

Mitigated Negative Declaration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	Miller-Almquist Bar - Surface Mining and Reclamation Plan.
Lead agency name and address:	Humboldt County Planning Department, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501 – 4484; PHONE: (707) 445-7541; FAX (707) 445-7446
Contact person and phone number:	Joshua Dorris, Planner – 445-7541
Project Location:	Located along the Mad River, on the Arcata North 7.5' Quadrangle Section 16 T6N R1E HB&M. The site is accessed from the north side of Highway 299, at Giuntoli Exit and then proceeding east on S Boyd Road in Humboldt County (APN# 507-261-004 & 019 & 012, & 021) This site is adjacent to an existing construction/storage yard located uphill from the river on the same parcels.
Project sponsor's name and address:	Applicant: Randy Sundberg GR Sundberg, Incorporated 5211 Boyd Road Arcata, CA 95521 (707) 825-6565
General plan description:	CF, IG
Zoning:	ML
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	<p>Application Renewal for a Conditional Use Permit/Mining Plan/Reclamation Plan for the seasonal extraction in Humboldt County of up to 6,300 cubic yards of sand and gravel per year from river gravel bars. The existing aggregate extraction site has historically involved aggregate removal from the exposed bar surface within the property. Secondary activities such as temporary equipment storage during active periods of operation will also occur.</p> <p>Monitoring information indicates that extraction at average historical levels is appropriate at this site and that such operations will not cause immediate nor cumulative significant adverse environmental impacts. The proposal is apply for a conditional use permit and</p>

	<p>Surface mining and reclamation plan. This project will remain consistent with the previous terms and conditions found within the previous permits. This project is subject to conditions and oversight found within the County of Humboldt's Interim Adaptive Management plan. as described in Chapter II (3).</p> <p>The proposal is for the extraction of up to 6,300 cubic yards of aggregate (sand and gravel) from adjacent gravel bars on an annual basis. The permitted volume is constant with the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Report allocation proposed by NMFS, FEV method for allocating maximum extraction volume by mean annual recruitment (MAR). (Table 2-4 SPEIR) for both the Miller Almquist Bar and Simpson-Glendale Bar</p> <p>The ongoing operation will continue to extract material as long as material is available on the gravel bar and operations conform to that established within the Interim Adaptive Management Plan. The extraction activity will continue to occur during the summer season between June 1st and October 15th. Aggregate materials will be extracted, loaded onto trucks and transported to an off-site location two miles north west of the project area where processing and storage will occur.</p> <p>In any given year, project extraction volumes, locations, and methods will be submitted by the applicant for approval by local, state, and federal agencies, including the County of Humboldt, CHERT, Dept. of Fish and Game, and Army Corps of Engineers. This interagency process is more specifically described later in this report.</p>
Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:	Adjacent lands are zoned lite industrial and commercial, Agricultural General, and utilized generally for agriculture, residential suburban, rural residential, highway commercial, open space, and wildlife habitat
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	Division of Mines and Geology Mine I.D., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit, Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement with CA Dept. of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board Clean Water Act Section

	401 Certification .
--	---------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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: 04.05.2019
Printed Name: Joshua Dorris	For: Humboldt County

Planning and
Building Dept.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Miller-Almquist Bar is a privately owned parcel on the Mad River, behind closed gates and with limited access. Although this is a private site, adjacent to other gravel mining operations, there are nearby public lands that citizens use recreationally. However, because the time frame of the gravel mining operation is so small, the proposed gravel mining will have no significant impacts on the aesthetics of the area. Use will be limited to a few weeks of the year and material will be stockpiled offsite or directly taken to a processing plant. No new roads are being constructed, vegetation will remain the same and annual inundation will clear any signs of use. Nevertheless, mitigation measures such as operating hours and timing have been generally defined and the site is rather small which would reduce the duration of operations. We anticipate no significant impacts to scenic vista</p>				
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Any visibility from the S. Boyd Rd, highway 299 or adjacent ownerships will remain the same as it has in a historical context. Vegetation that surrounds the site restricts and limits views of operation from drivers along adjacent roadways. No scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings within the project area will be removed or impacted by the project. No historic structures occur within the project area.</p>				

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

☐☐

X

☐

This project has been historically mined for aggregate resources the intensity and duration of the proposed project is well within that which has occurred in a historical context. These views are limited in extent and distance and those utilizing this area during recent history would be accustomed to the project site. Due to the similarities between the historical use of the site and that of the proposed project, the public is expected to be acclimated to the proposed project.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐☐☐

X

Project operations do not take place at night and require little equipment and no construction. Only the equipment could cause any glare, but this would be minimal. The project will not result in new sources or light or glare which would affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Cumulative Impact:

The proposed operation is a land use that may be considered by some to cause impacts to the aesthetic value surrounding the project site. However, aesthetic impacts are rather subjective and difficult to quantify. Nevertheless, mitigation measures such as operating hours and timing have been generally defined and the site is restricted with respect to the duration of operations. Given the lack of historical complaints it is perceived to be mitigated adequately. Land use in the surrounding area is a mixture of private agricultural and timber lands with lite industrial, dispersed rural residential estates. Historically the project site was not determined in the past to cause a cumulatively considerable impact to the aesthetic value of the surrounding area, and as proposed, consistent with past operations, would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

Existing Project Mitigation:

Vegetation will be retained around the site to screen views of the area from the public.

I. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

☐☐☐

X

Humboldt County has not been mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (www.consrv.gov). However, no prime agricultural soils have been identified within the project area.

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

☐☐☐

X

The project is proposed within a parcel zoned as lite industrial (ML) and the General Plan designation is (CF, IG). The final reclaimed state of the project area is consistent with the existing zoning. No Williamson Act Contract exists on the project parcels. Both California State Law and Humboldt County Ordinances encourage the conservation and utilization of mineral resources on private lands. In the past, the County has found that surface mining is considered a compatible use with lands zoned and designated for agricultural uses.

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

☐☐☐

X

The project is zoned lite industrial (ML) and will be reclaimed to the existing state following mining operations. No timber land will be effected of rezoned as part of this project as a result no effects to these resources will occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☐

X

No loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses will occur as a result of this project

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

☐☐☐

X

The project proposes to use the site as it has been historically; no farmland, timberland or forest land will be converted. Use of existing road access will be maximized.

The change in the existing environment is only proposed during the life of the permit. The proposed reclamation includes provisions for restoration (re-vegetation). The retention of the access road is consistent with the needs of agricultural activities

Cumulative Impact: This project will not impact any Agricultural Resources, as the site will be utilized as it has in the past. The site was not originally located on prime agricultural land and will not be expanded to impact or convert any prime agricultural land or Timber and forest land. This project will not cause a cumulatively considerable impact to agricultural resources.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) The project is confined to the project area indicated in the Mining and Reclamation Plans. Agricultural Resources are not affected.

Mitigation: None required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

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

☐
☐

X

☐

Discussion for finding b) applies to both finding a) & b).

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☐☐

X

☐

There are three types of air pollutants could result from this project. One is emissions from licensed extraction equipment and trucks used for transporting the gravel off-site. The second is dust from extraction, and transport and third from sorting and process of material at the site.

The project will result in similar truck traffic levels as has occurred in the past, Vehicles will be maintained to meet emission standards and off-road equipment Extraction and hauling activities can produce high fugitive dust levels during certain times of operation. The major sources of dust at the site would be from extraction, and truck traffic on the dirt access roads. Most of the dust that could cause a possible nuisance would be most attributable to truck traffic on the dirt access roads, with dust being carried upstream by the prevailing winds that generally travel up the river valley during the day. Dust associated with truck traffic would be trapped by the surrounding dense vegetation and would be less noticeable. Dust would only be created during times when extraction and hauling occur, and would be substantially decreased by periodic watering of the extraction areas, and access roads. USEPA (1995) has determined that at an average wind speed of 10 m.p.h. most dust (30 to 100 μ m in size) generally settles out of the atmosphere within 300 feet of the source, with larger particles traveling less distance and smaller particles traveling a longer distance. Most of the extraction areas, and hauling roads are more than 300 feet from the nearest residences and roads are continually watered during extraction activities. Activity in the project area would continue to require meeting NCUAQMD Air Quality standards, including Regulation 1, which prohibits nuisance dust generation and is enforceable by the District. The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District currently enforces dust emissions utilizing the CA Health and Safety Code (Section 41701) which limits visible emissions that exceed 40% density to a maximum of 3 minutes for any one hour period. There are currently no air quality problems identified in this region, and as proposed this project will not result in a violation of ambient air quality standards either individually or cumulatively in the area. The only sensitive receptors are the residences in the vicinity, however, due to the limited extraction activity that will occur, the rapid dissipation of the dust and the low density of residences, impacts will not be significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

☐
☐

X

☐

During certain times of the year, mostly in the winter, the NCAB is non-attainment for the state standard for particulate matter (PM-10), mainly in the area surrounding Humboldt Bay. Currently, the NCAB is non-attainment only for a few days per year. The draft attainment plan for PM-10 in the NCAB was completed in 1995. No final attainment plan currently exists for the NCAB. The attainment goals for lowering PM-10 in the NCAB were designed for Crescent City, Weaverville, Eureka, the nearest town (Ferndale), and PM-10 generated by this site would be detected best by the monitoring station located in Eureka. Based on the estimates generated for the 1995 draft attainment plan, Eureka needs a 49% reduction. This project as proposed consistent with past operations will not be generating any additional PM-10. Existing project mitigation measures included at the end of this section shall help to reach the attainment goals for PM-10 established in the 1995 draft attainment plan (NCUAQMD website).

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐
☐

X

☐

The sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include commercial facilities, residences, and recreationists and divers traveling on the Boyd Rd and Highway 299. The closest receptors potentially affected by the project are located along the west side of Boyd Rd.. Dust generated from gravel extraction, and loading and vehicle movement, has the potential to be considered objectionable by residents and recreationists in the general area.

This project similar in nature to historic activities with the project site and proposes no increase in dust generation above historic levels. Due to the limited extraction activity that will occur, the rapid dissipation of the dust and the lack of historical complaints by residences and recreationists, impacts are not significant. This project is required to meet air quality district standards on a continual basis.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐☐☐

X

Any objectionable odors arising from this site would be associated with excavation and trucking activities, and would not affect a substantial number of people. Due to the lack of historical complaints and the limited amount of time excavation operations occur, the impact from odors generated by on site operations is considered insignificant.

Cumulative Impact: During certain times of the year the NCAB is non-attainment for the state standard for particulate matter (PM-10), mainly in the area surrounding Humboldt Bay. While the percentage of days in the year the state standard has been exceeded has been decreasing over the past few years, the standard is still exceeded on several days every year, usually in the winter months when wood stoves are predominantly used for providing heat to residences. Particulate matter generated by this project was not determined in the past to be a cumulatively considerable addition to the limited PM-10 non-attainment status of the NCAB, and as proposed consistent with past operations would therefore not currently be determined to be a cumulatively considerable addition.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) Periodic watering of the extraction site, and access roads will continue to be utilized (as necessary) to reduce fugitive dust emissions.

IV. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐☐

X

☐

Potential impacts to listed aquatic species are mitigated by implementation of erosion control methods and a reclamation plan controlling surface runoff. Potential impacts to listed avian and mammal species are mitigated by maintaining operations at their historical levels and not expanding the mining site beyond that which currently exists.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐☐

X

☐

The vegetation surrounding the site is composed of coastal forest species of Northern California. These species and forest stands are not unique to the area and are not identified as a sensitive natural community. Storm runoff and the associated potential for sediment introduction to watercourses downslope will be control by the application of erosion control and the proposed surface runoff patterns proposed during surface mining and at completion of reclamation.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐☐

X

☐

The proposed project is incapable of significantly increasing peak flows or interrupting the hydrological connectivity within the area.

No additional road construction is proposed in association with this project. As previously stated the risk of increasing sediment introduction is mitigated by the application of annual erosion control measures and implementing surface drainage patterns consistent with the current pattern during the initial phase and then implementing a final grade conducive to the existing slope hydrology.

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?

☐☐

X

☐

The project has been an active mine historically, the area will be left in its current state following surface mining and final reclamation. No habitat modification is proposed.

Due to the environment created by historical mining the site fur bearing species may likely pass through the project area however, forage is limited to surrounding vegetated areas and nesting habitat is no present.

Furthermore, the project area is adjacent to the Boyd Road and 299 and traffic associated with commercial, industrial, logging, ranching activities, County road work, and rural commuters is consistent with noise levels produced during the course of operations.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐☐☐

X

The importance of existing gravel extraction operations is recognized by the Humboldt County General Plan – Frame Work Plan (see 9, Land Use and Planning).

This project is not in conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

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

☐
☐
☐

X

The property included in the project area is not within or subject to any habitat conservation plan.

Cumulative Impact: Existing project mitigation measures required by the regulatory agencies ensure that gravel extraction operations have an insignificant impact on 'threatened' or endangered species. Therefore, the project as proposed with existing mitigation measures will not cause a cumulatively considerable impact.

Mitigation: None required.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

☐
☐
☐

X

The project will not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources because none are present in this project area.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

☐
☐
☐

X

The project will not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological site because none are present in this project area.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐
☐
☐

X

The project will not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an paleontological site because none are present in this project area.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐
☐
☐

X

No human remains are known or were identified during the investigation at this project area

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 does not show any Alquist-Priolo earthquake zones within the project area. There is no likelihood that this project would impact these Faults or that these Faults would impact the proposed project.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The project site is located within youthful topography shaped by rapid uplifting and erosion within a geological time frame. The occurrence of earthquakes and strong seismic ground shaking has a potential to occur within and around the project vicinity. However, the surface mining and reclamation activities proposed will not expose people to any additional impacts related to this occurrence

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The ancestral alluvial deposit at the site is well compacted as can be observed along the access road and the exposed terrace at the site. Due to the lack, loosely consolidated material and the nature of the substrate surrounding the project site, the potential for liquefaction is greatly reduced. Seismic-related ground failure has the potential to occur, however, the activities proposed do not increase exposure of people to this type of event.

iv) Landslides?

☐☐☒☐

The youthful topography within the coast range is known for its potential for mass wasting in the form of rotational/translational slides, debris torrents, and debris slide slopes. However, the mining site itself is located directly on a river bar located on the Mad River. The stock pile area and access road are located on a bench just south of the site on adjacent to Boyd Rd.. The aggregate deposits adjacent to the project site demonstrates the ability to hold near vertical slopes. No unstable areas within the sites were identified that could potential cause harm to existing structures or people within or adjacent to the site that could potentially result from the proposed operations. The proposed project incorporates a reclamation plan to ensure that storm runoff is directed away from any potential unstable areas that could exist within the site onto gentle, well vegetated, stable topography. The implementation of these BMP's as well as compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices included in the Reclamation Plan will reduce to a level of 'less than significance' any effects of landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐☐☒☐

The project site is located on a gravel river bar with limited to no top soil present with the operational area other than the access road and stockpile area. Compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices and re-vegetation of the site pursuant to the final reclamation standards included in Section VI of the Reclamation Plan will reduce the potential occurrence of a substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion from occurring to a level of less than significant.

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?

☐☐☒☐

The geologic unit upon which the proposed site is located is stable. The design of the mining plan and the final contour as well as the resulting drainage pattern, mitigate the potential for increased surface runoff from reaching these areas and accelerating erosion or impacting potential unstable areas.

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

☐☐☐

X

The site is located within an area possessing stable soils.

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?

☐☐

X

☐

A portable chemical toilet will be provided and maintained by a licensed pumper.

Cumulative Impact: As described previously the project will not individually have geologic or soil related impacts. The project is a extension of an historic operation. The project site was not determined in the past to cause a cumulatively considerable impact to the geology & soils of the surrounding area, and as proposed consistent with historic operations would not therefore be determined to be a cumulatively considerable impact.

Existing Project Mitigation: None.

Mitigation: None proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

VII. 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions since the project entails the same historic operations approved in previous permits and is essentially the same or has been reduced due to the current restricted extraction volume allowed under the current PEIR and thus not increasing the baseline emissions and not resulting in a net increase in emissions.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Discussion for finding a) applies to both finding a) & b).

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

VIII. 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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

Discussion for finding b) applies to both finding a) & b).

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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

This project does not involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste or the emissions or disposal of hazardous substances. Standards of operation minimize potential impacts of spills from this project.

Public health and safety concerns include both on-site and off-site impacts. This project will not have a significant increase of risk to people on-site due to the following: it is in a somewhat isolated location; access is controlled; material to be excavated is structurally stable and no attractive nuisance to encourage trespass exists. No 'abandoned' equipment, structures, refuse, etc. associated with extraction activity will remain on the reclamation site or elsewhere on the parcel after extraction has been discontinued. If the current use is discontinued, the site will be incorporated into other current uses and/or utilized for future purposes consistent with current zoning.

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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

No schools exist within one-quarter mile of the project, and no hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste will be generated during the course of project operations, or left behind at the conclusion of operations.

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?*

☐
☐
☐

X

The site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites, and will not increase the risk of exposure to hazardous materials.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

☐
☐
☐

X

The nearest airstrip is Arcata-Eureka Airport, Located in McKinleyville, CA approximately 5.5 miles to the North of the project area. Substantial safety risks would not occur to people residing or working in the project area due to use of the airstrip.

☐
☐
☐

X

f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f).

g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

☐
☐
☐

X

Because of its size and scope and somewhat isolated location, this project will not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plan. The project has operated for over 15 plus years without any problems.

The proposed project may, at times, result in increased truck traffic. Traffic generated by this project, as discussed within this report, is similar to the type of traffic that has historically existed from previous permitted activities. Approval of the project will not change the existing level of traffic that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐☐

X

☐

Extraction activity will occur, away from vegetation, and will not increase the risk of wildland fires. The access roads shall be maintained in a state such that they are free of vegetation during times of activity, and equipment is kept in a 'fire-safe' condition. All processing equipment is routinely inspected by the operator and the Federal Mine Safety Administration. Fire extinguisher numbers and sizes are regularly inspected for compliance with MSHA regulations.

Cumulative Impact: This project does not involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste or the emissions or disposal of hazardous substances and is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites. The hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials in the environment will not be significant. Because of its size and scope and somewhat isolated location, this project will not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plan. Extraction activity will occur, away from vegetation, and will not increase the risk of wildland fires. The access roads shall be maintained in a state such that they are free of vegetation during times of activity, and equipment is kept in a 'fire-safe' condition. The site was not determined in the past to cause a cumulatively considerable addition to hazards & hazardous materials occurring in the surrounding area, and as proposed consistent with past operations would therefore not currently be determined to be a cumulatively considerable addition.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) All heavy equipment/machinery will be fitted with state approved ABC spark arrestors prior to operating on site.

2) Strict adherence to the federal mining safety regulations administered by the Federal Mine Safety Health Administration.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project shall be mitigated by strict adherence to the CHERT review team and Agency oversight, which oversees the annual pre and post extraction design and erosion control measures. Thus, the potential for sediment introduction from the project area into waters of the state is mitigated through conformance with review team recommendations as well as best management practices within applicable sections of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Plan.

b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

Other than municipal water no uses of groundwater supplies at the site are proposed. The topographical setting along the gravel bar as well as the proposed reclamation grade preclude the interception of groundwater.

c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project shall be mitigated by strict adherence to the CHERT review team and Agency oversight, which oversees the annual pre and post extraction design and erosion control measures. Thus, the potential for drainage patterns or stream bed alteration resulting from this project is mitigated through conformance with review team recommendations as well as best management practices within applicable sections of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Plan. Riparian vegetation will be retained in compliance with existing rules and regulations.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐

X

☐☐

The project is mitigated by strict adherence to the CHERT review team and Agency oversight, which oversees the annual pre and post extraction design and erosion control measures. Thus, the potential for drainage patterns or stream bed alterations that could increase the rate or amount in surface runoff that could result in increase flooding from this project is mitigated through conformance with review team recommendations as well as best management practices within applicable sections of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Plan. Riparian vegetation will be retained in compliance with existing rules and regulations

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐☐

X

☐

The proposed project will not result in an increase in runoff because it does not involve the creation of any impermeable surfaces. This application is proposed consistent with past operations and no additional development is being proposed at the site. The site is not a part of an existing or planned storm water drainage system.

No servicing of equipment (fueling or lubricating) occurs within the extraction area. In the event of an accidental lubricant or fuel leak (i.e., hydraulic lines breaking, etc.), operators have been instructed to move equipment to safer high ground (roadway or upper bench). If gravel is contaminated with a spill, the material will be removed and properly disposed.

The project will not result in any polluted runoff. Adherence to Mining and Reclamation Plan Standards that conform to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Water Code section 13000, et seq., and the Federal Clean Water Act 301 et seq. (33 U.S.C. section 1251, 1311, 1344 et seq.) the Regional Water Quality Control Board or the State Water Resources Control Board and requirements of the permitting agencies will ensure that water quality is not degraded.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐

X

☐☐

Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f).

Housing is not proposed as part of this project

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐☐☐

X

No structures are proposed as part of the project.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐☐☐

X

No levee or dam construction is associated with the project.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

☐☐☐

X

The project is not located within an area that would be subject to inundation by standing ocean waves or mudflows.

Cumulative Impact: The project will not result in any polluted runoff. The proposed project will not result in an increase in runoff because it does not involve the creation of any impermeable surfaces. The site is not a part of an existing or planned stormwater drainage system. Housing is not proposed as part of this project. The exposure of people and structures to injury or death and risk or loss due to dam failure is not significant. No increase of risk would occur above that of the existing operation. The site was not determined in the past to cause a cumulatively considerable impact to the hydrology & water quality of the surrounding area, and as proposed consistent with historical operations would therefore not currently be determined to be a cumulatively considerable impact.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) The project has will obtain and adhere to CHERT, and agency agreements regarding pre and post extraction design compliance, as well as approved agency permits including, Section 401 certification from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood

☐☐☐

X

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The project is located in a sparsely developed rural setting. No new access routes are proposed.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The project is located within a parcel zoned as (ML) and the General Plan designation is agricultural (CF, IG). In the past the County has determined that surface mining and Reclamation Plans are compatible uses within the previously mentioned zone and designation. The subject area is considered to offer low to no grazing and will offer the same once reclaimed.

The Humboldt County General Plan - Frame Work Plan recognizes the importance of existing gravel extraction sites as follows: "Sand, gravel and rock, being necessary to construction and development, are an essential component for the continued well-being of the County. They are the basis for much of the construction materials for roads, concrete, streambank protection, erosion control, septic systems and passive solar projects. Importation of these materials would raise costs and negatively impact the development and maintenance within the County. It is important to protect specific sites and haul routes against land use incompatibilities to assure the continued utilization of this resource."

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

☐☐☐

X

The property included in the project area is not included in any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Cumulative Impact: The project will not physically divide an established community and has been part Humboldt County community historically in the past. The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project since the Humboldt County General Plan contains policies supporting existing gravel mining sites such as the project site. The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The site was not determined in the past to cause a cumulatively considerable impact to the land use & planning in the surrounding area, and as proposed consistent with past operations would therefore not currently be determined to be a cumulatively considerable impact.

Existing Project Mitigation: None.

Mitigation: None proposed

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

XI. 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?

☐☐☐

X

Discussion for finding b) applies to both finding a) & b).

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?

☐
☐
☐

X

Rather than result in the loss of availability a locally important mineral resource, this project will allow the continued, sustainable utilization of an important mineral resource. The mineral resources available on the site are not unique to the area and are subject to annual replenishment.

Cumulative Impact: The mineral resources available on-site are not unique to the area. The final reclamation will have no effect on future mining opportunities in this area. The project site is not delineated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site within the Humboldt County General Plan.

Existing Project Mitigation: None

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐
☐

X

☐

The project is located in a industrial, commercial area. The intensity and duration of operations are expected to be low and fall within a range consistent with the historical mining operations as well as the existing traffic on Boyd Rd. that have taken place at the site and in association with the county road in the past. Expected noise levels at the nearest neighboring residence are to be 70 to 76 decibels.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐
☐

X

☐

As previously stated, the intensity and duration of operations are expected to be at a low level. In addition, a dense stand of young growth timber, brush and vegetation buffers the site from its nearest neighbor. Elevated noise levels are anticipated for the equipment operator(s) only.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐
☐

X

☐

Due to the limited times of project activities, the project will not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐
☐

X

☐

Temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the project area will occur. However, they are consistent with past noise levels.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐
☐
☐

X

The nearest airstrip is the public airstrip located 5.5 miles from the Arcata-Eureka Airport and is located outside of the airport land use plan. Any noise generated by the existing Air Port is minor and is not excessive beyond the historical baseline. No effect to individuals utilizing the project site is anticipated.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐
☐
☐

X

Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f).

Cumulative Impact

Noise generated by this project would be similar to noise levels from past operations at this site. No new noise sources are proposed. The approval of this project will not result in a cumulatively considerable addition to the existing noise levels in the surrounding area.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) Existing vegetation in and around the project area is left in place so as to provide a natural buffer to operational activities.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The proposed project will not produce any significant growth inducing impacts. Aggregate extraction is normally driven by growth, not vice versa. Growth inducing impacts are generally caused by projects that have a direct or indirect affect on economic growth, population growth, or when the project taxes community service facilities which require upgrades beyond the existing remaining capacity. No services or utilities are being required to be extended to the site. The economic benefits would not be such that people might be attracted to the area as a result.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The project will not displace any existing housing or people. There is no housing or people located within the project area.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

Discussion for finding b) applies to both finding b) & c).

Cumulative Impact: The proposed project will not produce any significant growth inducing impacts and will not displace substantial number of existing housing or people. Therefore, the project will not cause a cumulatively considerable impact or addition to the population and housing in the area surrounding the project site.

Existing Project Mitigation: None.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XIV. 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:*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The project consists of the continuation of historic operation. Additional use of fire protection, Police projection, schools, parks, or other public facilities will not be required for the project as proposed and consistent with past operations.

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Cumulative Impact: The project consists of the continuation of historic activities similar to other operation within the surrounding area. Additional use of public facilities and services will not be required for the project as proposed. Therefore, the project will not cause a cumulatively considerable addition to the use of public facilities and services in the Glendale or Blue Lake area.

Existing Project Mitigation:

1) All heavy equipment/machinery will be fitted with state approved ABC spark arrestors prior to operating on site.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XV. 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?*

☐
☐
☐

X

The proposed project is located within a private fenced ownership. The project area is an existing surface mining site and does not afford recreational opportunities in its current state. No public recreation opportunities are proposed by the project as a result on impacts on exiting recreational facility are expected

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?

☐
☐
☐

X

The project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

Cumulative Impact: The project consists of the continuation of historic activities. The project will not increase the use of, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Existing Project Mitigation:

Maintain measure to prevent public access to the site

Mitigation: None proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a) *Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?*

☐ ☐ X ☐

The project consists of the continuation of historical uses of the site and is consistent with operation within the surrounding area. Since the project represents an existing use, no additional traffic is proposed as a result of this project. Due to ongoing intermittent operation of this project, there will be no impacts to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system.

b) *Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

☐ ☐ X ☐

Traffic levels associated with this project are well within the historical levels associated with the site

c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

☐ ☐ ☐ X

Use of the airstrip is not a part of this project and would occur whether this project existed or not.

d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

☐ ☐ ☐ X

No roads or access ways will be altered; they will be the same as has existed historically. No new hazards or incompatible uses will not be created as a result of the proposed project.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☐

X

The existing access to the project area from the Boyd Rd. has been used since the project was originally permitted and no safety problems have occurred in the past. The project will not affect any other emergency access routes.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐

X

☐

The project will not affect adopted policies public transportation, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or public parking capacity in any manner. No foreseeable impacts to any policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation can be reasonably perceived as a result of the project.

Cumulative Impact: The project consists essentially of the continuation of a exiting project. Since the project represents an existing use, no additional traffic is proposed as a result of this project. Due to the intermittent operations proposed of this project, there will be no impacts to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system. No roads or access ways will be altered; they will be the same as has existed. No new hazards or incompatible uses will be created as a result of the proposed project. The existing access to the project area from Boyd Rd. has been used since the project was in operation and no safety problems have occurred in the past. The project will not affect any other emergency access routes. Therefore, the project will not cause a cumulatively considerable addition or impact to traffic and transportation in the surrounding area.

Existing Project Mitigation: None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) <i>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Since no water resources will be used on site other than for dust abatement, and no processing of materials will occur on-site, no discharge into State waters will occur, therefore no measures for wastewater treatment are proposed.				
b) <i>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Portable chemical toilets will be provided and maintained by a licensed pumper. The use and maintenance of the portable sanitary facilities will comply with all state and county regulations pertaining to this type of facility. No new water treatment or wastewater facilities or the expansion of such facilities are proposed or needed for the project.				
c) <i>Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
No new storm water facilities or the expansion of existing facilities are needed for the project.				
d) <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
No water resources will be required for extraction activities				
e) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
There is no wastewater treatment provider associated with the site.				

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐
☐

X

☐

The project site utilizes Humboldt County permitted land fill system for its solid wastes and disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐
☐
☐

X

The site will not create any solid waste that is not handled by and disposed of by an appropriate licensed operator.

Cumulative Impact: The project consists of essentially the continuation of existing project. No new water treatment or wastewater facilities or the expansion of such facilities are proposed or needed for the project. No new storm water facilities or the expansion of existing facilities are needed for the project. The project will not cause a cumulatively considerable addition of impact to the use or construction of utilities and service systems in the Glendale or Blue Lake area.

Existing Project Mitigation: None.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?

☐

X

☐
☐

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)?

☐
☐

X

☐

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

☐
☐

X

☐