

## **Project Information**

**Project Title:** Ryan Minor Subdivision and Special Permit

### **Lead Agency**

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

### **Property Owner**

Tim and Kathleen Ryan  
PO Box 455  
McKinleyville, CA 95519

### **Project Applicant**

Same as owner

### **Project Location**

The project is located in Fieldbrook area, on the east side of Fieldbrook Road, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection of Lyman Lane and Fieldbrook Road, on the property known as 1357 Fieldbrook Road.

### **General Plan Designation**

Residential Agriculture: 5 to 20 acres (RA5-20), Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Planning Area (FGCPA), 2017 General Plan, Density: Range is 5 to 20 acres per unit, Slope Stability: Relatively Stable (0) and High Instability (3).

### **Zoning**

Agricultural General (AG), Minimum building site area is 5 acres (B-5(5)).

### **Project Description**

A Minor Subdivision of an approximately 10-acre parcel into two parcels of approximately 2.5 acres and 7.5 acres. A Special Permit is required to allow Lot Size Modification to create a parcel below the 5-acre minimum pursuant to Section 314-99.1 H.C.C. The parcel is developed with a single-family residence, accessory structures and an on-site wastewater treatment system which will remain on proposed Parcel 1. Proposed Parcel 2 will be vacant and suitable for residential development. An exception request to allow a 20-foot setback to the barn on proposed Parcel 1 has been reviewed and approved by CAL FIRE. Both parcels will be served with water provided by the Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Services District and on-site wastewater treatment systems.

### **Baseline Conditions: Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**

The project site is located in the Fieldbrook area on the east side of Fieldbrook Road. It is in a developed neighborhood and surrounded by other similarly sized residential parcels.

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required** (permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Humboldt County Public Works Department, Division of Environmental Health, 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.

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

June 26, 2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Trevor Estlow, 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. <b>Aesthetics.</b> 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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                   |                                |  | X                            |           |

### Discussion:

**(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is not within an area mapped or designated with scenic vistas or resources nor is it in the Coastal Zone where specified areas of scenic values are mapped and certified by the state. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area. The parcels will be served by Fieldbrook Road. The Department finds no evidence that the creation of one additional parcel within an area characterized as rural residential will have a substantial adverse aesthetic impact. There is no indication that the future development likely to occur on the site will significantly increase light or glare or effect nighttime views in the vicinity.

| <p><b>II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p> | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>(a-e) No Impact:</b> Neither the subject property nor adjacent lands are within a Williamson Act contract. The site is not considered prime or unique farmland and is not used for agricultural purposes. The neighborhood is characterized by rural residential development with on-site septic systems and domestic water provided by the Fieldbrook/Glendale Community Services District. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern. One-family residential is a primary and compatible use within the RA designation and is principally permitted in the AG zoning district. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources.</p>   |                                |  |                              |           |

| <b>III. Air Quality.</b> 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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                |  | X                            |           |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**Discussion:**

**(a-e) Less than Significant:** The proposed project divides an approximately 10-acre parcel into two parcels. The subdivision will site the existing residence on one of the proposed parcels, with the other proposed parcel suitable for residential development. According to recent studies by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), the most significant contributors to PM-10 are residential wood burning stoves. Also, according to the NCUAQMD, all of 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. The area is characterized as suburban residential with similar sized lots in the surrounding areas. The Department finds no evidence that the project that is consistent with the planned build-out of the area will have a significant adverse impact on air quality.

| 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 federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| 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) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:**

Although, no tree removal is proposed at this time, future homesite development may require the removal of some trees. Therefore, in order to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Fish and Game Code, tree removal and brush clearing must be conducted outside of the nesting season. This measure is included in Mitigation Measure No. 1.

**(b-f) Less Than Significant:** The project site is not within an adopted or proposed habitat conservation plan. The area is developed with a residence and accessory structures. According to the California Natural Diversity Database, the site is outside any mapped habitat area. The project was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, however, they did not respond with any concerns. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on any habitat conservation plan.

**Mitigation Measure No.1.** The Development Plan shall include the following language: "Tree removal and vegetation clearing associated with the Project should be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (the nesting season is generally considered to be March 1 – August 15) in order to avoid 'take' as defined and prohibited by Fish and Game Code (FGC) §3503, 3503.5, 3513, and by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S. Code 703 et seq.). If work must be conducted during the bird nesting season, a qualified ornithologist (someone who is able to identify Northern California birds, and who has experience in nest-searching for passerines and raptors) should thoroughly survey the area no more than seven days prior to tree/vegetation removal to determine whether active nests (nests containing eggs or nestlings) are present. If active nests are found, appropriate buffers should be developed in consultation with CDFW to avoid a take."

| 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 as defined in §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) No Impact:** No historical resources have been documented on site. The site is currently developed with a home of fairly modern construction. No structures are proposed to be removed, therefore, the project will have no impact on historical resources defined in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5.

**(b,d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** Pursuant to AB52, the project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, the Blue Lake Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe. The NWIC recommended a cultural resource study and consultation with the local Tribes. Upon further consultation with the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe, it was recommended that the project be approved with no further study provided a note regarding inadvertent discovery is included in the project. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor will execute Mitigation Measure No. 2. by halting construction and coordinating 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. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure No. 2 includes language in the event that human remains are accidentally discovered during construction.

**Mitigation Measure No. 2.** The following note shall be place on the Development Plan and carried out through project implementation: "If suspected archaeological resources are encountered during the project: 1. Stop work within 100 feet of the find; 2. Call the Calfire project representative, a professional archaeologist and representatives from the Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe; 3. The professional historic resource consultant, Tribes and Calfire

officials will coordinate and provide an assessment of the find and determine the significance and recommend next steps.

"If human remains are encountered: 1. All work shall stop and per CA Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5: 2. Call the Humboldt County Coroner at (707) 445-7242; 3. The Coroner will determine if the remains are of prehistoric/historic Native American origin. If the remains are Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. 5. The NAHC is responsible under CA PRC 5097.98. (a) for identifying the most likely descendent (MLD) immediately and providing contact information. The MLD may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site."

The applicant is ultimately responsible for ensuring compliance with this condition."

| VI. <b>Geology and Soils.</b> 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 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         |
| <b>Discussion:</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |

**(a) No Impact:** There are no known earthquake faults located within the site.

**(i-iv) No impact:** The project site is located outside an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed project divides one parcel into two. The parcel is developed with one residence that will remain on proposed Parcel 1, with the other parcel suitable for residential development. All development associated with the subdivision will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The project is not within an area subject to landslides; therefore the project will not expose people or structures to risk of lost, injury, or death involving landslides.

**(b) Less Than Significant impact:** Any future home construction or road improvements will utilize appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) which will prevent soil erosion and loss of topsoil.

**(c) No impact:** The project is not located on geologic units or soils that are unstable or that will become unstable as a result of the project. The project will not result in the creation of new unstable areas either on or off site due to physical changes in a hill slope affecting mass balance or material strength.

**(d) No impact:** The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994); therefore, the project will not create substantial risks to life or property.

**(e) No Impact:** The project will connect to community sewer provided by the McKinleyville Community Services District.

| <b>VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</b> 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) Less Than Significant Impact:** The eventual residential construction on the vacant lots would contribute temporary, short-term increases in air pollution from equipment usage.

Because of the temporary nature of the greenhouse gas contributions, coupled with the modest quantity of emission, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

| VIII. 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) 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?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**Discussion:**

**(a-h) Less Than Significant impact:** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed subdivision involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is approximately five miles from the nearest airport, California Redwood Coast – Humboldt County Airport. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. The site is outside the area of concern related to the County's adopted Airport land use plan and will not result in unanticipated risk to the occupants of the site. 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 site is within the Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Services District with emergency fire services provided by the Fieldbrook Volunteer Department. 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 to high fire hazard severity area. The Planning Division expects that the minor subdivision will not result in significant impacts in terms of hazardous materials.

| IX. 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?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| 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)? |                                |  | 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, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**(a-j) Less than significant:** The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, and is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, in terms of both the County's Housing Element and the Fieldbrook/Glendale community plan. The project site is an area served by community water and on-site sewer systems. The Fieldbrook-Glendale Services District has indicated that it is able to provide water upon the payment of the appropriate fees. The Environmental Health Division has not identified any concerns with regard to the project interfering with groundwater recharge. The Department finds no evidence indicating that the subdivision will violate any water quality or waste discharge standards, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel, the project site is located in Flood Zone C, which is defined as "areas of minimal flooding", and is outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains. The project site is not within a mapped

dam or levee inundation area, and is outside the areas subject to tsunami run-up. The site is at an elevation of approximately 140 feet.

No streams, creeks or other waterways will be altered as a result of this subdivision. The Department finds no evidence that the proposed project will result in significant hydrologic or water quality impacts.

| <b>X. Land Use and Planning.</b> 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) 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? |                                |  |                              | X         |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |                                |  |                              | X         |

**Discussion:**

**(a-c) No Impact:** The project site is designated Residential Agriculture: 5 to 20 acres (RA5-20), Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Planning Area (FGCPA), 2017 General Plan, Density: Range is 5 to 20 acres per unit. The neighborhood is characterized as rural residential. The creation of one additional parcel for residential development is consistent with the zoning and land use density. The proposed subdivision infills an established development pattern, is consistent with the planned build-out of the area, and is consistent with the policies and regulations specified in the Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Plan and General Plan. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans proposed or adopted for this area. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning.

| <b>XI. Mineral Resources.</b> 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.

| XII. Noise. Would the project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                |  |                              | X         |
| b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?   |                                |  |                              | X         |
| c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                |  |                              | 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                |  | X                            |           |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**Discussion:**

**(a-d) No Impact:** Noises generated by the proposed project will result in a temporary increase during construction because the proposed project may require the use of heavy equipment (excavator, grader, loader and backhoe). The construction does not include equipment that would result in groundborne vibration. These activities are consistent with the current uses at the site and no permanent change in noise from the existing conditions would result from this project.

**(e and f) Less Than Significant Impact:** The project area is approximately five miles from the California Redwood Coast – Humboldt County Airport, and is not subject to the airport land use compatibility plan. The noise impacts associated with the airport are not anticipated to be excessive. Therefore, noise impacts will remain less than significant.

| XIII. Population and Housing. Would the project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |                                |  |                              | X         |

**Discussion:**

**(a-c) No** The proposed project divides one parcel into two. One existing residence will be sited on proposed Parcel 1 with the other proposed parcel vacant and suitable for residential development. One-family residential uses are primary and compatible uses within the plan designation and zoning district. The subdivision is consistent with the planned density of the area. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on population and housing.

| XIV. 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) No Impact:** The parcels will be accessed via Fieldbrook Road. The Department of Public Works has recommended improvements to Fieldbrook Road to meet current standards. The Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Services District did not identify any fire protection issues. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on public services.

| XV. 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 does not include recreational facilities. The project site is not within a Quimby Act fee area. The Department finds no evidence that the project will require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

| XVI. Tribal Cultural Resources.   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) 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: |                                |  |                              |           |
| i) 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   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| ii) 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, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**Discussion:**

**(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact:** The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, the Blue Lake Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe. The NWIC recommended a cultural resource study and consultation with the local Tribes. Upon further consultation with the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe, it was recommended that the project be approved with no further study provided a note regarding inadvertent discovery is included in the project. The standard condition of inadvertent discovery has been included as Mitigation Measure No. 2.

| XVII. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |                                |  | X                            |           |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  |                                |  | X                            |           |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   |                                |  | X                            |           |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?  |                                |  | X                            |           |

**Discussion:**

**(a-f) Less Than Significant Impact:** The property is accessed by Fieldbrook Road. The Land Use Division of Public Works has recommended standard conditions of approval including the improvement of the encroachment.

The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will exceed the level of service standard, will result in a change in air traffic patterns, will result in inadequate emergency access, inadequate access to nearby uses or inadequate parking capacity; or will conflict with adopted policies supporting transportation. The project site is approximately five miles southeast of the California Redwood Coast – Humboldt County Airport, the closest airport.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) requires land use projects to analyze traffic impacts based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). While no thresholds of significance have been adopted by the County, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) uses household VMT per capita as a recommended threshold with a threshold of 15% less than existing city household VMT per capita or regional household VMT per capita.

Given the proposed project's geographic location in a somewhat rural area, it would likely have a VMT per capita greater than the nearest city (Arcata) average. However, in a regional context, the proposed project site is closer to the urbanized portion of the City of Arcata than most areas of the

region. Therefore, the proposed project would likely have a lower than average VMT per capita in comparison to the regional average. Based on this qualitative analysis, VMT impacts are expected to be less than significant.

| XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                       |                                |  |                              | X         |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  |                                |  |                              | X         |
| d) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (i.e., new or expanded entitlements are needed)?   |                                |  |                              | X         |
| e) 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         |
| f) Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?   |                                |  |                              | X         |
| g) Violate any federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  |                                |  |                              | X         |

**Discussion:**

**(a-g) No Impact:** The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will be inconsistent with the planned build-out of the area or will result in a significant adverse to utilities and service systems. The parcel is not zoned for commercial or industrial uses. The lots will be served by on-site septic systems and community water provided by the Fieldbrook-Glendale Community Services District. The Department of Environmental Health has recommended approval of the project. The Division of Public Works reviewed the project and did not identify any drainage issues. The applicant will be required to provide a complete hydraulic report and drainage plan. The Department finds the project impact to be insignificant.

| <b>XIV. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</b>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | 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? |                                |  |                              | 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 through c) No Impact:** The proposed project divides one parcel into two. An existing residence will remain on proposed Parcel 1 with proposed Parcel 2 vacant and suitable for residential development. Staff finds no evidence that the proposed project will significantly degrade the quality of the environment, nor will it have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Based on the project as described in the administrative record, comments from reviewing agencies, a review of the applicable regulations, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is no significant evidence to indicate the proposed project as mitigated will have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## Proposed Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

### Biological Resources

**Mitigation Measure No. 1.** The Development Plan shall include the following language: "Tree removal and vegetation clearing associated with the Project should be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (the nesting season is generally considered to be March 1 – August 15) in order to avoid 'take' as defined and prohibited by Fish and Game Code (FGC) §3503, 3503.5, 3513, and by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S. Code 703 et seq.). If work must be conducted during the bird nesting season, a qualified ornithologist (someone who is able to identify Northern California birds, and who has experience in nest-searching for passerines and raptors) should thoroughly survey the area no more than seven days prior to tree/vegetation removal to determine whether active nests (nests containing eggs or nestlings) are present. If active nests are found, appropriate buffers should be developed in consultation with CDFW to avoid a take."

*Timing for Implementation/Compliance:* Throughout project construction

*Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:* Applicant and successors

*Monitoring Frequency:* Throughout construction

*Evidence of Compliance:* Visible evidence

### Cultural Resources

**Mitigation Measure No. 2.** The following note shall be placed on the Development Plan and carried out through project implementation: "If suspected archaeological resources are encountered during the project: 1. Stop work within 100 feet of the find; 2. Call the Calfire project representative, a professional archaeologist and representatives from the Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe; 3. The professional historic resource consultant, Tribes and Calfire officials will coordinate and provide an assessment of the find and determine the significance and recommend next steps.

"If human remains are encountered: 1. All work shall stop and per CA Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5: 2. Call the Humboldt County Coroner at (707) 445-7242; 3. The Coroner will determine if the remains are of prehistoric/historic Native American origin. If the remains are Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. 5. The NAHC is responsible under CA PRC 5097.98. (a) for identifying the most likely descendent (MLD) immediately and providing contact information. The MLD may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site."

The applicant is ultimately responsible for ensuring compliance with this condition."

*Timing for Implementation/Compliance:* Throughout project construction

*Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:* Applicant and successors

*Monitoring Frequency:* Throughout construction

*Evidence of Compliance:* Visible evidence