

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. Project title: Moser Final Map Subdivision
2. Lead agency name and address: Humboldt County Community Development Services Department, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501-4484; Phone: (707) 445-7541; Fax (707) 445-7446
3. Contact person and phone number: Trevor Estlow, Senior Planner, Phone: 707-268-3740, Fax: 707-445-7446
4. Project location: The project is located in Humboldt County, in the McKinleyville area, on either side of Boeing Avenue and on the west side of Airport Road, on the properties known as the portions of the Airport Business Park.
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Steve Moser, 3101 Concorde Drive, Suite E, McKinleyville, CA 95521
6. General plan designation: Commercial Services/Industrial General (CS/IG). McKinleyville Community Plan (MCCP). Density: Minimum parcel size to be adequate for proposed use under the tests of parking and setback requirement, consistent with planned uses of adjacent lands.
7. Zoning: Business Park in addition to Qualified, Landscape/Design Control, Airport Safety Review, and Noise Impact combining zones (MB-Q-L-AP-N).
8. Description of project: A Final Map Subdivision for the creation of 12 commercial lots within the Airport Business Park. The lots will be created from the two Remainder Parcels from the original subdivision and range in size between 30,310 and 61,230 square feet. The parcels will be served by community water and sewer.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The parcel is surrounded on the east and west by commercial properties, south of the property is residential parcels and the Arcata/Eureka airport is located to the north of the parcel.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Public Works, Building Division, Airport Land Use Commission.

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

Date

Trevor Estlow, Senior Planner

Printed name

For Humboldt Community Development Services

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.

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1. AESTHETICS

Finding: The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding; and will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Discussion: The project site is not within an area mapped or designated with scenic vistas or resources. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. Any new commercial structures will be located on an improved County road. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of 12 parcels within an area characterized as urban commercial will have a substantial adverse aesthetic impact. There is no indication that the future development likely to occur on the site will significantly increase light or glare or effect nighttime views in the vicinity.

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	--	--------------

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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; will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; and will not 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: Neither the subject property nor adjacent lands are within a Williamson Act contract. The site is not considered prime or unique farmland and is not used for agricultural purposes. The surrounding area is characterized by urban residential and commercial development including the Arcata/McKinleyville airport with services provided by the McKinleyville Community Services District. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern. Certain commercial development is a primary and compatible use within the CS/IG designation and is principally permitted in the MB zoning district. Agriculture is not a use allowed in the MB zone, nor are there any intensive ag uses in the immediate vicinity. The area is relatively flat with slopes to the southwest and may have been used for small scale agricultural activities in the past, however, there is no indication that agriculture has occurred in the recent past. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on 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:	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	--	--------------

3. AIR QUALITY

Finding: The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; will not 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); will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Discussion: Although minimal disturbance can be expected at the time of the construction of future commercial structures and during the road improvements, the subdivision under review at this point will not increase any negative air quality issues for the long term. The parcel is relatively flat and will not require significant grading for the roadwork or the future building sites. The additional parcels will increase the amount of traffic thus increasing vehicular exhaust levels slightly, but not at a level that Staff finds to be significant. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of twelve additional parcels within an area characterized as urban commercial will have a substantial adverse impact on air quality.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. : BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a 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; or 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; or 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; will not 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; will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Discussion: Per County resource maps, there are no sensitive biological resources on, or in the vicinity of, the project site. There are no wetlands or wetland habitat present on the site. The project does not involve any development within a streamside management area. The project site is not within an adopted or proposed habitat conservation plan. The project was referred to the Redding office of the DFG which did not respond with concerns. The area is developed on all four sides of the parcel. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Finding: The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5; or of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5; will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Discussion: The existing residence is not considered a significant historical resource, nor are there any known structures in the area that meet these criteria. The project was referred to Sonoma State University for the previous subdivision and again to the Wiyot Tribe. Both agencies did not identify any potential cultural impacts and recommended approval of the project. Nonetheless, the conditions of project approval include a requirement that a note be placed on the Development Plan protecting archaeological resources should they be found during site development.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED

Finding: The project has the potential to 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 project could 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.

Discussion: According to the County’s slope instability rating maps, the parcel is located in an area with a rating of “0”, or relatively stable, however the site is located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Area. As such, the applicant has had both a Fault Evaluation Report (FER) and an R-1 soils report prepared. The R-1 report was reviewed by Building Staff and found to be in compliance with regards to preparation requirements. The FER was reviewed by an independent geologist (Giblin Associates) and found to be in compliance with the Alquist-Priolo Act. The report identified two areas that contain fault traces and shall be prohibited from development of structures intended for human habitation. Provided that development is sited outside the area of concern (see mitigation measure below) the potential risks will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure #1:

- *All proposed structures for human habitation shall be located outside of the fault trace areas located on the tentative map. These areas shall be clearly depicted on a Development Plan.*

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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; and will not 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 Building Inspection Division did not identify any issues with expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The Uniform Building Code requires all structures in Humboldt County to be built in accordance with Zone 4, the most restrictive zone. These issues will be addressed upon the review of future Building Permits. The subject parcel is in an area served by community water and sewer. The proposed subdivision in-fills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. The Building Inspection Division did not identify any concerns with regards to site suitability for commercial development. The Department finds that with the proposed mitigation that the creation of twelve additional lots within an area characterized as urban commercial will not have a substantial adverse impact on geology and soils.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: NO IMPACTS

Finding: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; will not 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; will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; will not 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; will not, 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, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and will not 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. The project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area in terms of the nearby public airport.

Discussion: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed subdivision involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. According to the Fire Hazard map, the parcel is located in a low fire hazard area. The Arcata Fire Protection District has recommended approval of the project. The parcel is not within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire protection so CDF was not referred. Furthermore, the applicant proposes to improve the road frontages with paving, curbs, gutters and sidewalks, thus mitigating the effects of the subdivision further since residents and emergency vehicles will be able to pass. The site is within 2 miles from the Arcata/McKinleyville airport, however, the proposed uses (commercial business park) are consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of twelve additional parcels in an area characterized as urban commercial will create, or expose people or property to, hazardous materials, or impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | Poten-
tially
Signifi-
cant | Potentially
Significant
Unless Mit-
igation
Incorp. | Less
Than
Signifi-
cant Im-
pact | No
Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| l) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

8: a), b), f) - j): HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; will not 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); will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality; or 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; will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; 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; will not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Discussion: The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, in terms of the McKinleyville Community Plan (MCCP) adopted in 2002. The project site is an area served by community water and sewer. The McKinleyville Community Services District (MCSD) has indicated that it is able to provide water and sewer service to the proposed subdivision upon the payment of the appropriate fees. MCSD has not identified any concerns with regard to the project interfering with groundwater recharge. The Department finds no evidence indicating that the subdivision will violate any water quality or waste discharge standards, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel #625, the project site is located in Flood Zone C, which is defined as “areas of minimal flooding”, and is outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains. The project site is not within a mapped dam or levee inundation area, and is outside the areas subject to tsunami run-up.

As much of the previously pervious surface of the parcel will become paved or otherwise impervious as it develops, the applicant proposed a detention basin to handle any increased surface water runoff. The Department of Public Works has recommended that the applicant provide a complete hydraulic report assuring that the detention basin is sized appropriately. This option will satisfy the policy within the McKinleyville Community Plan requiring no net increase in stormwater runoff. The Department finds no evidence that the proposed project will result in significant hydrologic or water quality impacts.

8: c) - e): HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project will not: 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; 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 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.

Discussion: Given the project’s potential for a future increase in impervious surface through the development of both paved access areas and future homes with paved driveways, the applicant was required to provide the P/W Department with a Drainage Report addressing downstream runoff. The parcel drains in a southwesterly direction eventually into a stormwater detention pond prior to release into the stormdrain system. The project will not alter a stream or river, nor is there any indication that the project is likely to result in flooding on- or off-site. All drainage will be detained on site. These drainage requirements will keep this alteration’s impacts to a less than significant level.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

9: LAND USE AND PLANNING

Finding: The project will not physically divide an established community; will not 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; and will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Discussion: The project site is designated Commercial Services and Industrial General (CS/IG) by the McKinleyville Community Plan, and is zoned Business Park in addition to Qualified, Landscape/Design Control, Airport Safety Review, and Noise Impact combining zones. Commercial uses including office and manufacturing are primary and compatible uses within the CS/IG designation and is principally permitted in the MB zoning district. The neighborhood is characterized as urban commercial with residential uses to the south and the Arcata/McKinleyville Airport to the north. The creation of twelve additional parcels for commercial development is consistent with the zoning and land use density. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, and is consistent with the policies and regulations specified in the MCCP and Framework General Plan. 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 significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

10: MINERAL RESOURCES

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; and will not 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 is it 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 a significant adverse impact on mineral resources.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

11: a): NOISE: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED

Finding: The project has the potential to result in 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 unless mitigation is incorporated.

Discussion: This parcel is located within the Noise Impact combining zone due to the proximity to the Arcata/McKinleyville Airport. The combining zone requires that any residential use mitigate noise to provide a tolerable outside and inside noise level. As residential uses are not a principal use type but could be permitted with a Special Permit in the future, mitigation shall require a noise study to assure the noise levels are met. This mitigation measure shall be made a condition of approval and read as follows:

Mitigation Measure #2:

- *A noise study shall be required for any residential development proposed to demonstrate that interior and exterior noise level are within the limits identified in the McKinleyville Community Plan .*

11: a) - c), e,) f): NOISE: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; and, 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, or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. 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?

Discussion: The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. No vibrations or groundborne noise level increases are expected by the project. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of twelve additional parcels in an area characterized as urban commercial will result in a significant adverse noise impact. The parcel is within 2 miles of the Arcata/McKinleyville airport but the proposed uses are consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

11: d): NOISE: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project will not: result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Discussion: The short-term impacts by construction crews paving the access roads and building the future structures can be considered less than significant. These are normal sounds that can be expected in commercial areas which still have room to grow. They will be temporary in nature. The project is within a Noise combining zone with potential noise impacts due to the close proximity to the Arcata/McKinleyville Airport. See Mitigation Measure #2 above.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

Poten- tially Signifi-	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation	Less Than Signifi- cant Im-	No Impact
------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--------------

	cant	Incorp.	pact	
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12: POPULATION AND HOUSING

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); will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Discussion: The proposed subdivision does not propose residential development but could be proposed in the future and require a Special Permit. The proposed subdivision will result in the creation of 12 parcels that would be available for commercial development. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13: PUBLIC SERVICES

Finding: The project will not 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: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities.

Discussion: The proposed parcels will take access off of Airport Road via Boeing Avenue. The roads will be improved by paving and installing curbs, gutters and sidewalks along the street frontages. The property is not zoned for residential use so the payment of parkland dedication fees in lieu of the creation of a park were not required. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. The project will result in a slight increase in the demand for existing services such as fire protection, police protection, schools and other public facilities, but this increase would be within the capabilities of the existing infrastructure and services, per agency comments. All of the public service agencies have either recommended approval or conditional approval of the project, or had no comment. No issues were identified with regard to the provision, construction or maintenance of public services. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on public services.

14. RECREATION.

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

14: RECREATION

Finding: The project will not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Discussion: The project does not include recreational facilities. The property is not zoned for residential use so the payment of parkland dedication fees in lieu of the creation of a park were not required. The Department finds no evidence that the project will require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Cause 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15: a) and b): TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Finding: The project will not significantly cause 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) and exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Discussion: The creation of 12 new parcels will contribute a minimal amount of traffic within the McKinleyville area. In addition, the traffic study found that the proposed development based on existing traffic levels and with Airport Road as a two-lane roadway, would result in circulation levels of service at the study-area intersections of C or better at full project buildout. Level of service C is characterized as “stable flow, with acceptable delay, where backups may develop behind turning vehicles and most drivers feel somewhat restricted.” The project is conditioned to provide improvements as outlined in the Department of Public Works Subdivision Requirements dated September 1, 2006.

15: c) - g): TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not cause 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); will not 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; will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature; will not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity; and will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Discussion: Because of the LUD’s comments, the Department finds there is no evidence that the project will: cause 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), nor result in a change in air traffic patterns, nor result in inadequate emergency access, inadequate access to nearby uses or inadequate parking capacity, nor increase traffic-related hazards, or conflict with adopted policies supporting transportation. The project meets the requirements of the ALUCP for the Arcata/McKinleyville airport, the closest public airport, which is less than 2 miles away. There are no private airstrips nearby and all parking must be provided for on-site.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

16: UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Finding: The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; or 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; or 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; or have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed; or 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; or be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Discussion: The creation of twelve additional parcels for commercial development is not expected to negatively impact the utilities and service systems mentioned above. The parcel will be served by community water and sewer; the McKinleyville Community Service District has indicated that it will be able to provide the necessary services upon the payment of the appropriate fees. The development and maintenance of the required stormwater facility will further mitigate the need for off-site drainage facilities. The Department finds there is no evidence that the creation of twelve additional parcels in an area characterized as urban commercial will result in a significant adverse effect to utilities and service systems.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	Poten- tially Signifi- cant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit- igation Incorp.	Less Than Signifi- cant Im- pact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

17: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Finding: The project will not 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; or 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, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is no evidence to indicate the proposed project:

- Will have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history;
- Will have the potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals;
- Will have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable; or
- Will have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

Finding: The project could 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: Any discretionary land use permit could be considered to have effects that are cumulatively significant. A twelve parcel subdivision in an area where urban services are provided is not considered to be a project of this type. The zoning and land use designations which came into effect in 2002 with the adoption of the McKinleyville Community Plan years ago specifically with this type of development in mind. For these reasons, Staff finds this project's individual and cumulative impacts to be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measure #1 will require the building exclusion area to be mapped on the Development Plan. Mitigation Measure #2 will require a noise study if any residential development is proposed.

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.

Draft Program EIR, Airport Business Park, June 1997, Humboldt County Planning Division.

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

See 20.a above

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

See 20.a above

19: MITIGATION MEASURES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The following table lists the required mitigation measures, including the method of verification, monitoring schedule, and the responsible party.

Resource(s)	Measure No.	Summary of Mitigation Measure	Method of Verification	Monitoring Schedule	Responsible Party
Geology and Soils	1	In order to minimize geologic hazards the applicant/ owner shall: Requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>All proposed structures for human habitation shall be located outside of the fault trace areas located on the tentative map. These areas shall be clearly depicted on a Development Plan.</i> 	Placed on Development Plan	Notated on the Development Plan prior to map re-cordation.	Owner/applicant
Noise	2	In order to minimize noise impacts on site, the applicant/ owner shall: <u>Requirements:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A noise study shall be required for any residential development proposed to demonstrate that interior and exterior noise level are within the limits identified in the McKinleyville Community Plan.</i> 	Prior to any residential construction.	At such time building permits are applied for residential structures.	Owner/applicant,

HCCDS = Humboldt County Community Development Services Building and Planning Divisions
 LUD = Land Use Division of Department of Public Works
 DEH = Environmental Health Division of Health Department
 DFG = California Department of Fish and Game
 CDF = California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
 NCUAQMD = North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District