

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Project title: Resource Utilization Company Rock Pit-Surface Mining and Reclamation Plan renewal

2. Lead agency name and address:

Humboldt County Planning Department
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501

3. Contact person and phone number: Joshua Dorris (707) 268-3779

4. Project location: In the town of Orleans, within Orleans 7.5 min USGS Quad portions of Section 36, T11N, R5E, and Section 31, T11N R6E, H.B.&M. The site is accessed from on a private road which accesses onto Eyesee Road (USFS) and State Highway 96 (APN 529-131-011)

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Thomas W. Horn
Resource Utilization Company
P.O. Box 349
Orleans, CA 95556

6. General Plan Designation: AE, IG

7. Zoning: MH, U

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

This renewal request as proposed herein is for a project site that is 5 acres (Note: Original Reclamation Plan was 13 acres. Phase 2 has been removed from this renewal this amending the project size to 5 acres) of moderately consolidated non-marine sand and gravel material when benched and brought down to surrounding elevations (430' NGVD). Twice this amount is available when including the subsurface work proposed. The project is historic in nature and will continue with permit renewal and contains enough material to annually extract an average of 20,000 cubic yards for the next 40 years, longer when continued to be operated on an intermittent basis. Maximum production rates are proposed to be limited to 50,000 cubic yards in any given year, while still maintaining the average annual rate of 20,000 cubic yards averaged over a five-year period. Extraction will occur in a manner that minimizes reclamation requirements. Site conditions and historic monitoring indicates that extraction at average historical levels is appropriate at this site and that such operations will not cause immediate nor cumulative significant adverse environmental impacts. The proposal is apply for a renewal as a conditional use permit and Surface mining and reclamation plan. This project will remain consistent with the previous terms and conditions found within the previous permits. The proposal is for the continued extraction of up to 50,000 cubic yards of aggregate (sand and gravel) on an annual basis. The ongoing operation will continue to extract material as long as material is available. Aggregate materials will be extracted, loaded onto trucks and transported to an off-site location where processing and storage will occur.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Adjacent lands are designated Timber (T) and Residential Estates (RE), utilized generally for timber production, residential, agriculture, commercial, open space, wildlife habitat and highway.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

CA Division of Mines and Geology Mine ID, USACOE Section 404 Permit, CDFW LSA Agreement, RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification,

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? Yes

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

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

Joshua Davis

10/15/2020

Signature

Date

This checklist identifies physical; biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and dot represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: a) The proposed project is within the owner's landholdings, with no nearby public access. The project has been limited in size, scope and location and is not readily visible from nearby private or public locations because of existing topography, vegetation and distance (2000 ft.) from State Highway 96. The operation described in application materials do not include any new sources of light or glare affecting views in the area. Therefore, no visual impacts from the proposed extraction operation would be expected on any scenic vistas, scenic resources or the surrounding area. With standards included in the Mining and Reclamation Plans, no mitigation measures are necessary. b) The proposed project does not have rock outcroppings or historical buildings within its boundaries. c) This project has been historically mined for aggregate resources. The intensity and duration of the proposed project is well within that which has occurred in a historical context. These views are limited in extent and distance and those utilizing this area during recent history would be accustomed to the project site, Due to the similarities between the historical use of the site and that of the proposed project, the public is expected to be acclimated to the proposed project. d) Project operations do not take place at night and require little equipment and no construction. Only the equipment could cause any glare, but this would be minimal. The project will not result in new sources or light or glare which would affect day or nighttime views in the area. Mitigation: None required				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?	<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 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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion 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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) Humboldt County has not been mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (www.consrv.gov). However, no prime agricultural soils have been identified within the project area.</p> <p>b) The project is proposed within a parcel zoned as Heavy Industrial (MH) and Unclassified (U). The final reclaimed state of the project area is consistent with the existing zoning. No Williamson Act Contract exists on the project parcels. Both California State Law and Humboldt County Ordinances encourage the conservation and utilization of mineral resources on private lands. In the past, the County has found that surface mining is considered a compatible use with lands zoned and designated for agricultural uses.</p> <p>c) The project consist is zoned agricultural and Industrial and will be reclaimed to the existing state following mining operations. No timber land will be effected of rezoned as part of this project as a result no effects to these resources will occur.</p> <p>d) No loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses will occur as a result of this project</p> <p>e) The project proposes to use the site as it has been historically; no farmland, timberland or forest land will be converted. Use of existing road access will be maximized.</p> <p>The change in the existing environment is only proposed during the life of the permit. The proposed reclamation includes provisions for restoration (re-vegetation). The retention of the access road is consistent with the needs of agricultural activities.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) and b) There are three types of air pollutants could result from this project. One is emissions from licensed extraction equipment and trucks used for transporting the gravel off-site. The second is dust from extraction, and transport and third from sorting and process of material at the site.</p> <p>The project will result in similar truck traffic levels as has occurred in the past. Vehicles will be maintained to meet emission standards and off-road equipment. Extraction and hauling activities can produce high fugitive dust levels during certain times of operation. The major sources of dust at the site would be from extraction, and truck traffic on the dirt access roads. Most of the dust that could cause a possible nuisance would be most attributable to truck traffic on the dirt access roads, with dust being carried upstream by the prevailing winds that generally travel up the river valley during the day. Dust associated with truck traffic would be trapped by the surrounding dense vegetation and would be less noticeable. Dust would only be created during times when extraction and hauling occur, and would be substantially decreased by periodic watering of the extraction areas, and access roads. USEPA (1995) has determined that at an average wind speed of 10 m.p.h. most dust (30 to 100 µm in size) generally settles out of the atmosphere within 300 feet of the source, with larger particles traveling less distance and smaller particles traveling a longer distance. Most of the extraction areas, and hauling roads are more than 300 feet from the nearest residences and roads are continually watered during extraction activities. Activity in the project area would continue to require meeting NCUAQMD Air Quality standards, including Regulation 1, which prohibits nuisance dust generation and is enforceable by the District. The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District currently enforces dust emissions utilizing the CA Health and Safety Code (Section 41707) which limits visible emissions that exceed 40% density to a maximum of 3 minutes for any one-hour period. There are currently no air quality problems identified in this region, and as proposed this project will not result in a violation of ambient air quality standards either individually or cumulatively in the area. The only sensitive receptors are the residences in the vicinity, however, due to the limited extraction activity that will occur, the rapid dissipation of the dust and the low density of residences, impacts will not be significant.</p> <p>c) During certain times of the year, mostly in the winter, the NCAB is non-attainment for the state standard for particulate matter (PM-10), mainly in the area surrounding Humboldt Bay. Currently, the NCAB is non-attainment only for a few days per year. The draft attainment plan for PM-10 in the NCAB was completed in 1995. No final attainment plan currently exists for the NCAB. The attainment goals for lowering PM-10 in the NCAB were designed for Crescent City, Weaverville, Eureka, the nearest town (Ferndale), and PM-10 generated by this site would be detected best by the monitoring station located in Eureka. Based on the estimates generated for the 1995 draft attainment plan, Eureka needs a 49% reduction. This project as proposed consistent with past operations will not be generating any additional PM-10. Existing project mitigation measures included at the end of this section shall help to reach the attainment goals for PM-10 established in the 1995 draft attainment plan (NCUAQMD website).</p> <p>d) The sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include rural residences, and recreationists and divers traveling on local roads and the highway. Dust generated from gravel extraction, and loading and vehicle movement, has the potential to be considered objectionable by residents and recreationists in the general area.</p> <p>This project similar in nature to historic activities with the project site and proposes no increase in dust generation above historic levels. Due to the limited extraction activity that will occur, the rapid dissipation of the dust and the lack of historical</p>				

complaints by residences and recreationists, impacts are not significant. This project is required to meet air quality district standards on a continual basis.

e) The sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include rural residences, and recreationists and divers traveling on local roads and the highway. Dust generated from gravel extraction, and loading and vehicle movement, has the potential to be considered objectionable by residents and recreationists in the general area.

This project similar in nature to historic activities with the project site and proposes no increase in dust generation above historic levels. Due to the limited extraction activity that will occur, the rapid dissipation of the dust and the lack of historical complaints by residences and recreationists, impacts are not significant. This project is required to meet air quality district standards on a continual basis.

Mitigation:

A1. Periodic watering of the extraction site, and access roads will continue to be utilized (as necessary) to reduce fugitive dust emissions.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) Potential impacts to listed aquatic species are mitigated by implementation of erosion control methods and a reclamation plan controlling surface runoff. Potential noise impacts to listed avian species may occur from operations and a Mitigation Measure requires an analysis of operations affects to listed species. Potential impacts to mammal species are mitigated by maintaining operations at their historical levels and not expanding the mining site beyond that which currently exists.

b) The vegetation surrounding the site is composed of inland forest species of Northern California. These species and forest stands are not unique to the area and are not identified as a sensitive natural community. Storm runoff and the associated potential for sediment introduction to watercourses downslope will be control by the application of erosion control and the proposed surface runoff patterns proposed during surface mining and at completion of reclamation.

c) The proposed project is incapable of significantly increasing peak flows or interrupting the hydrological connectivity within the area.

No additional road construction is proposed in association with this project. As previously stated the risk of increasing sediment

introduction is mitigated by the application of annual erosion control measures and implementing surface drainage patterns consistent with the current pattern during the initial phase and then implementing a final grade conducive to the existing slope hydrology.

d) The project has been an active mine historically, The vast majority of this slope will be left in its current state following surface mining and final reclamation. No habitat modification is proposed.

Due to the environment created by historical mining the site is incapable of providing habitat for listed wildlife species. Fur bearing species may likely pass through the project area however, forage is limited to surrounding vegetated area and nesting habitat is not present.

Furthermore, the project area is adjacent to residential and industrial areas and traffic associated with logging, ranching activities, County road work, and rural commuters is consistent with noise levels produced during the course of operations. (see Biological Report).

e) The importance of existing gravel extraction operations is recognized by the Humboldt County General Plan (see Chapter 12, Energy Element).

This project is not in conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation and policy or ordinance.

f) The subject property is not within or subject to any habitat conservation plan.

Mitigation:

M2: Prior to blasting activities, a qualified biologist shall analyze potential noise disturbance to NSO at the property line to determine if the project conforms to USFWS noise guidelines as provided in Transmittal of Guidance: Estimating the Effects of Auditory and Visual Disturbance to Northern Spotted Owls and Marbled Murrelets in Northwestern California

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</u>				
Would the project				
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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Discussion:</u>				
a) There are no known historical resources are present in the project area.				
b) There are no known significant archaeological resources are present in the project area.				
c) There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features present in the project area.				
d) No human remains are known or were identified during the investigation at the project area.				
<u>Mitigation:</u>				
None proposed				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.				
Would the project				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
Discussion:				
i) Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 does not show any Alquist-Priolo earthquake zones within the project area. There is no likelihood that this project would impact these Faults or that these Faults would impact the proposed project.				
ii) The project site is located within youthful topography shaped by rapid uplifting and erosion within a geological time frame. The occurrence of earthquakes and strong seismic ground shaking has a potential to occur within and around the project vicinity. However, the surface mining and reclamation activities proposed will not expose people to any additional impacts related to this occurrence.				
iii) The ancestral alluvial deposit at the site is well compacted as can be observed along the access road and the exposed terrace at the site. Due to the lack, loosely consolidated material and the nature of the substrate surrounding the project site, the potential for liquefaction is greatly reduced. Seismic-related ground failure has the potential to occur; however, the activities proposed do not increase, exposure of people to this type of event.				
iv) The youthful topography within the coast range is known for its potential for mass wasting in the form of rotational/translational slides, debris torrents, and debris slide slopes. However, the mining site itself is located directly on flat located away from adjacent slopes. No unstable areas within the sites were identified that could potentially cause harm to existing structures or people within or adjacent to the site that could potentially result from the proposed operations. The proposed project incorporates a reclamation plan to ensure that storm runoff is directed away from any potential unstable areas that could exist within the site onto gentle, well vegetated, stable topography. The implementation of these BMPs as well as compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices included in the Reclamation Plan will reduce to a level of 'less than significance' any effects of landslides.				
b) The project site is located on fairly flat with limited to no top soil present with the operational area other than the access road and stockpile area. Compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices and re-vegetation of the site pursuant to the final reclamation standards included in the Reclamation Plan will reduce the potential occurrence of a substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion from occurring to a level of less than significant.				
c) The geologic unit upon which the proposed site is located is stable. The design of the mining plan and the final contour as well as the resulting drainage pattern, mitigate the potential for increased surface runoff from reaching these areas and accelerating erosion or impacting potential unstable areas.				
d) The site is located within an area possessing stable soils.				
e) Both existing toilets within the existing structures and portable chemical toilet will be provided and maintained by a licensed pumper.				

Mitigation:

None proposed

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</u>				
Would the project				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) and b) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.</p> <p>In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.</p> <p>It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions since the project entails the same historic operations approved in previous permits and is essentially the same or has been reduced due to the current restricted extraction volume allowed under the current PEIR and thus not increasing the baseline emissions and not resulting in a net increase in emissions.</p>				
<p>Mitigation:</p> <p>None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u>				
Would the project				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) and b) This project does not involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste or the emissions or disposal of hazardous substances. Standards of operation minimize potential impacts of spills from this project.</p> <p>Public health and safety concerns include both on- site and off-site impacts. This project will not have a significant increase of risk to people on-site due to the following: it is in an somewhat isolated location; access is controlled; material to be excavated is structurally stable and no attractive nuisance to encourage trespass exists. No 'abandoned' equipment, structures, refuse, etc. associated with extraction activity will remain on the reclamation site or elsewhere on the parcel after extraction has been discontinued. If the current use is discontinued, the site will be incorporated into other current uses and/or utilized for future purposes consistent with current zoning.</p> <p>c) No hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste will be generated during the course of project operations, or left behind at the conclusion of operations.</p> <p>d) The site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites, and will not increase the risk of exposure to hazardous materials</p> <p>e) The nearest airstrip is a private air strip owned and controlled by the applicant. Substantial safety risks would not occur to people residing or working in the project area due to use of the airstrip.</p> <p>f) Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f)</p> <p>Mitigation: None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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"/>
e) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>

g) Place housing 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"/>
h) 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"/>
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The project area is outside of areas mapped by FEMA as being subject to flooding and is not subject to other water related hazards, due to its location and soil type.

The project extent is located 1000 feet westerly of Wilder Gulch Creek which eventually drains into the Klamath River. An intermittent draw occurs north of the property, altered historically with an impoundment and pipeline, which carries flows along the northerly property line and outside of the project area.

A small diversion ditch (no defined channel) carries intermittent winter overflows to the south, outside of the project area into a culvert and the existing sediment settling basin. This drainage feature was historically altered so that run-off drained towards the log ponds that use to exist on the lower portion of the property.

The portion, upstream of the culvert road crossing and outside of project activities has streamside- associated vegetation and is proposed to remain unaltered by project. Run off from the identified project area should continue to be designed to disperse evenly across the site. Drainage across the property occurs toward the south. Surface run-off reaching the, limits of the project site would be checked by the proposed berm and percolate into adjacent vegetation retained along the southerly project boundary and surrounding gravelly grassland sells. No flows will directly enter any creek; none are located near the project area. The closest perennial creek is more than 1000 feet away. On-site grading has been designed to continue dispersing runoff and maximizing soil percolation. No change in groundwater recharge will occur as a result of the project. No withdrawals are proposed other than that necessary for washing or dust control. This water will be returned to the groundwater table by recharge after use.

Implementation of erosion control measures contained in the Reclamation Plan will reduce the potential for any surface erosion or siltation. No significant increase of water quantity or any overall change from the pre-project drainage pattern is anticipated. The type of material that will be exposed by the extraction operation is not subject to erosion. No discharge of mineral wastes will occur to nearby tributaries. No discharge will occur to waters of the State. As such and due to the limitations of proposed project improvements no Industrial Storm water Control Plan should be required.

b) Other than historical uses of groundwater supplies at the site are proposed. The topographical setting along the flat as well as the proposed reclamation grade precludes the interception of groundwater.

c) No Alteration from historical drainage patterns is proposed.

d) No Alteration from historical drainage patterns is proposed.

e) The proposed project will not result in an increase in runoff because it does not involve the creation of any impermeable surfaces. This application is proposed consistent with past operations and no additional development is being proposed at the site. The site is not a part of an existing or planned stormwater drainage system.

No servicing of equipment (fueling or lubricating) occurs within the extraction area. In the event of an accidental lubricant or fuel leak (i.e., hydraulic fuel lines breaking, etc.), operators have been instructed to move equipment to safer high ground (roadway or upper bench). If gravel is contaminated with a spill, the material will be removed and properly disposed of.

The project will not result in any polluted runoff. Adherence to Mining and Reclamation Plan Standards that conform to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Water Code section 13000, et seq., and the Federal Clean Water Act 301 et seq. (33 U.S.C. Section 1251, 1311, 1344 et seq.) the Regional Water Quality Control Board or the State Water Resources Control Board, and requirements of the permitting agencies will ensure that water quality is not degraded.

f) Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f).

g) No housing is proposed as part of this project.

- h) No structures are proposed as part of this project.
- i) No levee or dam construction is associated with the project.
- j) The project is not located within an area that would be subject to inundation by standing ocean waves or mudflows.

Mitigation:

Compliance with Reclamation Plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (Including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
a) The project area is outside of areas mapped by FEMA as being subject to flooding and is not subject to other water related hazards, due to its location and soil type.				
b) The project is located within a parcel zoned as Heavy Industrial and Unclassified, General Plan designation is agricultural exclusive and general industrial. The County has determined that surface mining and Reclamation Plans are compatible uses within all zoning districts and land use designations. The subject area is considered to offer low to moderate grazing and will offer the same if not enhanced grazing opportunities once reclaimed.				
The Humboldt County General Plan supports the conservation, development and utilization of mineral resources (Chapter 10, Mineral Resources). It recognizes the importance of mineral extraction sites being necessary for construction and development, and an essential component for the continued well-being of the County. They are the basis for much of the construction materials for roads, concrete, streambank protection, erosion control, septic systems and passive solar projects. Importation of these materials would raise costs and negatively impact the development and maintenance within the County. It is important to protect specific sites and haul routes against land use incompatibilities to assure the continued utilization of this resource.				
c) The property included in the project area is not included in any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.				
Mitigation: None required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
<p>Discussion: a) and b) Rather than result in the loss of availability a locally important mineral resource, this project will allow the continued, sustainable utilization of an important mineral resource. The mineral resources available on the site are not unique to the area.</p> <p>Mitigation: None required.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project 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"/>
<p>Discussion: a) The project is historic in nature and is located in a rural area. The intensity and duration of operations are expected to be low and fall within a range consistent with the historical mining operations as well as the existing traffic that have taken place at the site and in association with the county regulations in the past. Expected noise levels at the nearest neighboring residence are 70 to 76 decibels.</p> <p>b) As previously stated, the intensity and duration of operations are expected to be at a low level. In addition, a dense stand of young -growth timber, brush and vegetation buffers the site. Elevated levels are anticipated for the equipment operator(s) only.</p> <p>c) Due to the limited times of project activities, the project will not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.</p> <p>d) Temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the project area will occur. However, they are consistent with past noise levels.</p> <p>e) The nearest airstrip is the public airstrip is located outside of an airport land use plan. Any noise generated by the existing airport is minor and is not excessive beyond the historical baseline. Non effect to Individuals utilizing the project site is anticipated.</p> <p>f) Discussion for finding e) applies to both finding e) & f).</p> <p>Mitigation: NSO survey</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project				
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"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) The proposed project will not produce any significant growth inducing impacts. Aggregate extraction is normally driven by growth, not vice versa. Growth inducing impacts are generally caused by projects that have a direct or indirect affect on economic growth, population growth, or when the project taxes community service facilities which require upgrades beyond the existing remaining capacity. No services or utilities are being required to be extended to the site. The economic benefits would not be such that people might be attracted to the area as a result.</p> <p>b) and c) The project will not displace any existing housing or people. There is no housing or people located within the project area.</p> <p>Mitigation: None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project				
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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) The project consists of the continuation of an historic operation. Additional use of fire protection, Police projection, schools, parks, or other public facilities will not be required for the project as proposed and consistent with past operations.</p> <p>Mitigation: None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION. Would the project				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) The proposed project is located within a private fenced ownership. The project area is an existing surface mining site and does not afford recreational opportunities in its current state. No public recreational opportunities are proposed by the project as a result on impacts on exiting recreational facilities is expected.</p> <p>b) The project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation: None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>a) Humboldt County does not have a regional transportation plan, program, or policy addressing the circulation system. Therefore, the project would have no impact.</p> <p>b) Access to the project site is approximately 1,000 feet from State Highway 96. Pursuant to Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts (14 CCR 15064.3(b)(1) <i>Determining the Significant of Transportation Impacts</i>), projects within one-half mile of an existing stop along an existing highway transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Therefore, the project has a less than significant impact.</p> <p>c) The project involves renewing permits for an existing surface mining and processing facility and does not involve new uses or roadways. Therefore, the project has no impact.</p> <p>d) The project is historical in nature and no issues have been previously raised by affected agencies relating to inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the project would have no impact.</p> <p>Mitigation: None proposed</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
a) Since no water resources will be used on site other than for dust abatement, and processing of materials that will occur on-site, no discharge into State waters will occur. Therefore no measures for wastewater treatment are proposed.				
b) Existing toilets or portable chemical toilets will be provided and maintained by a licensed pumper. The use and maintenance of the portable sanitary facilities will comply with all state and county regulations pertaining to this type of facility. No new water treatment or wastewater facilities or the expansion of such facilities are proposed or needed for the project				
c) No new storm water facilities or the expansion of existing facilities are needed for the project.				
d) No water resources will be required for extraction activities.				
e) There is no wastewater treatment provider associated with the site.				
f) The project site utilizes Humboldt County permitted land fill system for its solid wastes and disposal needs.				
g) The site will not create any solid waste that is not handled by and disposed of by an appropriate licensed operator.				
Mitigation:				
None proposed				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
Would the project				
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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>