

## 5.11 Land Use and Planning

### 5.11.1 Environmental Setting

Land uses adjacent to the proposed project alignment include agriculture (i.e., row crops and orchards) and low-density, rural residential uses. Community facilities, including schools, are also located near the proposed route. Land uses in the vicinity of the proposed project are primarily rural residential and agricultural and are surrounded by open space and undeveloped forested land. Public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are located near the western portion of the proposed project area.

### 5.11.2 Regulatory Setting

#### Federal

**Redding Resource Management Plan.** The Redding Resource Management Plan requires that land use authorizations utilize existing right-of-way (ROW) routes to the maximum extent possible; this plan will be replaced and updated by the Northwest California Integrated Resource Management Plan (BLM 1993, 2016). Though the BLM has jurisdiction over ROWs on the Clear Creek Greenway in the vicinity of the proposed project area, the proposed project alignment would be located within the ROW of Cloverdale Road. Additionally, though there is public land managed by the BLM located at the western end of the proposed project area, the proposed project alignment would not cross BLM land. Thus, the proposed project would not be subject to the Redding Resource Management Plan.

#### State

There are no applicable state regulations or policies related to land use and planning for the proposed project.

#### Local

The proposed project would be located entirely within unincorporated Shasta County.

**Shasta County General Plan.** The Shasta County General Plan provides policy direction for land development in unincorporated Shasta County. The following policies from the Shasta County General Plan are relevant to the proposed project:

- *AG-h: The site planning, design, and construction of onsite and offsite improvements for nonagricultural development in agricultural areas shall avoid unmitigatable short- and long-term adverse impacts on facilities, such as irrigation ditches, used to supply water to agricultural operations.*
- *FW-c: Projects that contain or may impact endangered and/or threatened plant or animal species, as officially designated by the California Fish and Game Commission and/or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be designed or conditioned to avoid any net adverse project impacts on those species.*
- *SH-a: To protect the value of the natural and scenic character of the official scenic highway corridors and the County gateways dominated by the natural environment, the following provisions, along with the County development standards, shall govern new development:*
  - *setback requirements*
  - *regulations of building form, material, and color*

- 1 - *landscaping with native vegetation, where possible*
- 2 - *minimizing grading and cut and fill activities*
- 3 - *requiring use of adequate erosion and sediment control programs*
- 4 - *siting of new structures to minimize visual impacts from highway*
- 5 - *regulation of the type, size, and location of advertising signs utility lines shall be*
- 6 *underground wherever possible; where undergrounding is not practical, lines should be sited*
- 7 *in a manner which minimizes their visual intrusion. (Shasta County 2004)*

8  
9 While there are no Designated or Eligible State Scenic Highways in or near the proposed project area, the  
10 proposed project would be located along a section of Shasta County Route A16 (CR A16), which is  
11 designated in the Shasta County General Plan as a corridor in which natural environment is dominant.

12  
13 **Shasta County Code.** The Shasta County Code provides for the orderly and efficient application of the  
14 polices of Shasta County with respect to land use planning and management (Shasta County 2018). The  
15 proposed project area is located entirely within road ROWs in areas zoned rural residential (R-R) district  
16 and limited agriculture (A-1) district, per Title 17 – Zoning. BLM lands near the western part of the  
17 proposed project area are zoned as exclusive agriculture (EA) and agriculture preserve (AP). Several  
18 parcels classified as mixed use (MU) district and public facilities (PF) district are located near the  
19 intersection of Oak Street and Cloverdale Road and the intersection of Palm Avenue and Happy Valley  
20 Road. Because the proposed project alignment would occur entirely within road ROWs, Title 12 – Streets,  
21 Sidewalks and Public Places of the code applies to the proposed project. Shasta County considers all  
22 unincorporated territory one road district.

### 23 24 **5.11.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

25  
26 The impact analysis below identifies and describes the proposed project’s potential impacts on land use  
27 within the proposed project area. Potential impacts were evaluated according to significance criteria based  
28 on the checklist items presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and listed at the start of each  
29 impact analysis section below. Both the construction and maintenance/operations phases were considered;  
30 however, because the construction phase could result in physical changes to the environment, analysis of  
31 construction phase effects warranted a detailed evaluation.

#### 32 33 **Applicant Proposed Measures**

34 The applicant has not incorporated APMs to specifically minimize or avoid land use impacts. A list of all  
35 project APMs is included in Table 4-2 in Chapter 4.

#### 36 37 **Significance Criteria**

38 Table 5.11-1 describes the significance criteria from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines’ land use  
39 section, which the California Public Utilities Commission used to evaluate the environmental impacts of  
40 the proposed project.

Table 5.11-1 Land Use and Planning Checklist

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

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

Physical division of an established community can occur through construction of physical barriers or obstacles to access and circulation, as well as linear infrastructure or an assemblage of land uses that could restrict or hinder interaction and access to land along a project’s utility corridor or adjacent areas. The division of an established community would typically involve the construction of a barrier to neighborhood access (e.g., a new freeway segment) or the removal of a means of access (e.g., a bridge or roadway) that could impair mobility within or between existing communities and surrounding areas.

The proposed project would involve installation of telecommunications infrastructure—including over 80,000 feet of fiber optic cable and seven equipment cabinets—to provide high-speed internet service to the communities of Igo, Olinda, and Ono in Shasta County. The fiber optic network cable would be buried in conduit within utility easements in the shoulders of existing County roadways. Shasta County permits co-locating telecommunication infrastructure with public roadways through encroachment permits. The encroachment permit process conditions and regulates construction (e.g., trenching, grading, erosion control, etc.) to meet established engineering and safety standards and avoid indirect impacts outside of the construction zone.

Once installation of the proposed telecommunications infrastructure is complete and operational, the proposed project’s aboveground physical infrastructure would be limited to seven DLC sites. Each DLC site’s aboveground components would include a 2- by 3- by 4-foot equipment cabinet, an 8-inch by 8-inch by 2-foot cross connect box, and a 20-square-foot area of gravel around each equipment cabinet. Since the DLC sites would not obstruct or limit access to the county’s roadway network, the proposed project would not disrupt, physically divide, or isolate surrounding communities and would therefore, have a less-than-significant impact.

**Significance: Less than significant.**

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

The Shasta County General Plan guides land use decisions through general policies and objectives in the area of the proposed project (Shasta County 2004). The CPUC will consider the proposed project’s compatibility with General Plan policies that are not related to physical environmental issues when deciding if the proposed project will be approved. Conflicts between the proposed project and General Plan policies related to physical environmental issues are discussed, as relevant, in the Chapter 4 impact analyses of this Initial Study. Table 5.11-2 outlines applicable policies.

Table 5.11-2 Shasta County General Plan Policies

General Plan Policy	Conflict Analysis
<p><b>Policy AG-h:</b> The site planning, design, and construction of on-site and off-site improvements for nonagricultural development in agricultural areas shall avoid unmitigatable short- and long-term adverse impacts on facilities, such as irrigation ditches, used to supply water to agricultural operations.</p>	<p><b>No conflict.</b> Construction of the proposed project would occur along existing roadways. Directional boring would be used under facilities such as irrigation ditches that supply water to agricultural operations. See Section 5.2, "Agriculture and Forest Resources" for additional discussion of impacts to agricultural lands.</p>
<p><b>Policy FW-c:</b> Projects that contain or may impact endangered and/or threatened plant or animal species, as officially designated by the California Fish and Game Commission and/or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be designed or conditioned to avoid any net adverse project impacts on those species.</p>	<p><b>No conflict.</b> The proposed project would avoid and bore underneath wetlands, and would not remove trees during project construction to avoid impacts on endangered and/or threatened plant and animal species. See Section 5.4, "Biological Resources" for additional discussion of impacts on threatened and endangered species.</p>
<p><b>Policy SH-a:</b> To protect the value of the natural and scenic character of the official scenic highway corridors and the County gateways dominated by the natural environment.</p>	<p><b>No conflict.</b> There are no Designated or Eligible State Scenic Highways in or near the proposed project area. The proposed project would be located along a section of Shasta County Route A16 (CR A16), which is designated in the Shasta County General Plan as a corridor in which natural environment is dominant; however, project components along CR A16 would not result in a significant visual impact. See Section 5.1, "Aesthetics" for additional discussion of impacts on visual resources.</p>

Source: Shasta County 2004

1  
2 As noted in Table 5.11-2, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable policies in the Shasta  
3 County General Plan. Additionally, because the proposed project alignment would be sited entirely within  
4 road ROWs, the proposed project would be subject to conditions imposed by Shasta County relating to  
5 the issuance of encroachment permits, per Shasta County Code. For these reasons, there would be no  
6 impact.

7  
8 **Significance: No impact.**

9  
10 **Mitigation Measures**

11 Because all impacts on land use for the proposed project would be less than significant or nonexistent, no  
12 mitigation measures are required.