

Project Information

2019039092

Project Title: Pastori Parcel Map Subdivision

Lead Agency

Humboldt County Planning and Building Department – Planning Division
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501
(707) 445-7541

Property Owner

James Pastori
6337 Elk River Road
Eureka, CA 95503

Project Applicant

Same as owner

Project Location

The project is located in the Elk River area, on the east side of Elk River Road near its intersection with Showers Road and approximately 0.4 miles from the intersection of Elk River Road and Ridgewood Drive, on the property known as 6337 Elk River Road.

General Plan Designation

Residential Agriculture (RA); Humboldt County General Plan – Eureka Community Plan. Density: RA: one dwelling unit per 5 – 20 acres. Slope Stability: Moderate Instability.

Zoning

Agriculture General with a five acre minimum parcel size (AG-B-5(5)-Q) and including a Qualified Combining Zone (Ord. #2078) requiring that Secondary Dwelling Units not exceed specified densities, prohibiting land fills and commercial refuse burning, and allowing multiple parcels under joint ownership to be managed as a single unit for agricultural purposes.

Project Description

A Minor Subdivision to divide an approximately 10.72 acre parcel into two parcels of approximately 2.5 acres and 8.22 acres. The parcel is currently developed with a single family residence and an on-site wastewater treatment system. A Special Permit to allow an exception to the minimum lot size is requested per Section 314-99.1.1.2 of the Zoning Regulations. In addition, pursuant to Section 325-9 of the Humboldt County Code, an exception has been requested to allow proposed Parcel 2 to be served with a 20-foot right of way.

Baseline Conditions: Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The surrounding area is characterized by a mixture of agricultural and residential uses. Neighboring properties are primarily one acre or larger in size, with the majority of surrounding lands in parcels sizes of 5 to 15 acres in size. Water service is available through Humboldt Community Services District, though many properties currently rely on historic wells. Sewer service is not currently available. Larger size parcels zoned for agriculture and timber uses are located west and south of the property. The area is primarily served by well water and on-site wastewater treatment systems. Municipal water service is available to the area through Humboldt Community Services District.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required (permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Department of Environmental Health, California Department of Fish &

Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Building Inspection Division of Humboldt County, Humboldt County Public Works Department, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Humboldt Community Services District.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? No. If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? n/a

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

Determination: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature



Date

3/14/19

Steven Lazar, Senior Planner
Printed Name

Humboldt Planning & Building Dept.
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except No Impact answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A No Impact answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A No Impact answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. Potentially Significant Impact is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more Potentially Significant Impact entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from Potentially Significant Impact to a Less Than Significant Impact. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, Earlier Analyses may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addresses. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures describe the mitigation measures which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plan, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats, however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue identify:
 - a) The significant criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Environmental Checklist

Checklist and Evaluation of Environmental Impacts: An explanation for all checklist responses is included, and all answers take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. In the **Checklist**, the following definitions are used:

"Potentially Significant Impact" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact" means that the effect is less than significant and no mitigation is necessary to reduce the impact to a lesser level.

"No Impact" means that the effect does not apply to the proposed project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the project.

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

1: AESTHETICS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: (a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within an area mapped or designated with scenic vistas or resources nor is it in the Coastal Zone where specified areas of scenic values are mapped and certified by the state. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. The parcels will be served by Elk River Road, a county-maintained road. In 2017, a less than 3-acre conversion exemption was approved by Cal-FIRE. Designed to enable future construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), the conversion resulted in the removal of much of the remaining forested areas on the property. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of an additional parcel within an area characterized by residential and agricultural uses on small parcels (under 40 acres in size) would result in significant impacts to scenic resources or the visual character of the area. The proposal matches current development densities and there is no indication that the future development likely to occur on the site will significantly increase light or glare or effect nighttime views in the vicinity. Given this, the project activities can be considered compatible with the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

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

2: AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Discussion: (a-e) No Impact: Neither the subject property nor adjacent lands are within a Williamson Act contract. While lower portions of the property are mapped with agricultural soils, they have been host to existing residential development for decades. The site does not contain unique farmland and is not used for agricultural purposes. The neighborhood is characterized by low density residential development on parcels primarily ranging from 5 to 15 acres in size, with on-site septic systems and water service available through the Humboldt Community Services District. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern. One-family residential is a primary and compatible use within the RA designation and is principally permitted in the AG zoning district. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources.

Issues and Supporting Information**Potentially
Significant****Potentially
Significant Unless
Mitigation
Incorp.****Less Than
Significant
Impact****No
Impact**

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations: Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

☐☐☐☒

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

☐☐☐☒

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐☐☐☒

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

☐☐☐☒**3: AIR QUALITY: NO IMPACT**

Discussion: (a-e) No impact: The project site is located within the North Coast Air Basin and the jurisdiction of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). The North Coast Air Basin generally enjoys good air quality but has been designated non-attainment (does not meet federal minimum ambient air quality standards) for particulate matter less than ten microns in size (PM₁₀). To address this, the NCUAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Attainment Plan in 1995. This plan presents available information about the nature and causes of PM₁₀ standard exceedance, and identifies cost-effective control measures to reduce PM₁₀ emissions, to levels necessary to meet California Ambient Air Quality Standards. These include transportation measures (e.g., public transit, ridesharing, vehicle buy-back programs, traffic flow improvements, bicycle incentives, etc.), land use measures (infill development, concentration of higher density adjacent to highways, etc.), and combustion measures (open burning limitations, hearth/wood burning stove limitations; NCUAQMD 1995). The proposed subdivision results in one additional parcel suitable for residential development and would not: (a) obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (b) violate air quality standards; (c) contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (d) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or (e) create objectionable odors. An accessory dwelling unit is principally permitted and further development of additional residential units would not be possible due to current density restrictions applicable in the North Elk River area. Therefore, the proposed subdivision would not result in new or greater impacts than those that could

result from residential development scenarios within the range of uses already allowed on the property.

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

4: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Discussion: (c,d,f) No impact: The parcel is located within the northeast portion of the Elk River valley, near where the valley transitions to forested areas characterized by steeper terrain. Based on landscape position, information obtained during the site visit, and review of Departmental and National Wetland mapping, there are no wetlands or similar features known to occur in the area of the project. Orton Creek (a tributary to the lower Elk River) lies approximately 400-500 feet north of the parcel boundaries. Most of the areas of recent timberland conversion and future residential development lie within portions of the property which drain west into the lower Elk River valley, through neighboring agricultural lands. A Habitat Conservation Plan covers nearby private timberland managed by Humboldt Redwood Company but is not applicable to the project site.

4: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: (a,b,e) Less Than Significant Impact: The parcel is peripherally located within the Lower Elk River valley. Mapping from the California Natural Diversity Database situates it within the eastern portion of two areas with potential habitat for the obscure bumble bee and coast checkerbloom. The

site has been historically forested and is not known to possess wetlands, natural drainages or other types of Sensitive or Critical Habitats. A referral was sent to the Eureka office of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and they did not respond with any concerns.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5: CULTURAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT <p><u>Discussion:</u> (a-c) No Impact: The project was referred to the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, the Wiyot Tribe and the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). The Northwest Information Center noted that it is unclear whether a prior study for cultural resources (#S-886) performed in 1977 by Benson et al. included all or parts of the project area and recommended further study of the project area by a qualified professional archaeologist, and that local Native American tribe(s) be contacted. Consultation with the local tribes indicated that the site has a low probability of sensitive resources. Therefore, a cultural resource study was not required. An informational note describing the protocol for inadvertent discovery has been included in the Conditions of Approval as well as the Notes to appear on the Development Plan. These notations put the applicant and subsequent owners on notice that if archaeological resources are found during excavation on the property, all work is to be stopped and a qualified archaeologist is to be consulted for recommendations. Application of the County's standard "inadvertent discovery" condition regarding the applicant's responsibility should remains or artifacts be unearthed during any development has been included with Conditions of Approval as an on-going requirement. Inclusion is consistent with the recommendations made by the Bear River Tribe.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6: ENERGY: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT <p><u>Discussion:</u> (a,b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project will result in short-term energy consumption during the construction phase, with long-term energy consumption associated with the ongoing occupancy of the homes. The construction phase is not anticipated to utilize excessive energy and the</p>				

home will be constructed compliant with the energy requirements of Title 24 of the Building Code. Therefore, a less than significant impact will occur. The project would result in the creation of one additional vacant new parcel which could be developed with a single-family home.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7: GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT

Discussion: **(d,f) No Impact:** A Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) were prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying. The Soils Report was reviewed and approved by the Building Inspector on November 15, 2010. These reports address the geology and soils of the proposed project and are used as the basis of these responses. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and General Plan Geologic Hazards map, the project site is not located on or near a known fault. The nearest Alquist-Priolo zone is located approximately 10 miles west of the property. The site is not mapped in an area considered potentially liquefiable and, therefore, the potential for liquefaction to occur is low. A large retaining wall was constructed in association with the unpermitted residence and garage. Adherence to the approved Soils Report and Grading & Erosion Control Plan prepared by

Baird Engineering will be required as part of the Building Permit and Conditions of Approval for the requested Special Permit. This should insure that potential for erosion and instability will be minimized. No significant erosion appears to be occurring at this time. Provided the Soils Report recommendations are adhered to, surface drainage is not anticipated to pose a significant hazard to the proposed structure. According to the General Plan Geologic Hazards map, the project site has a very low to moderate potential for slope instability. However, onsite investigation by the geologist did not observe any evidence of historic slope movements that would affect the building site. There were no areas identified in the Soils report that included expansive soils. The proposed development will be served by on-site water and on-site sewage disposal systems. The Dept. of Environmental Health (DEH) recommends approval. The Department finds no evidence that the project will have a significant adverse impact with regards to geology and soils. There are no known unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features within the vicinity of the project site. Minimal additional ground disturbance is proposed to occur beyond the baseline environmental conditions.

7: GEOLOGY AND SOILS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: (a-c, e) Less Than Significant Impact: There are no known earthquake faults located within the site. The site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Area. The nearest active fault is a branch of the northwest-southeast trending Little Salmon Fault Zone, located approximately ½ mile from the property. Departmental Geologic mapping shows the northeastern portion of the property within an approximately 112-acre landslide complex surrounding the Orton Creek drainage. The property is located in an area of low to moderate slope instability. An R-2 Soils report prepared for the project by Pacific Affiliates identified a suitable building site on the new parcel being created (Lot 2), provided specific foundation and grading recommendations are followed.

7: GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT

Discussion: (d,f) No Impact: A review of local soil mapping does not show the presence of expansive soils (as defined in the Uniform Building Code) on or near the vicinity of the subject property. Therefore, the project does not involve substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. There are no known unique paleontological resources or geologic features that would be affected by the proposed subdivision.

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

8: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: (a,b) Less Than Significant Impact: In 2002 the California legislature declared that global climate change was a matter of increasing concern for the state's public health and environment, and enacted law requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to control GHG emissions from motor vehicles (Health & Safety Code §32018.5 et seq.). In 2006, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32) definitively established the state's climate change policy and set GHG reduction targets (Health & Safety Code §38500 et seq.), including setting a target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 requires local governments to take an active role in addressing climate

change and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. While methodologies to inventory and quantify local GHG emissions are still being developed, recommendations to reduce residential GHG emissions include promoting energy efficiency in new development.

The proposed project involves creation of one new parcel, suitable for residential development. The eventual residential construction on the vacant lot would contribute temporary, short-term increases in air pollution from equipment usage. Because of the temporary nature of the greenhouse gas contributions, coupled with the modest quantity of emission, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Future residential use would emit limited greenhouse gases.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9: HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9: HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: (a-g) Less Than Significant Impact The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed subdivision involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is approximately 5.7 miles from the nearest airport – Murray Field. There are no

private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. The site will not result in unanticipated risk to the occupants of the site. The Department finds no evidence that the project will create, or expose people or property to, hazardous materials, or impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan. The site of the proposed subdivision is in an area of high fire hazard severity and the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire protection, and also within the Humboldt #1 Fire Protection District. With centerline, 10-foot paved traveled lanes, and shoulders, Elk River road complies with the Category 4 standard. The parcel being divided is located approximately 2100 feet from the nearest secondary access and therefore does not exceed the dead-end road length limits of the local Fire Safe Regulations. Cal-FIRE reviewed the project and did not identify any concerns. Future development of the resulting vacant parcel will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code and UBC. For these reasons, the Planning Division expects that the subdivision will result in less than significant impacts in terms of hazards and hazardous materials.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10: HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT				
Discussion: (a-e) Less than significant impact: The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, in terms of both the				

County's Housing Element, the Eureka Community Plan (ECP) adopted in 1995 and the recently adopted Humboldt County General Plan 2017. The project site is an area served by community water and private septic systems. The Humboldt Community Services District (HCSD) has indicated that it is able to provide water service to the proposed subdivision upon the payment of the appropriate fees. HCSD has not identified any concerns with regard to the project interfering with groundwater recharge. The Department finds no evidence indicating that the subdivision will violate any water quality or waste discharge standards, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is located in Flood Zone C, which is defined as "areas of minimal flooding", and is outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains. The project site is not within a mapped dam or levee inundation area and is outside the areas subject to tsunami run-up. Elevation throughout the property ranges from 100-240 feet. Public Works has recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant submit a complete hydraulic report and drainage plan for their approval. The Department finds no evidence that the proposed project will result in significant hydrologic or water quality impacts.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
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 plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11: LAND USE AND PLANNING: NO IMPACT

Discussion: (a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is designated Residential Agriculture Low Density (RA) by the Humboldt County General Plan 2017, and is zoned Agriculture General with a 5-acre minimum parcel size. The parcel also included a Qualified Combining Zone (Ord. #2078) requiring that Secondary Dwelling Units not exceed specified densities, prohibiting land fills and commercial refuse burning, and allowing multiple parcels under joint ownership to be managed as a single unit for agricultural purposes. Single-family residential and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) are both allowable use types within the RA designation and are principally permitted in the AG zoning district. The neighborhood is characterized by rural residential development. The creation of one additional parcel for residential development is consistent with the zoning and land use density (one to eight dwelling units per acre). The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, and is consistent with the policies and regulations specified in the Eureka Community Plan and Humboldt County General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with a comprehensive view of both documents, as they concern land use, circulation, hazards and resources, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, public facilities and development timing. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12: MINERAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT				
<p><u>Discussion:</u> (a and b) No Impact: The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. Additionally, on-site soils and geologic resources are not suitable as commodity materials that would be of value to the region or the state. The site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site by a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on mineral resources.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13: NOISE: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT				
<p><u>Discussion:</u> (a,b) Less Than Significant Impact: Noises generated by the proposed project will result in a temporary increase during construction because the proposed project may require the use of heavy equipment (excavator, grader, loader and backhoe). The construction does not include equipment that would result in groundborne vibration. These activities are consistent with the current uses at the site and no permanent change in noise from the existing conditions would result from this project.</p> <p>Noises generated by the proposed project will result in a temporary increase during construction because the proposed project may require the use of heavy equipment (excavator, grader, loader and backhoe). The construction does not include equipment that would result in groundborne vibration. These activities are consistent with the current uses at the site and no permanent change in</p>				

noise from the existing conditions would result from this project.

12: NOISE: NO IMPACT

Discussion: (c) No Impact: The closest airport (Murray Field) is located over 5 miles from the proposed project site. The project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14: POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14: POPULATION AND HOUSING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT				
<p>Discussion: (a, b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project divides a parcel, resulting in the creation of one new parcel, that will be suitable for future residential development. One-family residential uses and Accessory Dwelling Units are both primary and compatible uses within the plan designation and zoning district. Over 10 acres in size, the parcel qualifies for development of a Secondary Dwelling Unit as a principally permitted use. Following subdivision, neither resulting parcels would not be eligible for second units, due to combined effect of the resulting parcel sizes and density limits of the RA land use designation.</p>				

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

15: PUBLIC SERVICES: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: **(a,1-5) Less Than Significant:** The new parcel being created through the proposed subdivision will be accessed via a private driveway crossing through the front half of the property being divided. Both parcels ultimately take access from Elk River Road, a county-maintained road. The Department of Public Works has recommended improvements to the access road to meet current standards. Cal-FIRE and Humboldt #1 Fire Protection District did not identify any fire protection issues. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on public services.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16: RECREATION: NO IMPACT

Discussion: **(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities. The project has been conditioned upon payment of parkland dedication fees in lieu of creating a neighborhood park on the site. The Department finds no evidence that the project will require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with * CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? * Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts, effective July 1, 2020	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17: TRANSPORTATION: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: **(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact:** Access to the parcel being divided is provided by Elk River Road, a public road. An existing driveway is proposed to be utilized and extended to provide access to the new parcel being created through the proposed subdivision. The Land Use Division of Public Works has recommended standard conditions of approval including the improvement of the encroachment and improvement of the access road. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The criteria (for analyzing transportation impacts) found within 15064.3 (b) of the Guidelines are not yet effective and therefore are not applicable to the project. The proposed driveway improvements would not result in design features or incompatible uses that increase hazards. The parcel being divided is located approximately 2100 feet from the nearest secondary access and therefore does not exceed the dead-end road length limits of the local Fire Safe Regulations. Cal-FIRE reviewed the project and did not identify any concerns.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: **(a,b) Less Than Significant Impact:** The project was referred to the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, the Wiyot Tribe and the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). NWIC. The Northwest Information Center noted that it is unclear whether a prior study for cultural resources (#S-886) performed in 1977 by Benson et al. included all or parts of the project area, and recommended further study of the project area by a qualified professional archaeologist, and that local Native American tribe(s) be contacted. Referral with the local tribes indicated that the site has a low probability of sensitive resources. Therefore, a cultural resource study was not required. An informational note describing the protocol for inadvertent discovery has been included in the Conditions of Approval as well as the Notes to appear on the Development Plan, and put the applicant and subsequent owners on notice that if archaeological resources are found during excavation on the property, all work is to be stopped and a qualified archaeologist is to be consulted for recommendations.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19: UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Discussion: **(a-e) Less than significant:** The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will be inconsistent with the planned build-out of the area or will result in a significant adverse to utilities and service systems. The parcel is not zoned for commercial or industrial uses. The lots will be served by community water provided by the Humboldt Community Services District. The Department of Environmental Health has recommended approval of the project. The parcel currently drains southerly towards Elk River Road. Due to the parcels size and location, it is not subject to compliance with Low Impact Development (LID) requirements applicable to development of lands governed by the Regional Board's MS4 program. Stormwater detention as well as Low Impact Development (LID) techniques will be utilized as part of the improvement plans submitted to Public Works in order to comply with the McKinleyville Community Plan requirement of no increase in downstream flows and the Regional Water Board's MS4 program. The Division of Public Works reviewed the project and did not identify any drainage issues. The applicant will be required to provide a complete hydraulic report and drainage plan. The Department finds the project impact to be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20: WILDFIRE: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT <p><u>Discussion:</u> (a-d) Less than significant: The proposed subdivision site is in an area of high fire hazard severity and the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire protection, and also within the response area of Humboldt #1 Fire Protection District for structural fire protection. With centerline, 10-foot paved traveled lanes, and shoulders, Elk River road complies with the Category 4 standard. The parcel being divided is located approximately 2100 feet from the nearest secondary access and therefore does not exceed the dead-end road length limits of the local Fire Safe Regulations. Cal-FIRE reviewed the project and did not identify any concerns. Future development of the resulting vacant parcel will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code and UBC. For these reasons, the Planning Division expects that the subdivision will result in less than significant impacts in terms of hazards and hazardous materials. In 2017, a less than 3-acre conversion exemption was approved by Cal-FIRE, which resulted in the removal of much of the remaining forested areas on the property. This conversion of timberland facilitates the maintenance of defensible space around existing and future development. Though large contiguous holdings of industrial timberland can be found on adjacent lands southeast of the parcel (owned and managed by Humboldt Redwood Company), adjacent neighboring timberland immediately east of the property is planned and zoned for future residential development (Slack & Winzler Properties).</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT				
<p><u>Discussion:</u> The proposed project divides one parcel into two – one developed and one vacant and suitable for future residential development. Staff finds no evidence that the proposed project will significantly degrade the quality of the environment, nor will it have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Based on the project as described in the administrative record, comments from reviewing agencies, a review of the applicable regulations, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is no significant evidence to indicate the proposed project as mitigated will have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p>				

22. DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP)

Following analysis of the proposed project, no potential impacts were identified that could be considered significant. Consequently, inclusion of mitigation measures was not determined necessary.

23. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 16063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

No earlier analysis used.

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

See 23(a) above

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

See discussion of MMRP under 22 above.

SOURCE/REFERENCE LIST: The following documents were used in the preparation of this Initial Study. The documents are available for review at the Humboldt County Planning & Building Department during regular business hours.

County of Humboldt, Planning & Building Department (December 2017). *Humboldt County General Plan*. HCPD.

Pacific Affiliates (June 2018). *On-Site Sewage Testing*, Eureka:PA1.

Pacific Affiliates (June 2018). *R-S Soils Report*, Eureka:PA2.

Pacific Affiliates (July 2018). *Site Plan / Tentative Map*, Eureka:PA3.