EXHIBIT 6: CEQA Documentation
Humboldt Coastal Nature Center

California Home

Monday, Febuary 25, 2008

Friends of the Dunes Coastal Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Special Permit for Establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Ed

SCH Number: 2007022113

Type: NOD - Notice of Determination

Project Description

A Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels of 30.81 acres (APN 506-111-20) and 24.64 acres (APN 506-111-11) each. The parcels will exchange approximately 13.53 acres to result in one parcel of 17.28 acres and the other of 38.17 acres. The larger parcel is currently developed with a residence and two barns. The smaller parcel is currently vacant. The Lot Line Adjustment will facilitate a Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing residence to be permitted as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve. The permit also includes establishing existing trails and the restoration of approximately 30.5 +/- acres encompassing beach and dune habitat pampas grass that threaten endangered species and rare plant communities. A Coastal Development Permit is required for all development within the Coastal Zone. A Special Permit is requested to establish parking standards based on existing use levels at the Manila Community Center.

Project Lead Agency

Humboldt County Community Development Services

Contact Information

Primary Contact:
Trevor Estlow
Humboldt County Community Development Services
(707) 268-3740
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501-4484

Project Location

County: Humboldt
City:
Region:
Cross Streets: New Navy Base Rd (Hwy. 255) and Stamps Lane
Parcel No: 506-111-11, 20
Township: 6N
Range: 1W
Section: 34
Base: HBM
Other Location Info: City/Nearest Community: Manila area

Determinations

This is to advise that the ☒ Lead Agency ☐ Responsible Agency Humboldt County Planning Commission has approved the project described above on 4/5/2007 and has made the following determinations regarding the project described above.

1. The project ☐ will ☒ will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☐ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   ☒ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures ☐ were ☒ were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Statement of Overriding Considerations ☐ was ☒ was not adopted for this project.
5. Findings ☒ were ☐ were not made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

Final EIR Available at:

Date Received: 4/27/2007

CEQAnet HOME | NEW SEARCH

California Home

Monday, Febuary 25, 2008

OPR Home > CEQAnet Home > CEQAnet Query > Search Results > Document Description

Friends of the Dunes Coastal Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Special Permit for Establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Ed

SCH Number: 2007022113

Type: Neg - Negative Declaration

Project Description

A Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels of 30.81 acres (APN 506-111-20) and 24.64 acres (APN 506-111-11) each. The parcels will exchange approximately 13.53 acres to result in one parcel of 17.28 acres and the other of 38.17 acres. The larger parcel is currently developed with a residence and two barns. The smaller parcel is currently vacant. The Lot Line Adjustment will facilitate a Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing residence to be permitted as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve. The permit also includes establishing existing trails and the restoration of approximately 30.5 +/- acres encompassing beach and dune habitat pampas grass that threaten endangered species and rare plant communities. A Coastal Development Permit is required for all development within the Coastal Zone. A Special Permit is requested to establish parking standards based on existing use levels at the Manila Community Center.

Project Lead Agency

Humboldt County Community Development Services

Contact Information

Primary Contact:
Trevor Estlow
Humboldt County Community Development Services
(707) 268-3740
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501-4484

Project Location

County: Humboldt
City:
Region:
Cross Streets: New Navy Base Rd (Hwy. 255) and Stamps Lane
Parcel No: 506-111-11, 20
Township: 6N
Range: 1W
Section: 34
Base: HBM
Other Location Info: City/Nearest Community: Manila area

Proximity To

Highways: 255
Airports:
Railways:
Waterways: Humboldt Bay
Schools:
Land Use: Currently developed with single family residence and outbuildings. GP: Agricultural General (AG) and Natural Resources (NR) in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan (HBAP) Density: AG:1 unit/2.5 acres. Z: Rural Residential Agriculture (RA) and Natural Resources (NR).

Development Type

Other

Local Action

Use Permit, Other Action, Local Coastal Permit

Project Issues

Coastal Zone, Noise, Population/Housing Balance, Public Services, Recreation/Parks, Traffic/Circulation, Wetland/Riparian

---

Reviewing Agencies (Agencies in **Bold Type** submitted comment letters to the State Clearinghouse)

Resources Agency; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1; Department of Parks and Recreation; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Fish and Game, Region 1; Department of Water Resources; California Coastal Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 1; Department of Boating and Waterways; State Lands Commission

---

Date Received: 2/27/2007 **Start of Review:** 2/27/2007 **End of Review:** 3/28/2007

CEQAnet HOME | NEW SEARCH

HUMBOLDT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

***DRAFT* MINUTES**

April 5, 2007

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Bruce Emad, Mary Gearheart, Richard Hansis, Scott Kelly, Sef Murguia, Jeff Smith

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Tom Herman

STAFF PRESENT: Kirk Girard, Director Community Development Services, Carolyn Ruth, Deputy County Counsel, Bob Bronkall, Associate Engineer, Public Works, Steve Werner, Supervising Planner, Elizabeth Burks, Current Planner, Marcella Clem, Current Planner, Trevor Estlow, Current Planner, Alyson Hunter, Current Planner, Steve Lazar, Current Planner, Michael Richardson, Current Planner, Michael Wheeler, Advanced Planner, Betty Webb, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chamber of the Humboldt County Courthouse, Vice Chairman Jeffery Smith presiding.

The Minutes of the March 15, 2007 Planning Commission meeting were approved 6/0. (EMAD/KELLY)

AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

1. **Samoa Pacific Group, Samoa Area** CASE Nos. GPA-02-01 & ZR-02-02: FILE Nos. APN 401-021-29 et. al.

   BY ORDER OF THE CHAIR, this project was continued to May 3, 2007.

2. Public Hearing Item #2 was heard as Administrative Agenda Item #9.

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

BY A UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE, unless otherwise noted, the Planning Commission took the recommended action of approval subject to specified conditions on the following projects:

1. **Ray Jones, Shelter Cove Area** (844 Spring Rd.): A Coastal Development Permit is necessary to consider the construction of a single-family residence, decking, and attached garage. A Special Permit is required for Design Review. Note: It is recommended a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted. **CASE Nos. CDP-06-22 & SP-06-25; FILE No. APN 109-182-27.** (SL)

2. **Chris Renner, Orick Area** (120001 HWY 101): A Coastal Development Permit is necessary for the placement of a new 12,000-gallon above ground fuel tank at the Shoreline Deli and Market. A special Permit is required for Design Review. **CASE Nos: CDP-06-45 & SP-06-53; FILE No. APN 520-251-15.** (EB)

3. This project was heard as ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING, Item #1.

4. **Patti Campbell, Eureka Area** (3322 Mitchell Rd.): A two-year extension of a Coastal Development Permit and Notice of Merger approved January 20, 2005. The original Coastal Development permit was requested in order to develop a single-family residence with an attached garage. The Notice of Merger merged two parcels into one parcel. **No change to the original project is proposed. If approved, the extension will expire February 22, 2009. CASE Nos. CDP-02-63X & NOM-02-17X; FILE No. APN 017-182-10, -11.** (MDC)

5. **Keith Combs, Cutten Area** (6047 Beechwood Dr.): A minor subdivision of one parcel into two parcels. This project includes mitigation for potential traffic impacts to the Walnut Drive/Hemlock Street intersection. **Note this project was originally noticed and circulated for the July 20, 2006 Planning Commission, but pulled to be re-noticed.** Note: It is recommended a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted. **CASE No. PMS-05-17; FILE No. APN 303-091-02.** (AH)

6. **Danco Group, McKinleyville Area** (1550 Heartwood Dr.): A minor subdivision of one parcel into two parcels. A Special Permit is requested to allow parking based on established uses and to allow an exception to the loading space requirement. **CASE Nos. PMS-06-15 & SP-06-80; FILE No. APN 508-251-30.** (TE)

7. **Victoria Schanzle, McKinleyville Area** (865 Eucalyptus Rd.): A Coastal Development Permit and Special Permit for a secondary dwelling unit and major vegetation removal (30 trees downed by the December 31, 2005 storm). **CASE Nos. CDP-06-06 & SP-06-07; FILE No. APN 510-241-22.** (EB)

8. **William Tilch, Eureka Area** (2838 Spears Rd.): The Modification of a previously approved Coastal Development Permit and Special Permit will consider the construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence, a new covered deck and a new septic tank. A Special Permit is required to consider granting a reduction of the Streamside Management Area. Note: a separate Coastal Development Permit (#1-06-033) involving the placement of a mound leach field has been approved by the California Coastal Commission. If approved, the Modification will expire one year from the effective date. Note: It is recommended a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted. **CASE Nos. CDP-04-23M & SP-04-25M; FILE No. 403-022-45.** (SL)

9. **Friends of the Dunes, Manila Area** (200 Stamps Ln. & 1970 Park St.): A Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels. A Conditional Use and Coastal Development Permits are necessary to allow the existing residence to be permitted as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve, which will include a restroom building, covered outdoor area, parking lot improvements and signage/trail markers. A Special Permit is requested to establish parking standards. Note: It is recommended a Negative Declaration be adopted. **CASE Nos. CDP-06-49, CUP-06-14, LLA-06-08 & SP-06-71; FILE Nos. APN 506-111-11, -20.** (TE)

THE MOTION WAS MADE (HANSIS/MURGUIA) to adopt the associated Mitigated Negative Declarations, make all the required findings based on evidence in the staff report, supplemental information, and approve the project on the Administrative Agenda as described on the Agenda Item Transmittal subject to its recommended conditions of approval.

THE MOTION PASSED BY THE VOTE 6-0 (Kelly & Smith abstained on #6)

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING:

1. **Dennis Breckner, McKinleyville Area** (1781 Central Ave.): A two-year extension of a Minor Subdivision and Special Permit approved January 16, 2003. The original project involved the subdivision of one parcel into two parcels. The applicant is also seeking an exception to the subdivision regulations for approval to create one "flag lot". **If approved will expire on January 28, 2009.** Note: The Humboldt County Planning Commission adopted a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact on January 16, 2003. **CASE Nos. PMS-01-14XX & SP-01-24XX; File No. APN 509-221-21.** (MDC)

Commissioner Emad questioned the subdivision regulations for the approval to create one "flag lot". Staff reassured commission the original project did include the "flag lot" and the next extension will be written in past tense to prevent confusion, as there are no changes to the original project in this extension.

THE MOTION WAS MADE (EMAD/GEARHEART) to make all the required findings based on evidence in the staff report, supplemental information, and approve the project on the Administrative Agenda as described on the Agenda Item Transmittal subject to its original recommended conditions of approval.

THE MOTION PASSED BY THE VOTE 5-0 (Kelly abstained on #1)

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **MATEEL COMMUNITY CENTER, Cooks Valley Area** (240 Cooks Valley Rd): Review of the 2006 *Reggae on the River* music festival and setting attendance levels for the 2007 event. **CASE No. CUP-04-38M; FILE No. 33-041-23, 33-271-05 & -07.** (MDR)

The public comment period was reopened:

Michael Richards reminded the commission that the purpose of the public hearing was to receive and file the 2006 annual report, review the proposed conditions, further mitigate the project, and set the 2007 attendance levels for ticket sales and volunteer workers. It is **not** about transferring rights to the permit to some other entity, approving a permit (this permit was approved in 2005), nor permitting another festival.

Commissioner Smith explained that the public comment period was reopened to receive testimony from Under Sheriff Downey.

Michael Thomas Downey, Under Sheriff gave a report on last year's event and spoke of his years of experience with Mateel and Peoples Productions; overall he felt Reggae is still a well run event. However, after receiving the after action report from 2006 (memo from Sgt. Swithenbank to Mr. Downey) he felt there was far more people attending the event than the 10,000 tickets sold. The other issue was more prevalent drug activity as reported by Times-Standard and The Eureka Reporter. In addition, off duty officers had also reported they had witnessed open trays of marijuana, LSD, ecstasy, and mushrooms. He felt the sheriffs department has a duty to provide a level of safety; therefore, he and Sheriff Philp talked about the possibility of a much bigger presence at the event including a command post.

Commissioner Kelly asked Sheriff Downey how he felt a command post would be received if the attendance was the same as the previous year.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PLANNING DIVISION
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
3015 H Street Phone (707) 445-7541
Eureka, CA 95501 Fax (707) 445-7446
www.co.humboldt.ca.us/planning

May 9, 2007

RECEIVED
JUL 0 9 2007
COASTAL CONSERVANCY
OAKLAND, CALIF.

Project Name: Friends of the Dunes, Carol Vander Meer
PO Box 186
Arcata, CA 95519
Case No(s): CDP-06-49 / CUP-06-14 / LLA-06-08 / SP-06-71
File No.: APN: 506-111-11 & -20

Dear Applicant:

This is to advise you that the appeal period for the above noted project has been completed and the project is effective as of May 9, 2007. The project approval granted by this

- ☒ use permit
- ☒ development permit
- ☒ special permit
- ☐ variance
- ☐ modification
- ☐ tentative subdivision map
- ☒ lot line adjustment
- ☐ determination of status
- ☐ ag preserve ☐ non-renewal
- ☐ extension

is/are valid for 36 months and is/are set to expire on May 9, 2010. Please take note of this expiration date; no additional notification will be provided to you by this Department.

If the conditions of approval have not been satisfied and construction or use in reliance upon the development permit or variance, or recordation of the final or parcel map, has not occurred before the expiration date, a new application must be filed. The new application will require additional fees and may be subject to different requirements and standards.

In the event that development or necessary construction, or the recordation of the subdivision map, cannot begin within the noted time period, you may apply to the Planning Division for an extension. Applications for such extensions must be submitted before the scheduled expiration date, accompanied by the appropriate fees, and may be granted only when: (1) the permitted development has not changed; and (2) the findings made when the permit was granted can still be made.

Please contact the Planning Division of the Humboldt County Community Development Services at (707) 445-7541 if you have any questions or require for more specific information on extensions.

PLANNING DIVISION OF THE HUMBOLDT
COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Kirk A. Girard, Director

ATTACHMENT 5
Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration

Friends of the Dunes APNs 506-111-11 & -20 (Manila area) Case Nos: CDP-06-49/CUP-06-14/LLA-06-08/SP-06-71

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

SCH # 2007022113

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95814-3044 (916) 445-0613

Project Title: Friends of the Dunes Coastal Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Special Permit for establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve.
Lead Agency: Humboldt County Community Development Services - Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501
Contact Person: Trevor Estlow, Senior Planner, Phone: (707) 268-3740 Fax: (707) 445-7446 Email: testlow@co.humboldt.ca.us

Project Location:
County: Humboldt City/Nearest Community: Manila area Zip Code: 95501
Cross Streets: The project is located in Humboldt County, in the Manila area, on the west side of New Navy Base Road (Hwy 255) at the intersection of Stamps Lane and New Navy Base Road, on the properties known as 200 Stamps Lane and 1970 Park Street. Acres of Project area: 55.5 acres. Assessor's Parcel Nos. 506-111-11 & -20
Section: 34; T6N R1W; Base; H.B.& M.
Within 2 Miles: City of Eureka Waterways: Humboldt Bay Airports: n/a Railways: n/a
Schools: n/a

Document Type:

CEQA:		NEPA:	Other:
☐ NOP	☐ Supplement/Subsequent	☐ NOI	☐ Joint Document
☐ Early Cons	☐ EIR (Prior SCH No.) ____	☐ EA	☐ Final Document
☒ Neg. Dec.	☐ Other ____	☐ Draft EIS	☐ Other ____
☐ Draft EIR		☐ FONSI	

Local Action Type ☒ Conditional Use Permit/Coastal Development Permit/Lot Line Adjustment/Special Permit

Development Type
☒ A Lot Line Adjustment to facilitate the establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve including beach and dune restoration and trails.

Project Issues Discussed in Document

☐ Aesthetic/Visual	☐ Flood Plain/Flooding	☐ Schools/Universities	☐ Water Quality
☐ Agricultural Land	☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard	☐ Septic Systems	☐ Water Supply/Grndwtr
☐ Air Quality	☐ Geologic/Seismic	☐ Sewer Capacity	☒ Wetland/Riparian
☐ Archeological/Historical	☐ Minerals	☐ Erosion/Comp/Grading	☐ Wildlife
☒ Coastal Zone	☒ Noise	☐ Solid Waste	☐ Growth Inducing
☐ Drainage/Absorption	☒ Population/Housing	☐ Toxic/Hazardous	☐ Land Use
☐ Economic/Jobs	☒ Public Service/Facilities	☒ Traffic/Circulation	☐ Cumulative Effects
☐ Fiscal	☒ Recreation/Parks	☐ Vegetation	☐ Other ____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Use
Present Land Use: The parcels are currently developed with a single family residence and outbuildings.
General Plan Designation: Agricultural General (AG) and Natural Resources (NR) in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan (HBAP) Density: AG:1 unit/2.5 acres, NR: n/a.
Zoning: Rural Residential Agriculture (RA) and Natural Resources (NR).

Description of project:
A Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels of 30.81 acres (APN: 506-111-20) and 24.64 acres (APN: 506-111-11) each. The parcels will exchange approximately 13.53 acres to result in one parcel of 17.28 acres and the other of 38.17 acres. The larger parcel is currently developed with a residence and two barns. The smaller parcel is currently vacant. The Lot Line Adjustment will facilitate a Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing residence to be permitted as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve. The permit also includes establishing existing trails and the restoration of approximately 30.5± acres encompassing beach and dune habitat. The restoration work will include manual removal of yellow bush lupine, European beachgrass, iceplant and pampas grass that threaten endangered species and rare plant communities. A Coastal Development Permit is required for all development within the Coastal Zone. A Special Permit is requested to establish parking standards based on existing use levels at the Manila Community Center.

F:\testlow\ENVDOCS\Friends of the Dunes.doc

Friends of the Dunes APNs 506-111-11 & -20 (Manila area) Case Nos: CDP-06-49/CUP-06-14/LLA-06-08/SP-06-71

KEY
S = Document sent by lead agency
X = Document sent by SCH
✓= Suggested distribution

Resources Agency
___ Boating & Waterways
✓ Coastal Commission
___ Coastal Conservancy
___ Colorado River Board
___ Conservation
✓ Fish & Game (Redding office)
___ Forestry
___ Office of Historic Preservation
___ Parks & Recreation
___ Reclamation
___ S.F. Bay Conservation & Develop. Comm.
✓ Water Resources

Business, Transportation & Housing
___ Aeronautics
___ California Highway Patrol
___ CALTRANS District #1
___ Department of Transportation Planning (HQ)
___ Housing & Community Development
___ Food & Agriculture

Health & Welfare
___ Health Services

State & Consumer Services
___ General Services
___ OLA (Schools)

Cal-EPA
___ Air Resources Board
✓ APCD/AQMD (North Coast)
___ California Waste Mgmt Board
___ SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
___ SWRCB: Delta Unit
___ SWRCB: Water Quality
___ SWRCB: Water Rights
✓ Regional WQCB #1 Northcoast

Youth & Adult Corrections
___ Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices
___ Energy Commission
✓ Native American Heritage Comm.
___ Public Utilities Commission
___ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
___ State Lands Commission
___ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

___ Other:1

Public Review Period (to be filled in by the lead agency)

Starting Date: FEB 26, 2007 Ending Date: MARCH 25, 2007

Signature [signature] Date: FEB 20, 2007

Applicant: Friends of the Dunes
Carol Vander Meer
Address: P.O. Box 186
City/State/Zip: Arcata, CA 95518
Phone: (707) 268-0334

For SCH Use Only:
Date Received at SCH ___
Date Review Starts ___
Date to Agencies ___
Date to SCH ___
Clearance Date ___
Notes:

F:\testlow\ENVDOCS\Friends of the Dunes.doc

25

PLANNING DIVISION
HUMBOLDT COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
3015 H STREET
EUREKA, CA 95501

Initial Study and Draft Negative Declaration
YOUNG, Pat Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit

1. Project title: Friends of the Dunes Coastal Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Lot Line Adjustment and Special Permit (CDP-06-49/CUP-06-14/LLA-06-08/SP-06-71)
2. Lead agency name and address: Humboldt County Community Development Services - Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501-4484; Phone: (707) 445-7541; Fax (707) 445-7446
3. Contact person and phone number: Trevor Estlow, phone: 707-268-3740
4. Project location: The project site is located in Humboldt County, in the Manila area.
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Friends of the Dunes, Carol Vander Meer, P.O. Box 186, Arcata, CA 95518
6. General plan designation: Agricultural General (AG) and Natural Resources (NR) in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan (HBAP).
7. Zoning: Rural Residential Agriculture (RA) and Natural Resources (NR).
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or on-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.): A Lot Line Adjustment between two parcels of 30.81 acres (APN: 506-111-20) and 24.64 acres (APN: 506-111-11) each. The parcels will exchange approximately 13.53 acres to result in one parcel of 17.28 acres and the other of 38.17 acres. The larger parcel is currently developed with a residence and two barns. The smaller parcel is currently vacant. The Lot Line Adjustment will facilitate a Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing residence to be permitted as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve. The permit also includes establishing existing trails and the restoration of approximately 30.5± acres encompassing beach and dune habitat. The restoration work will include manual removal of yellow bush lupine, European beachgrass, iceplant and pampas grass that threaten endangered species and rare plant communities. A Coastal Development Permit is required for all development within the Coastal Zone. A Special Permit is requested to establish parking standards based on existing use levels at the Manila Community Center.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: The Parcel is currently developed with a single family residence and outbuildings. The immediate area is both rural residential and natural resource in use with both smaller and larger sized parcels surrounding the subject parcel (.25 -20 acres in size) and the Pacific Ocean to the west.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Building Division.

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier 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

FEB 20, 2007
Date

Trevor Estlow, Senior Planner

Humboldt County Community Development, Planning Division

F:\testlow\ENVDOCS\Friends of the Dunes.doc

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 analyze in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated: "describe the mitigation measures which 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.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

1. AESTHETICS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not impact aesthetics with regards to: a scenic vista or scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The project will not have a significant impact on the environment with regards to aesthetics, specifically, the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Discussion: The proposed project will adjust a property line and convert an existing single family residence into the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve. The project also proposes to remove non-native invasive plant species from the beach and dune areas as well as establish a trail system. There is no indication that the proposed project will adversely affect a scenic vista or scenic resources, nor create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. There are no known special status trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings or state scenic highways within the project vicinity.

For the reasons mentioned above, Staff finds that the project will have no impact on the environment with regards to aesthetics, specifically, the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE 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. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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; or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Discussion: The subject property is planned for rural residential development and natural resources. Given that the parcel consists mostly of beach and dune habitat, the potential land for agricultural use is minimal. The areas surrounding the subject parcel are engaged primarily in open space and residential uses. The property is not in a Williamson Act contract.

Based on the existing non-agricultural use of the parcel and its size, the project will not result in conversion of agricultural land or have a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources. Based on the above, the Department finds the project is not expected to result in a significant adverse affect on the agricultural resources.

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:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

3. AIR QUALITY: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will have a less than significant impact on the environment with regards to the following air quality issues: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; or violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or 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). The project has a limited potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people unless mitigation measures are incorporated.

Discussion: According to the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), all of the Humboldt County is in non-attainment of the State's PM-10 (particulate matter of 10 microns in size) standard, but complies with all other State and Federal air quality standards. According to recent studies by the NCUAQMD, the most significant contributors to PM-10 are residential wood burning stoves. Currently, a wood burning stove is not proposed, however, it is unlikely that one additional stove would result in a significant increase in particular matter. Furthermore, any impacts to air quality during the project timeframes for any proposed development would be temporary. Staff finds that the potential for even a temporary increase in pollutants negligible.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4. : BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT/LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project is not expected to: impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); nor impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the DFG or USFWS or interfere substantially with the movement of an native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, nor significantly impact 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; nor conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources or any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Discussion: According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife National Wetland Inventory there are mapped wetlands exist on the parcels in question but not in the area of planned restoration. All activities adjacent to mapped endangered plant populations will be carried out under direct supervision of the Restoration Manager. In addition, the project was referred to the Eureka office of the Department of Fish and Game and they did not respond with any comments or concerns.

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for the project location, thus, the project did not conflict with any such plans. The Department does not have any evidence that the project will result in adverse impacts either directly or through habitat modifications, on wetland habitat or that it would interfere with the movement of fish and wildlife species. Nor will the project conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources or any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will have no environmental impact with respect to the above biological resources issues.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project does not have the potential to impact a historical resource as defined in §15064.5; an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5; a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries unless adequately mitigated.

Discussion: The Department believes the proposed education center and restoration work will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical or cultural resources on the site. A referral was sent to both the North Coastal Information Center (N.C.I.C) as well as the Wiyot Tribe and neither agency identified any resources and recommended approval of the project.

The County's standard informational note has been added to the Conditions of Approval regarding legal requirements should any on-site activities reveal the presence of archaeological resources or human remains. Based on the above, the Department believes that potential impacts to cultural resources will be adequately mitigated with respect to cultural resources.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or land sliding. The project site is not 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. Furthermore, the project does not appear to have the potential to cause a significant impact on the environment with respect to soil erosion or loss of topsoil unless mitigation measures are incorporated. The project will not create substantial risk to life or property by being located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), nor does the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.

Discussion: The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The parcel is located in an area mapped on the Framework General Plan Geologic Hazard map as having a low to moderate slope instability. As no structures are proposed in the moderate slope instability area, no soils report was required. The project was referred to the Building Inspection Division and they recommended approval of the project. Referral comments did not suggest the proposed project would result in any landslide hazards or expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Water and sewage disposal are provided by the Manila Community Services District. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will not result in a significant environmental impact with respect to the above specific geology/soils issues.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) 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?

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not: have an impact on the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; nor 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; nor emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; nor 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; nor would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to its proximity within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; nor result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to proximity to a private airstrip; nor will it impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Lastly, the project will not impact the environment in regards to its location within an area of high wildland fire.

Discussion: The use poses a limited threat as far as hazardous materials spillage is concerned. Furthermore, there are no known or listed hazardous materials sites on or nearby, the project will not result in a safety hazard regarding a private or a public airstrip as there are none nearby, nor is there an emergency evacuation plan in place for the area that this project, as proposed, could affect. There is no evidence in the record that suggests that this project could impact the environment in relation to the hazards mentioned above.

The project site is within an area marked as nil fire potential on the Framework General Plan Resource map. The parcel is in the Local Responsibility Area (LRA) for fire protection and falls under the purview of the Arcata Fire District as a first responder to emergencies. The fire district did not voice concerns with regards to the project's potential impact on resources or its creation of hazardous fire scenarios. The Department believes the proposed project, as evidenced above, will have a less than significant impact on the environment with regards to the specific hazards above.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not have a significant impact on the environment with regards to the following hydrology and water quality issues: substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; nor create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; nor 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). The project will not significantly nor 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; nor place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; nor place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; nor expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding and including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; nor inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. As proposed, the project is not expected to substantially degrade water quality and hydrology.

Discussion: The project consists of the establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve as well as the removal of non-native invasive plants and trail signage. There are no indications that the project would impact water quality by any action of the proposed project. The project was referred to the Department of Fish and Game who has not recommended any additional comments or mitigation.

According to FIRM map panel # 775, the parcel is located within "C", areas of minimal flooding, therefore, Staff finds the project to not have an impact with regards to flooding. Likewise, the project will not 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; or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. All structures are located landward of sand dunes in excess of 40 feet, thereby minimizing any potential tsunami risk. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project as proposed and conditioned will have no significant impact, individually or cumulatively with regard to above hydrology and water quality issues.

Lastly, the Department did not receive any referral comments regarding the project having an adverse impact on existing or planned stormwater drainage facilities, or otherwise degrading water quality. There may be a publicly maintained drainage facility downstream, however, there is no expected increase in water flow over what has historically occurred and the Land Use Division of Public Works' referral comments did not reflect concerns regarding flooding issues.

Thus, based on the above, the Department finds that the project as proposed and conditioned will have a less than significant impact, individually or cumulatively with regard to above hydrology and water quality issues other than erosion.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not physically divide an established community; nor conflict with a local 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; nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Discussion: The project site is designated Agricultural General (AG) and Natural Resources (NR) in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan (HBAP). It is zoned Rural Residential Agriculture (RA) and Natural Resources (NR). The parcel is currently developed with a single family residence with associated outbuildings. The project involves the establishment of the residence as the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve as well as beach and dune restoration and trail maintenance. The surrounding area is residential and open space with surrounding parcels averaging ¼-10 acres in size.

There is no evidence that the project will physically divide an established community. It is actually more likely to bring the community together. The applicant has applied for a CUP to establish the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center as a neighborhood community center, which requires a discretionary permit, thus conforming to applicable local land use plans and policies. In addition, there are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans proposed or adopted for this area. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning, more specifically, physically dividing an established community; nor conflict with a local 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; nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or violating habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans for this area.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

10. MINERAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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; or 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.

Discussion: The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. The project site is not, nor adjacent to, a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in significant adverse impact with regard to mineral resources.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

11. NOISE: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will have no environmental impacts with regards to: the exposure of persons to or, generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or, a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted or, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Discussion: The project will create very little increases in noise and ground vibrations during the project activity. The main structure is already built and slight noise may be created when parking area improvements are made, however, there is no evidence the use will create permanent ambient noise levels above existing levels. Furthermore, there is no private airstrip in the vicinity of the project. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will have no impact, individually or cumulatively, with regards to noise.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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); nor displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; nor displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Discussion: The project includes the establishment of the Humboldt Bay Coastal Education Center and Reserve for the neighborhood benefit. The project is utilizing an existing residence, however, it has not been used as such for many years. The Lot Line Adjustment will allow for future subdivision that could potentially create separate residential parcels in the future. There is no evidence the project will induce growth within the area, displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitate the construction of replacement housing or the displacement of people. Based on the above, the Department finds no evidence indicating that the project will have an adverse impact on population and housing.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
v. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will have a less than significant impact to the environment with regards to an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).

Discussion: The project is anticipated to create approximately 25 vehicle trips per day, approximately 3 times that of a single family residence. This increase in traffic is not anticipated to substantially increase the overall traffic impacts on the roadway. In addition, the project was referred to Cal Trans and they commented that the access road (Highway 255) was adequate to serve the property. Based on the project as proposed, comments from reviewing agencies, and review of applicable regulations, the Department finds there is no evidence indicating the proposed project will result in individually or cumulatively significant impacts regarding traffic load.

There are no airports, public or private, within 2 miles of the site. In regards to emergency access, neither Public Works nor Cal Trans voiced concerns that the road was exceptionally substandard in width. There are no policies regarding alternative transportation routes for this area.

There are no known restrictions along the road that could impede passage such as a covered bridge with weight restrictions. In addition, the project will not alter any private or public improvements, such as roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, parking lots or any other transportation routes or facilities. Based on the project as proposed, comments from reviewing agencies, and review of applicable regulations, the Department finds there is no evidence indicating the proposed project will result in individually or cumulatively significant impacts regarding: capacity or level of service; nor hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) 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?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will: not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB; nor 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; the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources without new or expanded entitlements being needed; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Discussion: The parcels are planned and zoned for residential and agricultural uses. The project is not expected to generate a substantial solid waste situation. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the project will result in a significant impact with respect to utilities and service systems. Referral comments have not identified any concerns regarding the project's impact to utilities and service systems. Based on the evidence and County records, Staff finds that the project will have either no impact on or a less than significant impact on utilities and service systems.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

17. a) and b): MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project has a less than significant 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, 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. Nor will it 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).

Discussion: The proposed work within a beach and dune area will restore the dune areas and enhance the existing native vegetation in the area. Staff finds, and referral agencies appear to agree, that the proposed beach and dune restoration will not negatively impact the area. 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.

17. c): MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Discussion: Based on the project as described in the administrative record, comments from reviewing agencies, a review of the applicable regulations, the inclusion of conditions and mitigations, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is no evidence to indicate the proposed project will have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly

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

n/a

20. 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 are addressed by mitigation measure based on a the earlier analysis.

See 20a.

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.

n/a