

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

**Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
Renner – General Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification**

1. Project title: Renner General Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification (GPA-11-02/ZR-11-02)
2. Lead agency name and address: Humboldt County Community Development Services - Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501-4484; Phone: (707) 445-7541; Fax (707) 445-7446
3. Contact person and phone number: Trevor Estlow, phone: 707-268-3740
4. Project location: The project site is located in Humboldt County, in the Alton area, on the south side of State Highway 36, approximately 1,000 feet east of the intersection of State Highway 36 and Van Duzen Street, on the properties known as 564 and 646 State Highway 36.
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Helen Renner, 1919 Price Creek School Road, Ferndale, CA 95536.
6. General plan designations: Commercial Recreation (CR).
7. Zoning: Highway Service Commercial with a Qualified combining zone (CH-Q).
8. Description of project: A General Plan Amendment to change the General Plan designation from Commercial General (CG) to Industrial General (IG). The change would facilitate the use of the property for a fence contracting business, including truck and equipment storage, office space, a work area and additional storage. The property would be used mainly as a contractor's storage yard and office, with a small amount of retail sales and metal fabrication. In addition to the change to the General Plan designation, the zoning classification would change from Highway Service Commercial with a Qualified combining zone to Limited Industrial (ML). The property is served with on-site water and on-site wastewater treatment systems.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The site is currently developed with a metal shop building and an old dilapidated barn/residence. The parcels are surrounded by larger agriculture lands to the north and south with Rohnerville Airport located approximately ½ mile to the north. Lands to the east are planned and zoned for industrial uses. To the west is a cluster of small residential lots before running into State Highway 101. The Van Duzen River is located approximately ¾ miles to the south along with other large agricultural parcels.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) Caltrans, Environmental Health Dept., Humboldt County Building Division.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


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

- Aesthetics Agriculture and Forestry Resources Air Quality
- Biological Resources Cultural Resources Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions 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

Aug. 17, 2011

Date

TREVOR ESTLOW

Printed name

HUMBOLDT COUNTY
FOR 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.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</p> <p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p> <p>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</p> <p>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</p> <p>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>1. AESTHETICS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not impact aesthetics with regards to: a scenic vista or scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The project will not have a significant impact on the environment with regards to aesthetics, specifically, the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The site is located on the south side of State Highway 36 approximately ¼ mile east of State Highway 101. The site slopes away from the road and the proposed development will be sited lower than the highway. Once developed, the site will be landscaped to help reduce visual impacts. A large portion of the property contains a wetland area that is heavily vegetated with mature trees. This area will remain in a natural state. Since there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings that will be affected by this project, there will be no impact on them.</p> <p>Furthermore, given that the site is lower than the highway, the project will not significantly impact views, vistas or the visual character of the area. The project is conditioned to ensure that any lighting used will be of the minimum wattage possible and be kept within the site boundaries. The parcel is not located in a mapped Coastal Scenic or View area (the parcel is not in the Coastal Zone).</p> <p>For the reasons mentioned above, Staff finds that the project will have less than a significant impact on the environment with regards to aesthetics, specifically, the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>				
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land,</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No Impact</p>

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest and (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conservation of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Discussion: The subject property will be planned and zoned for light industrial and commercial use. The area is not farmed currently and is not suitable given the industrial/commercial zone designation. Surrounding areas are planned and zoned for agricultural use and are used as such. In addition, the mapping of prime soils begins south of this site. Agricultural activities are not a permitted uses in the industrial zones. The property is not in a Williamson Act contract; however, some agriculture properties closer to the Van Duzen River are. Based on the existing non-agricultural use of the parcel and the commercial/industrial strip along the highway frontage, the project will not result in conversion of agricultural land or have a significant adverse impact on agricultural or forestry resources. Based on the above, the Department finds the project is not expected to result in a significant adverse affect on the agricultural or forestry resources.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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:</p>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3. AIR QUALITY: NO IMPACT</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will have a less than significant impact on the environment with regards to the following air quality issues: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; or violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). The project has a limited potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people unless mitigation measures are incorporated.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> According to the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), all of the Humboldt County is in non-attainment of the State's PM-10 (particulate matter of 10 microns in size) standard, but complies with all other State and Federal air quality standards. According to recent studies by the NCUAQMD, the most significant contributors to PM-10 are residential wood burning stoves. This project does not propose any wood stoves, but very minor potential impacts to air quality would arise from the temporary presence of construction equipment during the sporadic times of need. Air quality impacts would be similar to those in other commercial and industrial areas. Staff finds that the potential for even a temporary increase in pollutants negligible.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<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. b) & c): BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATED

Finding: The project could impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the DFG or USFWS unless mitigation is incorporated. The project could have an impact 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 unless mitigation is incorporated.

Discussion: The site contains a man-made wetland located on the western portion of the property. No development is proposed within this area, however, in order to assure future development does not impact this wetland, a Development Plan will be recorded on the parcels that will identify the area and label it "unbuildable." A site visit conducted by the Department of Fish and Game verified the area and this requirement satisfies their concerns.

Mitigation Measure #1

- The applicant shall record a Notice of Development Plan and prepare a Development Plan which clearly identifies the wetland area and labels it "unbuildable."

4. a), c) – f): BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will have a less than significant impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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 (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources by interfering 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; or will the project conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources or any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Discussion: According to the Framework Plan Biological Resources map there are no sensitive biological resources on or in the vicinity of the project site, other than the wetland area mentioned above. The CA Natural Diversity Data Bank lists the Siskiyou Checkerbloom (*Sidalcea maliflora* ssp. *patula*) as potentially located within the area. A site visit by Fish and Game staff and Planning staff during the blooming period did not identify the plant on site. Furthermore, the site did not appear dry enough to provide suitable habitat. Referral comments from resource agencies have not identified any concerns regarding the proposed project. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for the project location, thus, the project did not conflict with any such plans.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5; nor cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5; nor directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; nor disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Discussion: The project was referred to the North Coastal Information Center (NCIC) for a review of their records of the site for archaeological and paleontological resources. NCIC recommended approval of the general plan amendment and zone reclassification. Furthermore, pursuant to Senate Bill 18 (California Government Code Section 65352.3), notice was sent on April 21, 2011 to potentially affected tribes to request consultation regarding the proposed General Plan Amendment. As of July 21, 2011 (90 day timeframe), no tribe requested a consultation.

No structures exist on site that would qualify as historic or otherwise unique. There is an old barn/residence in disrepair that will remain. There are no known cemeteries, unique geologic features or other historic resources in the area. Nonetheless, the County's standard informational note has been added to the Conditions of Approval regarding legal requirements should any on-site activities reveal the presence of archaeological resources or human remains. Based on the above, the Department believes the project will have no impact with respect to cultural resources.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless 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:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT

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

Discussion: The project site is not within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and the site's building sites are relatively flat with a gentle slope to the south. The parcel is located in an area mapped on the Framework General Plan Geologic Hazard map as having relatively stable soils, therefore, no soils report was required. Referral comments did not suggest the proposed project would result in any landslide hazards or expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. The Department of Environmental Health (DEH) has recommended approval of the project based on a review of the existing septic system in place. The property is served by an existing well. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will not result in a significant environmental impact with respect to the above specific geology/soils issues.

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

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Discussion: The proposed project will change the general plan designation and zone classification to

facilitate the relocation of an existing fence company to the site. The project does not change the potential buildout, however, it does change the allowed uses on site. Previously, the zoning of the property limited the uses to those related to a now defunct closed track railroad amusement park. The park has since closed down and the site has remained underutilized. The relocation of the existing fence company will result in some additional emissions due to the fabrication element, however, not to a level considered significant. Overall, the impacts are minimal and the project is not anticipated to generate a significant amount of greenhouse gases, nor conflict with any plan or policy regulating such gases.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant 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?	<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 the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard 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 intermingled with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: NO IMPACT

Finding: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project 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; nor emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; nor be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; nor would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to its proximity within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; nor result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to proximity to a private airstrip; nor will it impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Lastly, the project will not impact the environment in regards to its location within an area of high wildland fire.

Discussion: The project involves a general plan amendment and zone reclassification to facilitate the relocation of an existing fence business. There is no indication that the proposed use would pose a threat to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The use poses no unusual threat as far as hazardous materials spillage is concerned. Furthermore, there are no schools within two (2) miles of the site, there are no known or listed hazardous materials sites on or nearby.

The project will not result in a safety hazard regarding a private or a public airstrip. The Rohnerville Airport is approximately ½ mile to the north and over 300 feet higher in elevation than the project site. The site is within zone C that allows this type of use. There is no emergency evacuation plan in place for the area that this project, as proposed, could affect. There is no evidence in the record that suggests that this site could impact the environment in relation to the hazards mentioned above.

The project site is within an area marked as nil fire potential on the Framework General Plan Resource map. The site is located in the Local Responsibility Area for fire protection and is within the Fortuna Fire District. The Fortuna Fire District reviewed the project and recommended approval. The Department believes the proposed project, as evidenced above, will have a less than significant impact on the environment with regards to the specific hazards above.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: 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 uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<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"/>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATED

Finding: The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor degrade water quality. The project 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). It will not 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; and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Discussion: The project will relocate an existing fence contracting business to this site. An additional building will likely be constructed on site as well as the storage of equipment and materials. There is no evidence in the record that the project will create or contribute to any violations of waste discharge requirements.

The parcel is well outside any dam or levee inundation area, and outside the areas subject to tsunami run-up. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Panel 1120 B), the westernmost portion of the parcel is within Flood Zone A, areas within the 100-year flood, however, all existing and proposed development will be outside this area. The flood zone is encumbered by a wetland area that will be protected. All development will occur within Flood Zone C, which is defined as areas of minimal flooding, and is outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains.

The County Division of Environmental Health has already reviewed and approved the proposed project. As mentioned above, the Department finds no evidence indicating that the subdivision will violate any water quality or waste discharge standards.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Without Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING: NO IMPACT</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not physically divide an established community; nor conflict with a local land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The subject parcel currently has a zoning designation of Highway Commercial with a Qualified combining zone limiting the uses on the property, such that they are similar to amusement parks as that was the use of the site at the time of the most recent General Plan adoption. Since that adoption, the amusement park ceased operation. The property owners had intended to follow the General Plan Update which would change the designation to Industrial General. Given the timeframe of the General Plan Update and the fact that their current lease expires in May 2012, the applicants chose to pursue the General Plan Amendment prior to the adoption of the General Plan Update. The zoning would also change from Highway Service Commercial to Limited Industrial. The parcel sizes are consistent with the zoning and general plan designation.</p> <p>The parcels are surrounded by larger agriculture lands to the north and south with Rohnerville Airport located approximately ½ mile to the north. Lands to the east are planned and zoned for industrial uses. To the west is a cluster of small residential lots before running into State Highway 101. The Van Duzen River is located approximately ¾ miles to the south. There is no evidence that the project will physically divide an established community. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans proposed or adopted for this area. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning, more specifically, physically dividing an established community; nor conflict with a local land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or violating habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans for this area.</p>				
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Without Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

		Incorp.	†	
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"/>
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT</p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. The project site is not, nor adjacent to, a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in significant adverse impact with regard to mineral resources.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. NOISE: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

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

Discussion: The project will create similar noise levels as would commercial uses currently allowed on the subject parcels. The proposed use as a fence contracting business will utilize the site for metal fabrication and storage of equipment and materials. An office will likely be constructed accessory to the business. It is anticipated that seven employees will enter the facility approximately three times a day and customers will average approximately five to ten per week. However, since there is no evidence the project will create permanent ambient noise levels above existing levels, Staff considers these potential impacts low. The project is within zone C of the Rohnerville Airport, the nearest public airport. This zone allows for this type of use and would require an overflight easement for residential use. There is no private airstrip in the vicinity of the project. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will have no impact, individually or cumulatively, with regards to noise.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Without Mitigation Incorporated.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<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"/>

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); nor displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; nor displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Discussion: The project will not change the overall density that currently exists over the project area. The project does not include the demolition of any residential units. There is no evidence the project will induce growth within the area, displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitate the construction of replacement housing or the displacement of people. Based on the above, the Department finds no evidence indicating that the project will have an adverse impact on population and housing.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES.

	Potent ially Signifi cant	Potentia lly Signific ant + Unless Mitigatio n Incorp.	Less Than Signifi cant Impac t	No Impa ct
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

14. PUBLIC SERVICES: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not have a significant impact on the environment with regards to the following public services: 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 project site is located in a rural area near the town of Alton. The parcel is served by State Highway 36, a State Highway which meets road category 4 standards. The local fire district has reviewed the project and recommends approval. The existing encroachment off of State Highway 36 may need improvements which will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans. Referral comments did not indicate the project would impact or require additional public services for any of the following: fire and police protection (see above), schools, parks, other public. Based on the above, and comments from reviewing agencies, the Department finds no evidence indicating that the project will result in an adverse impact with regard to public services.

15. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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?

Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15. RECREATION: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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; nor 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 will not change the overall density that currently exists over the project area, thus it is not considered growth inducing. There is no indication that the proposed development would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. There is no evidence indicating that the project would affect existing recreational opportunities based on the project as proposed, comments from reviewing agencies, and review of applicable regulations.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will have no impact on the environment with regards to: exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; nor cause inadequate parking capacity; nor conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). The project will not have a significant impact on the environment with regards to an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) or a substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Discussion: The proposed project will result in the relocation of an existing fence business to the site. The site will be used for metal fabrication and storage of equipment and materials. An office will likely be constructed accessory to the business. It is anticipated that seven employees will enter the facility approximately three times a day and customers will average approximately five to ten per week. This level of service is similar to if not less than the previous use of the site (amusement park) and is not likely to create additional impacts to the circulation of the area.

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

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant + Without Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: NO IMPACT

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

Discussion: The parcel is currently developed with a metal storage building of approximately 2,800 square feet. An additional building and storage yard will likely be constructed on site. The Division of Environmental Health has recommended approval of the project. An existing septic system will be utilized for the business. Both parcels are currently served by an onsite well. There is no evidence that the use will exceed wastewater treatment facilities or require additional water or wastewater facilities. The proposed use will not require additional storm water facilities other than on-site stormwater BMP's as the site is developed. The site drains to the south away from the highway. The remaining area will maintain a typical rural landscape. Landscaping will be required for the parking area.

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

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Without Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

indirectly?	
-------------	--

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will not 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 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). Nor will it have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Discussion: Based on the project as described in the administrative record, comments from reviewing agencies, a review of the applicable regulations, the inclusion of conditions and mitigations, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is **no evidence** to indicate the proposed project:

- Will have 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

See Mitigation Monitoring Plan below.

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.

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

See 20a.

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

See 19.

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
Biological Resources	1	Minimize impacts to biological resources. <u>Requirements:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall record a Notice of Development Plan and prepare a Development Plan which clearly identifies the wetland area and labels it "unbuildable." 	Prior to issuance of any building permits.	Prior to building permit approval.	Applicant & successors in interest.

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