

Project Information

Project Title: Rio Dell Leasing LLC / Manuel Meras Zoning Reclassification

Lead Agency

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

Property Owner(s)

Northwester Pacific Railroad Co
Philip J Nyberg & Melinda J Trust
Steve Wills Trucking & Logging, LLC
Unique Bagz Inc.
Rio Dell Leasing LLC Co
Kenneth M Bareilles Cotr
Humboldt Iq LLC Co

Project Applicant

Rio Dell Leasing / Manuel Meras

Project Location

The parcels are located in the County of Humboldt, in the Alton area, on the south side of Highway 36, lying between its intersection with Hillcrest Drive and River Bar Road, approximately 1 to 1½ miles east of its intersection with Highway 101. The properties are known as 800, 988, 1076, 1178, 1298, 1444, and 1576, State Highway 36, and further described as 201-311-012, 201-311-022, 201-311-024, 201-322-001, 201-322-010, 201-322-012, 201-322-017, 201-322-019, 201-322-031, 201-322-033, 204-081-003, 204-081-004 & 204-171-003

General Plan Designation

Industrial General (IG) and Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone (AP)

Zoning

Heavy Industrial - Qualified (MH-Q)

Project Description

The project proposes to remove a Qualified (Q) combining zone currently in place on approximately 66 acres of heavy industrial zoned parcels known as Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 201-311-012, 201-311-022, 201-311-024, 201-322-001, 201-322-010, 201-322-012, 201-322-017, 201-322-019, 201-322-031, 201-322-033, 204-081-003, 204-081-004 & 204-171-003. The Q zone, adopted under Ordinance 1689, precludes the use of the parcels for both retail sales/retail services and qualifies the industrial use of the properties for timber products processing and storage of no longer than five (5) days. These qualifications to the industrial and commercial use of the property limit their use in such a way that the parcels were vacant for decades.

The project applicant is requesting removal of the Q zone designation from the subject parcels in order to reflect the contemporary use of industrial, agricultural, and wholesale/retail commercial activities in the area. The original reason to reserve these properties for timber products processing

is no longer a priority as there has been a significant decline in the timber industry in the County and local mills have shut down. The applicants desire is to begin, and continue, transporting, selling and producing agriculture products and other materials, and begin storing and selling water and septic tanks from these industrial properties. The Zone Reclassification will facilitate use of the site for these other industrial uses by removal of the Q zone. There are two businesses currently desiring to utilize these parcels for other uses: Lost Coast Hay Sales and Bandera USA Water and Septic Tanks. The petition states that each of these businesses utilize previously underutilized industrially zoned properties that were a blight to the Alton area. These businesses are not allowed under the Q zone, and the owners are requesting removal of the Q zone designation from these parcels in order to reflect contemporary use for industrial, agricultural, and wholesale/retail commercial activities. The original reason to reserve these properties for timber products processing is somewhat antiquated as there has been a significant decline in the timber industry in the County and the local mills have shut down. The owners wish to begin and continue selling and producing agriculture products and other materials, and begin storing and selling water and septic tanks from these prime industrial properties.

Baseline Conditions: Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is located on the south side of Highway 36, approximately ½-mile west of the Rohnerville Airport. Parcels 201-322-001, and 201-311-020 are currently vacant. The remaining parcels are either developed with industrial or storage uses.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required (permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Humboldt County Council, Public Works Department, Division of Environmental Health, Building Division. Fortuna Fire Protection District, California Fish & Wildlife, CalTrans District 1 and the Northwest Information Center.

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

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

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

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

Determination: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Date

Steven Lazar, Senior Planner
Printed Name

Humboldt County Planning
and Building Department
For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of 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, 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 XVII, "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. (California Code of Regulations, title 14 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. **N/A**
 - 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 measures based on the earlier analysis. **N/A**
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures 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**

Environmental Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
<p>Discussion: (a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to remove the Q overlay zoning designation from 13 parcels, which would allow the potential for a wider range of uses as determined by the underlying (existing) Heavy Industrial (MH) zoning designation. Although there is no development proposed as part of this project, staff found no potentially significant aesthetic impacts as the County would review any future development to ensure consistency with any applicable design criteria and compliance with applicable development standards, including setbacks and building heights.</p>				
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

<p>Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>			X	
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>				X
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a) Less Than Significant Impact: Although the site is mapped in the General Plan as prime farmland if irrigated, the majority of project parcels were converted to a heavy industrial use with prior General Plans decades ago and all of the project parcels have been planned for industrial use and so have already been effectively converted through the previous zoning actions. The project parcels do not contain unique farmland. General agriculture is not a use allowed in the MH zone.</p> <p>(b-e) No Impact: The project proposes to remove the Q overlay zoning designation from 13 parcels, which would allow the potential for a wider range of uses as determined by the underlying (existing) Heavy Industrial (MH) zoning designation. No development is proposed as part of this project. Neither the subject properties nor adjacent lands are within a Williamson Act contract nor zoned for forest or agricultural use. There is no forestland or timberland on the parcels. The project will result in a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources.</p>				

III. Air Quality. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion:

(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within the North Coast Air Basin and the jurisdiction of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). The North Coast Air Basin generally enjoys good air quality, but has been designated non-attainment (does not meet federal minimum ambient air quality standards) for particulate matter less than ten microns in size (PM₁₀). To address this, the NCUAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Attainment Plan in 1995. This plan presents available information about the nature and causes of PM₁₀ standard exceedance, and identifies cost-effective control measures to reduce PM₁₀ emissions, to levels necessary to meet California Ambient Air Quality Standards. These include transportation measures (e.g., public transit, ridesharing, vehicle buy-back programs, traffic flow improvements, bicycle incentives, etc.), land use measures (infill development, concentration of higher density adjacent to highways, etc.), and combustion measures (open burning limitations, hearth/wood burning stove limitations; NCUAQMD 1995).

The project proposes to remove the Q overlay zoning designation from 13 parcels which would allow the potential for a wider range of uses as determined by the Heavy Industrial (MH) zoning designation. The uses which would be permitted utilizing the underlying (existing) MH zone are generally similar in nature to the principally permitted uses currently in place with the Q combining district with respect to operating emissions, including manufacturing uses, and would be subject to compliance with applicable air quality standards; this can include the need for obtaining NCUAQMD Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate approvals. As noted, no development is proposed as part of this project. Therefore, the project would not: (1) obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (2) violate air quality standards; (3) contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (4) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or (5) create objectionable odors.

IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

Discussion:

(a - f) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to remove the Q overlay zoning designation from 13 parcels, which would allow the potential for a wider range of uses as determined by the Heavy Industrial (MH) zoning designation. Future development, which may occur as a result of the potential for expanded range of uses, may trigger additional CEQA analysis, including with respect to potential biologic resource impacts, if exceeding exemption thresholds. However, no development is proposed as part of this project. 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 site is not within an adopted or proposed habitat conservation plan. The project was referred to the Eureka office of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife which did not respond with concerns. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Discussion:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact: The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) and the following Tribes: the Bear River Band of Rohnerville Rancheria, Big Lagoon Rancheria, Cher-Ae-Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, Hoopa Valley Tribe and Wiyot Tribe. Although no concerns were expressed by the Tribes, the NWIC had the following comment with regards to possible historic-era building/structures: "The 1943 and 1944 USGS Fortuna 15' quads depict one building in the proposed project area, and the 1959 USGS Fortuna 15' quad depicts seven buildings in the proposed project area. The Office of Historic Preservation has determined that any building or structure 45 years or older may be of historical value. Cultural Resource Protections found within section 10.6 of the General Plan require that a records check be conducted during ministerial and discretionary permit review to ensure that projects will not result in impacts to listed or eligible historical resources.

(b, c) Less Than Significant Impact: NWIC recommended further study since the project area lies adjacent to archaeological site P-12-001074, which consists of a Native American lithic scatter. As previously stated, none of the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers expressed concern about any of the parcels being sensitive to new ground disturbance or development. The area has a history of industrial uses and development and is not known to be sensitive for discovery or disturbance of tribal cultural resources.

Cultural Resource Protections found within section 10.6 (CU-S4[E]) of the General Plan require standard conditions and notations be placed on all discretionary projects and ministerial permits involving ground disturbing activities. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor must halt construction and coordinate with a professional archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and appropriate tribes so resources can be evaluated so that there is not a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The project is not expected to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The standard notation:

"The project site is not located within an area where known archaeological sites have been identified. However, as there exists the possibility that undiscovered archaeological resources may be encountered during construction activities, the following post-review, inadvertent archaeological discovery measures are required under state and federal laws:

If archaeological resources are encountered, all ground disturbing work at the find location plus a reasonable buffer zone must be immediately suspended, the approving County department contacted, and a qualified professional archaeologist retained to analyze the significance of the find and formulate further mitigation (e.g., project relocation, excavation plan, and protective cover) in consultation with culturally affiliated tribes or other descendant groups, where applicable.

Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, if known or suspected Native American or other human remains are encountered, all ground-disturbing work must cease in the vicinity of the discovery, and the County Coroner contacted. The respectful treatment and disposition of remains and associated grave offerings shall be in accordance with PRC §5097.98.

The applicant and successors in interest are ultimately responsible for ensuring compliance with this condition."

VI. Energy. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

Discussion:

(a-b) No Impact: The project will not result in short-term energy consumption or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The project is the removal of the Q overlay zone on 13 parcels with no new development proposed at this time.

VII. Geology and Soils. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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:			X	
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.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
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?			X	
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion:

(a {i-iv} - f) Less Than Significant Impact: There will be no impacts from the proposed project, which involves the removal of the Q overlay zone from 13 parcels. However, the project site is located within an area of high probability for seismic-related ground failure from liquefaction and is also located on a Historic Quaternary Fault. Removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning, creating the potential for future development. The County would address the impacts from any future development application either through discretionary review or building permits, which would require compliance with County development and construction standards, including with respect to seismic safety.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X

Discussion:

(a-b) No Impact: In 2002 the California legislature declared that global climate change was a matter of increasing concern for the state's public health and environment, and enacted law requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to control GHG emissions from motor vehicles (Health & Safety Code §32018.5 et seq.). In 2006, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32) definitively established the state's climate change policy and set GHG reduction targets (health & Safety Code §38500 et sec.), including setting a target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 requires local governments to take an active role in addressing climate change and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. While methodologies to inventory and quantify local GHG emissions are still being developed, recommendations to reduce GHG emissions include promoting energy efficiency in new development.

The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; therefore, the project will have no impact. Removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning creating the potential for future development. The uses which would be permitted utilizing the underlying (existing) MH zone are generally similar in nature to the principally permitted uses currently in place with the Q combining district with respect to construction and operations emissions, including manufacturing uses, and would be subject to compliance with applicable air quality standards; this can include the need for obtaining NCUAQMD Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate approvals. As noted, no development is proposed as part of this project. No project is therefore not anticipated to result in significant greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?			X	
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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

Discussion:

(a-g) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning, creating the potential for future development. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed rezone involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The Department finds no evidence that the project will create, or expose people or property to, hazardous materials, or impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan. The project site is less than ½-mile from the nearest airport (Rohnerville Airport) and is within the airport compatibility zone. Should development occur as a result of the project, new development would be subject to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The site is within the Fortuna Fire Protection District. Future development of the site will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code and UBC. According to the Fire Hazard map, the parcel is located in a moderate fire hazard area.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would:			X	
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

Discussion:

(a-e) Less than significant Impact: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning, resulting in the potential for future development. The County would address the potential hydrology or water quality impacts from any future development application either through discretionary review or building permits. This would include review of site plans and on-site storm drainage plans, and compliance with County grading standards and water quality treatment criteria. No significant impacts are anticipated.

XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

Discussion:

(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is designated General Industrial (IG), Airport Land Use Compatibility (AP) by the Humboldt County General Plan 2017, and is zoned Heavy Industrial Qualified (MH-Q). Removal of the Q overlay zone, focused primarily on the potential for forestry mill-related processing, will not conflict with or otherwise modify the underlying existing uses of the MH zoning or its development standards. Future development, should it occur, would be required to comply with the regulations of the Airport Compatibility Plan and MH zoning district, including with respect to setbacks and building heights.

XII. Mineral Resources. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion:

(a and b) No Impact: On-site soils and geologic resources are not suitable as commodity materials that would be of value to the region or the state. The site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site by a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

XIII. Noise. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Discussion:

(a and b) Less than Significant Impact: As there is no development proposed as a part of this project, removal of the Q zone overlay will not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, nor will it generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Any future development would be required to comply with applicable County noise standards.

(c) Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within the Rohnerville Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone (ALCP). The project proposes to remove the Q overlay zone and does not propose any construction at this time. The County would review any future development to ensure consistency with the ALCP.

XIV. Population and Housing. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion:

(a, b) No Impact. The proposed removal of the Q overlay zone will not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace substantial numbers of people or housing. No housing is proposed as part of the proposed project, and no replacement housing would be needed.

XV. Public Services. 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion:

(a-e) Less Than Significant: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone would allow for a wider range of uses under the existing MH zoning for the site, creating the potential for future development. The County would address the impacts from any future development application either through discretionary review or building permits to ensure availability of necessary

public services. This would also include payment of applicable development impact fees and property taxes for future development.

XVI. Recreation. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Discussion:

(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning creating the potential for future development. The County would address recreation impacts from future development; however, the County only applies recreation development fees through residential subdivision projects.

XVII. Transportation. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

Discussion:

(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone would allow for a wider range of uses under the existing MH zoning for the site, creating the potential for future development. Traffic generated for uses that would be permitted under the MH zone would generally be similar in nature to the principally permitted uses currently in place with the Q combining district, including manufacturing uses. Some permitted uses in the MH zone, such as offices, could generate more vehicular traffic than mill-related operations, but would generally be offset with lower truck traffic volumes. The properties are accessed by State Highway 36. A referral was sent to the Land Use Division of Public Works. No recommendations were made by Public Works for the rezone.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>				
<p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k), or</p>			X	
<p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>			X	

Discussion:

(a-b) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: (See discussion and Mitigation under Section V – Cultural) The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the MH zoning creating the potential for future development. Consistent with requirements of AB 52, the project was referred to the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University and local Tribes.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) 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?			X	
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion:

(a-e) Less than significant: The project proposes the removal of the Q overlay zoning designation on 13 parcels. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone would allow for a wider range of uses under the existing MH zoning for the site, creating the potential for future development. The County would address the impacts related to provision of utilities from any future development application either through discretionary review or building permits. All necessary utility installations would be required as part of any future construction on the properties, including for provision of water and wastewater utilities.

XX. Wildfire. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?			X	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion:

(a-d) Less than significant: The project is located within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA) for fire protection and served by the Fortuna Fire Protection District. The project is not subject to substantial wildfire risk. The Department finds the project's potential impact to wildfire hazards to be less than significant.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion:

(a-c) Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to remove a Qualified (Q) combining zone currently in place on approximately 66 acres of heavy industrial zoned parcels known as Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 201-311-012, 201-311-022, 201-311-024, 201-322-001, 201-322-010, 201-322-012, 201-322-017, 201-322-019, 201-322-031, 201-322-033, 204-081-003, 204-081-004 & 204-171-003. No development is proposed at this time; however, the removal of the Q overlay zone allows for a wider range of uses under the existing MH zoning of the project site, creating the potential for future development. The County would address the impacts from any future development application either through discretionary or building permits.