixtures.
- Computer-generated photometric grid showing footcandle readings every 10 feet within the property or site, and 10 feet beyond the property lines at a scale specified by the Planning Department. Iso-footcandle contour line style plans are also acceptable.
- Relative landscaping information that indicates mature tree size, shrubbery and other vegetation in order to evaluate the long-term and seasonal effectiveness of lighting or screening of lighting.

| Project applicant | Submit report and plan as identified in mitigation measure. | City of Mt. Shasta | Site plan review and inspection. |
### Air Quality

**MM AIR-1** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City shall ensure the grading plan notes include the following:

a. All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be covered or sufficiently watered to prevent fugitive dust from leaving property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of ambient air quality standards. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete site coverage, preferably in the mid-morning and after work is completed each day.

b. All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent a public nuisance.

c. All areas (other than paved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered periodically or have dust palliatives applied for stabilization of dust emissions.

d. All project vehicles shall be limited to a speed of 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads

e. All land clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation activities on the project site shall be suspended when winds are expected to exceed 20 miles per hour.

f. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of free board in accordance with the requirements of CVC [California Vehicle Code] Section 23114. This provision is enforced by local law enforcement agencies.

g. Paved streets adjacent to the construction site that are used by project construction vehicles and/or equipment movement shall be swept or washed at the end of the day to remove excessive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>Include mitigation measure on grading plan notes and implement during construction.</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Confirm grading plan includes notes and verify measures used during construction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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accumulations of silt and/or mud resulting from activities on the project site. Dry power sweeping is prohibited.

h. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. Construction equipment shall be a minimum EPA Tier 3 certified.

i. Off-road construction equipment shall not be left idling for periods longer than five minutes when not in use.

j. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. The SCAPCD’s phone number shall also be included on the sign.

k. All building pads and paving shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

### Biological Resources

**MM BIO-1** If clearing and/or construction activities would occur during the bird breeding season (typically January through July for raptors and February 15 through August 15 for other birds), preconstruction surveys to identify active nests shall be conducted within 3 days of construction initiation, particularly vegetation-clearing and ground-disturbing activities. Surveys must be performed by a qualified biologist for the purposes of determining presence/absence of active nest sites within the proposed impact area, including construction access routes and a 500-foot buffer (if feasible). If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is required. Surveys shall be repeated if construction activities are delayed or postponed for

| Project applicant | Include mitigation measure on grading plan notes. Implement prior to and during construction. Provide survey report(s) to City and implement protective measures during construction. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm survey completed and grading notes include measure. |
more than 7 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MM BIO-2</strong> If an active nest is found during preconstruction surveys, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until a qualified biologist deems the nest inactive. Restrictions shall include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment) at a minimum radius of 300 feet around an active raptor nest and 100 feet around other active bird nest(s). Activities permitted within exclusion zones and the size may be adjusted through consultation with the CDFW.</th>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>Implement protective measures during construction and provide documentation to City.</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Confirm restrictions implemented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MM BIO-3</strong> Vegetation containing active nests that must be removed as part of the project shall be removed during the nonbreeding season (August 16 through December 31), but only provided that the nest(s) are confirmed no longer active.</th>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>During construction. Provide documentation prepared by qualified biologist nests removed only during period identified in mitigation measure</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Confirm documentation submitted and measures implemented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MM BIO-4</strong> Construction-related activities shall occur only during daylight hours.</th>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>Include notes on grading plan.</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Inspect during construction activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **MM BIO-5** Prior to the removal of any trees, a bat survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist between March 1 and July 31. If bat roosts are identified, the bats shall be safely flushed from the sites where roosting habitat is planned to be removed prior to roosting season (typically May to August) and prior to the onset of construction activities. If maternity roosts are identified during the roosting season (typically May to September), they must remain undisturbed until a qualified biologist has determined the young bats are no | Project applicant | Prior to and during construction, provide survey report(s) to City and implement protective measures during construction. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm survey completed. Verify compliance through site inspection. |
longer roosting. If roosting is found to occur on-site, replacement roost habitat (e.g., bat boxes) shall be provided to offset the roosting sites removed. If no bat roosts are detected, then no further action is required if the trees or buildings are removed prior to the next breeding season. If removal is delayed, an additional survey shall be conducted 30 days prior to removal to ensure that a new colony has not been established.

**MM BIO-6** If a female or maternity colony of bats is found on the project site, and the project can be constructed without the elimination or disturbance of the roosting colony (e.g., if the colony roosts in a large tree not planned for removal), a qualified biologist shall determine what buffer zones shall be employed to ensure the continued success of the colony. Such buffer zones may include a construction-free barrier of 200 feet from the roost and/or the timing of the construction activities outside of the maternity roosting season (after July 31 and before March 1).

**MM BIO-7** If an active nursery roost is documented on-site and the project cannot be conducted outside of the maternity roosting season, bats shall be excluded from the site after July 31 and before March 1 to prevent the formation of maternity colonies. Nonbreeding bats shall be safely evicted, under the direction of a bat specialist in coordination with the CDFW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM CUL-1</strong> If any subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. An on-site archaeological monitor or principal investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained by the project applicant and shall be afforded a reasonable amount of time to evaluate the significance of the find. Work shall not continue within a 50-foot radius of the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either (1) not cultural in origin or (2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. If a potentially eligible resource is encountered, the archaeologist, the City, and the project applicant shall arrange for either (1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible, or (2) test excavations to evaluate eligibility and, if eligible, total data recovery as mitigation. The determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the City as verification that the provisions in CEQA for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met.

| MM CUL-2 | If human remains are discovered during project development, all work must stop within 50 feet of the find and the Siskiyou County Coroner shall be notified, per California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then determine those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American(s). Together with representatives of the people of most likely descent, a qualified archaeologist shall make an | Project applicant | Include mitigation measure on grading plan notes and implemented during construction. Notify City in accordance with mitigation measure and provide documentation to City of Mt. Shasta | City of Mt. Shasta | If remains found, confirm actions identified in mitigation have been implemented. |
assess the discovery and recommend/implement mitigation measures as necessary. City measures have been implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Project applicant</th>
<th>Submit SWPPP to City prior to construction. Implement BMPS during construction.</th>
<th>City of Mt. Shasta</th>
<th>Confirm SWPPP meets City standards. Verify compliance with BMPs through site inspection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MM GEO-1** The project applicant shall prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for the project to comply with the terms of both the EPA’s Stormwater General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Construction Activities and the State Water Resources Control Board’s General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities. The project applicant shall submit the SWPPP to the City with the grading permit application. The SWPPP shall include, but is not limited to, the following best management practices (BMPs):

- If excavation occurs during the rainy season, stormwater runoff from the construction area shall be regulated through a stormwater management/erosion control plan that shall include temporary on-site silt traps and/or basins with multiple discharge points to natural drainages and energy dissipaters. Stockpiles of loose material shall be covered and runoff diverted away from exposed soil material. If work stops due to rain, positive grading away from slopes shall be provided to carry the surface runoff to areas where flow would be controlled, such as temporary silt basins. Sediment basins/traps shall be located and operated to minimize the amount of off-site sediment transport. Any trapped sediment shall be removed from the basin or trap and placed at a suitable location on-site, away from concentrated flows, or removed to an approved disposal site. |
- Temporary erosion control measures (such as fiber rolls, staked straw bales, detention basins, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover) shall be provided until the proposed landscaping is established to minimize discharge of sediment into nearby waterways.
- No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the spring and winter months.

**MM GEO-2** The project applicant shall submit a grading plan to the City for review and approval. The grading plan shall identify how the recommendations in the Geologic and Soils Investigation (GeoServe and SCE 2016) will be achieved for: site preparation (removal of vegetation, old fill, debris, and subsurface utility features if any); excavation and compaction; vertical and lateral loads; and slabs on grade; and drainage. The grading plan shall also demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements of the City’s Construction Standards (Resolution No. CCR-05-12) and Mt. Shasta Municipal Code Chapter 15.04 (Building Code), which requires implementation of California Building Code Chapter 18, Section 1803 et seq. and Appendix J regulations pertaining to grading permits and plans. As required under Section J104, the grading plan shall show the existing grade and finished grade and estimated quantities of excavation and fill and how the project will meet applicable requirements set forth in Section J106 (Excavations), Section J107 (Fills), Section J109 (Drainage and Terracing), Section J110 (Erosion Control).

The grading plan shall also incorporate the recommendations of the Drainage Study (Mt.

| Project applicant | Prior to construction, submit grading plan. During construction, provide documentation to City demonstrating compliance with grading plan. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm grading plan meets City specifications. Verify compliance through site inspection. |
Shasta Engineering 2018) as it pertains to preparation of subsurface materials for drainage features such as culverts.

No vegetation removal or earthwork of any kind shall be permitted on the site until the City has issued a grading permit for the project. During earthwork, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City demonstrating compliance with the City-approved grading plan. The grading activities shall also be subject to inspection by City staff. In the event of non-compliance with the grading plan, as determined by City staff, the applicant shall cease activities until corrective action has been implemented to the City's satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous Materials</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM HAZ-1</strong> The applicant shall not be allowed to operate the car wash until the City has issued a final industrial waste discharge permit for the car wash and confirmed via inspection and test results provided by the applicant that the required pretreatment features have been installed and are operating correctly and that the effluent meets required limits specified in the permit. The applicant shall provide the results of routine outfall monitoring to the City as required by the final permit. If the system is not operating in accordance with the permit, the applicant shall be required to implement corrective action to the City’s satisfaction, or the City may require that car wash operations are discontinued.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM HAZ-2</strong> Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project, the City shall ensure construction plan grading notes includes the following and that</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the applicant has completed required inspections and data gathering to inform that process:
The project site shall be inspected by Underground Services Alert. The project applicant shall also request information from the Siskiyou County Environmental Health Department (SCEHD) to determine if any septic systems or wells are on-site. If such features are present, they shall be abandoned at the applicant's expense in accordance with SCEHD regulations. In the course of subsurface work such as excavation and trenching, any signs of residual petroleum and other soil contamination (e.g., stained, discolored, or odorous soil) are uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, or if previously unknown buried utility features or lines are found, construction activities in the affected area shall cease, and the applicant shall immediately notify the City's Public Works Director and Planning Department.

The Public Works Director and/or Planning Director, in consultation with the SCEHD and Central Valley RWQCB, shall advise the applicant’s construction contractor of the appropriate measures for containment, testing, and removal of the suspect material or features, in accordance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Construction work in the affected area shall not resume until the Public Works Director and/or Planning Director, in consultation with SCEHD and/or Central Valley RWQCB, has determined that all required corrective measures have been satisfied.

| Hydrology and Water Quality |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

Implement actions prior to and during construction as specified in mitigation measure. Provide results of consultation with SCEHD.

SCEHD and CVRWQCB if necessary.
The applicant shall prepare and submit a final drainage study and plan to the City for review and approval that identifies the specific drainage and stormwater runoff water quality treatment features identified in the CEQA Drainage Study, Commercial Site Development (Mt. Shasta Engineering 2018). The applicant shall not be allowed to operate the project until City staff have verified the final design features have been installed and are operating correctly.

The final drainage plan shall provide evidence the 18-inch CMP culvert on N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard will have adequate capacity to convey the project’s flows in combination with off-site tributary discharges to the culvert. The evaluation and analysis of culvert capacity shall be performed at the applicant’s expense and in coordination with City of Mt. Shasta Public Works staff. If it is determined the existing culvert does not have adequate capacity, the project’s drainage plan shall be redesigned to provide for retention of all stormwater from the 100-year design storm without connection to the 18-inch culvert. Redesign, if necessary, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.

The final drainage study and plan shall also include a monitoring program that provides for periodic measurements of the quantity (rate and volume) and composition of stormwater flows to the City’s system, to be performed at the applicant’s expense, to demonstrate the system is functioning as approved. The results of water quality monitoring shall also be used to document that there are no illicit discharges to the storm drain system.

The applicant shall be responsible for long-term maintenance of the on-site storm drain system and

| MM HYD-1 The applicant shall prepare and submit a final drainage study and plan to the City for review and approval that identifies the specific drainage and stormwater runoff water quality treatment features identified in the CEQA Drainage Study, Commercial Site Development (Mt. Shasta Engineering 2018). The applicant shall not be allowed to operate the project until City staff have verified the final design features have been installed and are operating correctly. The final drainage plan shall provide evidence the 18-inch CMP culvert on N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard will have adequate capacity to convey the project’s flows in combination with off-site tributary discharges to the culvert. The evaluation and analysis of culvert capacity shall be performed at the applicant’s expense and in coordination with City of Mt. Shasta Public Works staff. If it is determined the existing culvert does not have adequate capacity, the project’s drainage plan shall be redesigned to provide for retention of all stormwater from the 100-year design storm without connection to the 18-inch culvert. Redesign, if necessary, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The final drainage study and plan shall also include a monitoring program that provides for periodic measurements of the quantity (rate and volume) and composition of stormwater flows to the City’s system, to be performed at the applicant’s expense, to demonstrate the system is functioning as approved. The results of water quality monitoring shall also be used to document that there are no illicit discharges to the storm drain system. | Project applicant | Prior to construction, submit final drainage study and plan to City. During operation, submit monitoring results to City as specified in mitigation measure. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm drainage plan meets City standards. Verify features constructed through site inspection. Confirm receipt of monitoring results. |
any repairs should the system be found to not operate in accordance with approved final design.

**Noise**

**MM NOI-1**  Construction activity shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m., per the requirements of Mt. Shasta General Plan Policy NZ-1.B(c).

In order to reduce construction noise, during the site preparation and grading/excavation phases, the applicant shall install a temporary noise barrier or enclosure around the residential parcel adjoining the mini-storage and car wash parcels to break the line of sight between the construction equipment and the adjacent residence. The temporary noise barrier shall have a sound transmission class (STC) of 35 or greater in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Test Method E90, or at least 2 pounds per square foot to ensure adequate transmission loss characteristics. In order to achieve this, the barrier may consist of steel tubular framing, welded joints, a layer of 18-ounce tarp, a 2-inch-thick fiberglass blanket, a half-inch-thick weatherwood asphalt sheathing, and 7/16-inch sturdy board siding. In addition, to avoid objectionable noise reflections, the source side of the noise barrier shall be lined with an acoustic absorption material meeting a noise reduction coefficient rating of 0.70 or greater in accordance with ASTM Test Method C423.

Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shroud, in accordance with manufacturers’ recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.

| Project applicant | Include mitigation measure on grading plan notes and implement during construction. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm restrictions shown on grading plan. Verify compliance through site inspection. |
When not in use, motorized construction equipment shall not be left idling for more than five minutes.

**MM NOI-2** Prior to construction, the project applicant shall provide a report prepared by a qualified noise consultant that presents the results of noise monitoring at the automatic car wash. If the noise level exceeds the City’s 50 dBA daytime standard at the property line of the single-family residence immediately north or at the two-story building to the northeast, the applicant shall implement one of the following, or equally effective, noise-reducing measures prior to project operation:

(a) install entrance and exit doors on the automatic car wash that operate when the car wash is in use; or
(b) use a dryer system that will reduce noise levels to 50 dBA or less at the residential property lines; or
(c) install a permanent 6-foot noise barriers along the side adjoining the residential property to the north and along the east side along the Road No. 2M16 and Ski Village Drive roadway frontages.

Such barriers shall be constructed of CMU block, or material of similar density and use, with no visible gaps between construction materials or at the base of the wall. Additionally, any barrier along the project frontage shall be designed to visually blend with the perimeter fencing and include vegetation between wall and frontage. The project applicant shall demonstrate that the barriers are sufficient to achieve the City’s 50 dBA daytime noise standard.

Under any option, noise monitoring shall be performed by a qualified professional at the

| Project applicant | Prior to construction, submit report to City and show noise-reduction features on site plan, based on result of noise study. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm noise report submitted and features shown on site plan or building design, as determined through noise testing. Verify compliance through site inspection. |
applicant’s expense prior to project operation to demonstrate the resulting noise level is less than 50 dBA. If monitoring shows levels are not reduced, another method for noise reduction shall be used or if the City’s 50 dBA cannot be achieved, the automatic car wash shall not be used.

Such noise monitoring shall also account for simultaneous operation of the vacuum stations with the auto wash. If the City’s 50 dBA noise standard is not achieved and/or the City receives complaints from nearby residences about noise, the applicant shall take corrective action to reduce noise levels to the City’s satisfaction.

**MM NOI-3** Prior to operation, the project applicant shall provide a report prepared by a qualified noise consultant that presents the results of noise monitoring at the vacuum station with all four units in use. If the noise level exceeds the City’s 50 dBA daytime standard at the property line of the single-family residence immediately north, at the two-story building to the northeast, or the single-family residence to the east, the applicant shall implement one of the following, or equally effective, noise-reducing measures prior to project operation: (a) install mufflers or similar noise attenuation on the vacuum stations; (b) use vacuum units that produce less noise; or (c) install a noise barrier to the north and/or east as necessary. Under any option, noise monitoring shall be performed at the applicant’s expense to demonstrate the resulting noise level is less than 50 dBA. If monitoring shows levels are not reduced, another method for noise reduction shall be used or if the City’s 50 dBA cannot be achieved, the vacuum station shall not be used.

| Project applicant | Prior to operation, provide results of noise testing per mitigation measure. Modify site plan if required. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm receipt of noise testing and noise reduction measures included on revised site plan, if required. |
The applicant shall provide the City the results of noise monitoring by a qualified professional demonstrating compliance with the 50 dBA daytime standard. Such noise monitoring shall also account for simultaneous operation of the vacuum stations with the auto wash. If the City’s 50 dBA noise standard is not achieved and/or the City receives complaints from nearby residences about noise, the applicant shall take corrective action to reduce noise levels to the City’s satisfaction.

If the results indicate a 6-foot barrier is not sufficient, an additional noise-attenuation method must be included in design to reduce noise levels further to achieve the 50 dBA standard, which would minimize aesthetic impacts that may result with a taller barrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM NOI-4</th>
<th>Project conditions of approval shall specify that vibratory rollers shall not be used in dynamic mode (i.e., rolling motion only with no vibration) within 30 feet of a residential structure. Other vibratory compaction methods such as plate compactors are acceptable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Show on grading/site plan and contract specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
<td>Include in conditions of approval. Verify compliance through site inspection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM TRA-1</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP) shall be submitted by the project applicant or its construction contractor for review and approval by the City of Mount Shasta Works/Engineering Department and implemented throughout project construction. The CTCP shall include a schedule of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction, submit CTCP to City as detailed in mitigation measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta</td>
<td>Confirm CTCP submitted. Verify compliance through site inspection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction and anticipated methods of handling traffic to ensure the safe flow of traffic and adequate emergency access, including maintaining an open lane for vehicle travel at all times. The CTCP shall identify methods for coordinating with and notifying the Mt. Shasta Police Department and Fire Department and Cal Fire at least 14 days in advance if construction vehicle or equipment traffic activity on N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard or Ski Village Drive has the potential to cause disruption of traffic flow.

**MM TRA-2** The applicant shall pave the segment of roadway (Road No. 2M16) between Ski Village Drive and the Spring Hill parking area following installation of the water line extension and prior to operation of the mini-storage. The applicant shall submit the design for the roadway segment to be paved concurrent with the grading permit application and final site plan showing driveway locations and shall demonstrate the roadway meets the City’s design standards and will use acceptable paving materials.

| Project applicant | Show on site/grading plan and implement during construction. | City of Mt. Shasta | Confirm design meets standards and improvement constructed. |

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

**MM TCR-1** The final grading plan for the project shall include notes stating:

If tribal cultural resources are discovered during project construction activities, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the tribal monitor shall assess the situation, consult with agencies as appropriate, and make recommendations regarding the treatment of the discovery.

Impacts to tribal cultural resources should be avoided by project activities, but if such impacts cannot be avoided, the resources shall be evaluated for their California Register eligibility. If the tribal

| Project applicant | Include notes on grading plan. | City of Mt. Shasta | City shall ensure grading plan notes include inadvertent discovery requirements as detailed in mitigation. If resources found, confirm actions identified in mitigation have been implemented. |
cultural resource is not California Register-eligible, no further protection of the find is necessary. If the tribal cultural resource is California Register-eligible, it shall be protected from project-related impacts or such impacts mitigated. Mitigation may consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, systematic recovery and analysis, recording the resource, preparation of a report of findings, and accessioning recovered archaeological materials at an appropriate curation facility. Public educational outreach may also be appropriate.
NEW MINI-STORAGE PROJECT
FOR
MR. JIM FREEZE, MT. SHASTA, CALIFORNIA

NEW MINI-STORAGE

The new min-storage facility will have (1) office and (4) buildings with an assortment of bay sizes as follows:

BUILDING LEGEND

(46) 10’x30’, (29) 10’x10’, (62) 10’x20’ and (16) 5’x10’. (1) 13’x18’ office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE COVERAGE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New building area=</td>
<td>29,858 s.f.</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping and snow=</td>
<td>13,653 s.f.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt area=</td>
<td>43,699 s.f.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SITE</td>
<td>87,120 s.f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The described project is provided to accommodate the ever increasing demand for personal storage. There will be larger bays for commercial storage and smaller for personal storage. There will be an attendant’s office on site with an ADA approved restroom to register customers and provide assistance as needed and (5) parking stalls, ((1) van accessible). There will be a 24’ wide entry gate with 6’ high architecturally pleasing wrought iron steel security fencing with equally spaced stone veneer columns. Security lighting will be down cast to minimize impact to neighboring parcels.

Buildings are oriented so the gable end of buildings with attractive veneer type finishes are visible to the public rather than long utility appearance of roll up doors. Also, sensitive to noise the buildings have been oriented so minimal number of bays will be facing the public way. A trash bin will be screened from public view. The roof design will be consistent with the design of the structure and an environment friendly color (Forest Green) that will minimize reflection and glare.

SITE DRAINAGE: The site will be graded so storm water is drained into multiple drainage inlets. It will then be piped underground to a holding pond. It will be then discharged to existing City Drainage facilities. If detention is required, it will be metered out of the pond at the discharge point. Snow storage area are located to the rear of the site and will not interfere with public use nor public view.

TRAFFIC STUDY: Intermittent light traffic is expected. Rental truck vans and passenger size vehicles will be the standard. The traffic will be moving and no street parking allowed. CEQA Environmental Review to detail.
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FIGURE 3.0-4
Proposed Mini-Storage Site Plan
A History of Self-Storage Excellence

Since 1979, Heritage Building Systems has cultivated leadership in the metal building industry. Specializing in mini-storage buildings and building accessories, as well as agricultural, industrial and general purpose structures, we have supplied customers like you with more than 35,000 buildings, making Heritage one of the largest retailers of custom-designed steel structures in the world.

Whether you are expanding an existing facility or starting a new venture, you’ll find Heritage to be a valuable ally. In addition to our high-quality, cost-effective buildings, we will provide you with expert guidance on all aspects of the self-storage business.

Mini-Storage That’s Built To Last

As one of the best known and most trusted names in the mini-storage industry, Heritage Building Systems has earned its reputation as an innovator and leader. Heritage helped develop the modern cold-formed mini-storage building, pioneered the use of computerized engineering and pricing systems, and has reshaped the way steel structures are marketed in the United States.

Most building companies just want to supply your materials, but we know that this business demands personal attention and service. We realize that each construction job is unique and we’re here to help you when you need us through every phase of your project, from start to finish.

The Gold Standard in Single-Story Storage

Heritage is your best resource for a successful mini-storage project. Our experienced and dedicated project consultants, engineers and customer service personnel will work tirelessly with you to develop a system that meets your specifications.

However simple or complex, there is virtually no limit to the metal building solutions we can provide. All of our metal mini-storage building options can be fully customized. Our standard products and optional accessories include:

- Our Signature 200 Pre-painted Galvalume wall panels that are available in a wide variety of colors and come with a 25-year limited paint warranty.
- Framing members that are pre-painted with standard red-oxide primer, or optional galvanized members.
- A variety of door & trim packages.
- A competitive selection of colors.
- Multiple roof & wall panel profiles, including Standing Seam Roofs.
- Various Mullion Configurations.

Heritage is ready to take your single-story storage project to the next level.

Climate Controlled—Weather Or Not!

With a climate controlled self-storage solution by Heritage, you can rest assured you’ll have a mini-storage system that will get the job done year after year, and that is tough enough to weather any storm.

Your self-storage steel building will have lower utility costs on average as a result of our high standards for thermal efficiency. Heritage steel buildings are absolutely ideal for providing you and your end-users peace of mind when it comes to storing away those prized possessions.

So, if you are building a self-storage facility designed to protect against the elements, then it’s time to give Heritage a call. We offer unrivaled choices for climate controlled mini-storage.

Superior Shelter For Boat and RV

The demand for covered storage structures is continually increasing due to community and homeowner association restrictions. Fortunately, Heritage Building Systems makes it easy to capitalize on the booming RV and boat storage building market. We can provide you with superior quality steel buildings in a wide range of sizes, specially suited for boats and RVs.

All of our structures are fabricated with the highest quality metal solutions. So you can be confident that your boat or RV steel storage building will live up to even the highest of expectations. In addition, our talented staff will assist you in selecting the design and appearance that best fits your commercial or individual needs.

Discover The Heritage Difference

On behalf of the Heritage team, it would be our privilege to serve you. Our company has provided metal building solutions for people just like you for over 30 years. In fact, Heritage has served thousands of satisfied customers through the use of straight talk, outstanding service before and after the sale, accurate quotes, understandable contracts and orders delivered to your complete satisfaction.

It is our exceptional people and quality products that truly set us apart from the rest. But don’t take our word for it. Give us a call today. We invite you to discover the Heritage difference for yourself.

Call Us Today!
1-800-643-5555
Why Choose Steel?

Benefits That Matter

- **Low Cost**: Steel is a much more cost-effective alternative to constructing your building.
- **Versatility**: Steel buildings are extremely versatile, and can serve a wide range of end-use applications.
- **Time Savings**: Steel structures offer faster erection time, which saves time and money!
- **Longevity**: The durability of a metal building is significantly greater than a structure constructed of wood or other materials.
- **Low Maintenance**: Metal construction is cheaper and easier to maintain. Not only does your building look great, but maintaining it is simple.

- **Energy Efficient**: A well-insulated metal building can drastically decrease heating and cooling expenses. Insulated roof and wall systems preserve and reassure thermal efficiencies.
- **Expandability**: It is easy to enlarge a building by removing the end walls, erecting new framework and adding matching wall and roof panels. In most situations, the original end wall panels can be reused.
What is Solar Reflectivity (SR)?
Solar reflectivity or reflectance is the ability of a material to reflect solar energy from its surface back into the atmosphere. The SR value is a number from 0 to 1.0. A value of 0 indicates that the material absorbs all solar energy and a value of 1.0 indicates total reflectance. ENERGY STAR requires an SR value of 0.25 or higher for steep slope (above 2:12) roofing and an SR value of 0.65 or higher for low slope (2:12 or less) roofing. For more information, please go to www.energystar.gov.

What is Solar Reflectance Index (SRI)?
The SRI is used to determine compliance with LEED requirements and is calculated according to ASTM E 1980 using values for reflectance and emissivity. Emissivity is a material's ability to release absorbed energy. To meet LEED requirements, a roofing material must have an SRI of 0.80 or higher for steep slope (above 2:12) roofing and an SRI value of 0.50 or higher for low slope (2:12 or less) roofing. For more information, please go to www.usgbc.org.

Call 800.643.5555

www.heritagebuildings.com
An NCI Company – Listed on the NYSE as NCI
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The benefits of our experience, technology, and sheer purchasing power can be yours when you join the thousands who have let Heritage maximize their investment in the lucrative self-storage industry. Whether you are expanding an existing facility or starting a new venture, you’ll find Heritage a valuable ally. In addition to our high-quality, cost-effective buildings, we’ll provide you with expert guidance on all aspects of the business.

Mini-Storage Systems

We are capable of providing many options for your mini-storage facility:

- All-Steel Systems
- Pier & Header Systems
- Two-Story Buildings
- Masonry Systems
- Interior Systems
- Climate-Controlled Buildings

Most building companies just want to supply your materials, but we know that this business demands personal attention and service. We realize that each construction job is unique and we’re here to help you when you need us through every phase of your project, from start to finish. If you want a company that will go the extra mile to make your overall project a success, call Heritage.

HERITAGE BUILDING SYSTEMS
Established 1979

A Legacy Built to Last

1-800-643-5555 | www.heritagebuildings.com
An NCI Building Systems Company – Listed on the NYSE as NCS

To get the most from your new building, call your Heritage representative for a price quote today at 1.800.643.5555.
As one of the best known and most trusted names in the mini-storage industry, Heritage Building Systems has earned its reputation as an innovator and leader. Heritage helped develop the modern cold-formed mini-storage building, pioneered the use of computerized engineering and pricing systems, and has reshaped the way steel structures are marketed in the United States.
FIGURE 3.0-7
Proposed Car Wash Site Plan